



STATE CAPITOL COMMITTEE

**Legislative Building
Senate Rules Room
304 15th Avenue SW
Olympia, Washington 98504**

**June 21, 2018
9:00 a.m.**

Final Minutes

SCC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark Neary (Acting Chair) on behalf of Cyrus Habib, Lt. Governor (SCC Chair) & Kim Wyman, Secretary of State (Vice SCC Chair)
Ted Sturdevant (on behalf of Hillary Franz, Commissioner of Public Lands)
Kelly Wicker, Governor's Designee

OTHERS PRESENT:

Chris Liu, Director, Dept. of Enterprise Services	Rose Hong, Dept. of Enterprise Services
Bill Frare, Dept. of Enterprise Services	Nouk Leap, Dept. of Enterprise Services
Ann Larson, Dept. of Enterprise Services	Lisa Pemberton, Dept. of Enterprise Services
Kevin Dragon, Dept. of Enterprise Services	Carly Kujath, Office of Financial Management
Chris Gizzi, Dept. of Enterprise Services	Allen Miller, NCCHPDA
La Tasha Wortham, Lt. Governor's Office	Bob Jacobs, NCCHPDA
W. Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services	

Welcome, Introductions & Approval of Agenda

Acting Chair Mark Neary called the State Capitol Committee (SCC) meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. A meeting quorum was attained.

Mr. Neary reviewed the meeting agenda.

Members provided self-introduction.

The SCC meeting agenda was published in *The Olympian* newspaper. Public comment for each specific agenda item will be received when the agenda item is under consideration. Comments for items not on the agenda will be received at the end of the meeting.

The agenda was accepted as published.

Approval of Minutes – December 7, 2017 & Joint SCC/CCDAC February 15, 2018 - Action

Kelly Wicker moved, seconded by Ted Sturdevant, to approve the minutes of December 7, 2017 and the Joint SCC and CCDAC meeting minutes of February 15, 2018 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Capitol Campus Development Opportunity Sites – Action

Mr. Neary reported in January 2017, Schacht/Aslani Architects and DES presented the findings and recommendations contained in the State Capitol Development Study, Opportunity Sites 1, 5, 6, & 12 during a joint meeting of SCC and the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC). Because the meeting lacked a quorum, no action was taken to adopt the study. A copy of those meeting minutes was provided to members for background on the discussion. Additionally, DES Director Chris Liu, DES Assistant Director Bill Frare, and DES Master Planner Kevin Dragon reviewed the findings and development scenarios described in the study with the CCDAC on May 17, 2018. CCDAC members recommended SCC approve the findings and recommendations in the study and pre-approved the development opportunity sites outlined in the study. This briefing includes a review of the recommendations in the study. Mr. Neary recognized Director Liu.

Director Liu reported the study helped to formulate goals and opportunity sites for future development. The Schacht/Aslani report is comprehensive and identified sites ready for development. The report does not identify specific uses for any of the sites other than the site would be available for future development. The SCC and the Legislature determine the type of development for each site.

Assistant Director Bill Frare, Facility Professional Services, said the study examined four opportunity sites and identified several site development alternatives for each site. Each of the alternatives included three to five development scenarios, such as demolishing the existing building or full buildout of the site with cost estimates included for each scenario. Because campus parking was a priority for DES during the study, all building sites include parking options and associated costs.

Currently, the General Administration Building (GA) does not include any parking. However, the alternatives for the site include options for rehabilitation of the building or constructing a new building. The difference in cost between rehabilitation and new construction is approximately \$10 million more. Parking was not included within those scenarios. The study explored costs for off-site parking and the cost to add parking to the scenarios. The study provides the SCC and the Legislature with several options for consideration moving forward. The requested action before the SCC is pre-approval of the sites. The action does not approve any new buildings or any specific construction project.

Mr. Sturdevant asked whether the recommendation includes any implications in terms of how the sites are managed in the near term. Assistant Director Frare cited the GA and Newhouse sites as examples and explained that DES, as the manager of the assets, recognizes the status of each building's current lifecycle. Maintenance and preventive maintenance decisions are based on the long-term use of the facilities. For the GA Building, OFM elected to have all personnel removed from the building. The building is currently vacant. The Legislature also funded the removal of art within the building. Mothballing the building entailed shutting down as many systems as possible to reduce operational costs.

Planner Dragon provided a summarized presentation of the January 7, 2017 presentation by Schacht/Aslani Architects. A project team assigned to the study considered all development sites identified in the Master Plan for Capitol Campus. The study focused on Development Opportunity Sites 1, (GA Building) 5 (Pritchard Building), 6 (Newhouse Building), and 12 (ProArts Site). Programmatic needs were identified as the House, Senate, and Legislative support. The team considered visitor services and swing space needs as well because each year, the campus hosts approximately 2,500 school districts for tours. The study explored ways to build capacity to address those needs, as well as swing space for employees when buildings are under renovation or replacement. Swing space in Thurston County is limited.

The study identified sites 5 and 6 for Legislative-related functions with sites 1 and 12 identified for agency functions. Maximum height limitations were identified in the Master Plan. Building heights on the West Campus are not to rival the size of the Legislative Building as it should always be the prominent feature within the landscape. The O'Brien and Cherberg Buildings establish the size for office buildings in terms of height. The buildings above the Plaza on the East Campus set the height requirements (OB2 and WSDOT). There was also acknowledgement of the importance to protect the view corridors to and from the Legislative Building.

Pedestrian corridors were examined to identify ways to improve corridors and develop new connections for surrounding neighborhoods. The study also considered parking needs on campus. The Parking Management Plan was reviewed to determine ways to implement some elements of the plan recognizing parking needs are greatest during legislative sessions.

The study recognized that the Helen Sommers Building (1063 Block) would experience an increase in parking demand. Recent preliminary data indicates parking need is not as great as forecasted; however, future parking needs would continue to increase. The study explored cost effective parking solutions recognizing parking structures are more expansive than surface parking.

The study also accounted for the Wilder & White design principles and the Olmsted Brothers Landscape Plan for spatial order on the campus, acknowledging that some significant features have been modernized.

The study identified the development capacity of each opportunity site but no programmatic needs. Programmatic needs are typically identified during a pre-design of a facility.

Planner Dragon reviewed existing conditions for each of the opportunity sites:

- The GA Building completed in 1956 is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is considered an historic building on campus. The building has been vacated and mothballed. Current limitations include the City of Olympia's prohibition for any reoccupation of the building until significant improvements to the building are completed.
- The Pritchard Building was completed in 1958 and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Today, the building vacancy is 63% with current uses for legislative and administrative functions. The building's design presents some challenges. Some pre-designs were completed to identify ways to repurpose the building. Conversion of the building to a different programmatic use would be very costly.
- The Newhouse Building was completed in 1934 and is eligible for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. The building was constructed as a temporary facility. The building is fully occupied with many offices undersized.
- The ProArts site was purchased as a future development site. The site is shared with a park creating some site constraints in the design of a new facility.

Capacity analyses were completed for each site. For the GA site, the study identified a seven-story building with parking for 420 vehicles totaling a building gross size of 275,000 square feet. The Pritchard site identified a building capacity of 144,000 square feet with parking for 400 vehicles. Cost projections were completed for each development scenario. Site constraints were identified for all sites.

Planner Dragon reviewed study results for each opportunity site. For the GA Building site, four alternatives were studied. The first was mothballing the building at an estimated cost of \$500,000 annually as identified in 2017 dollars. Mothballing the facility preserves the structure if the state decided to reinvest in the facility. The second alternative was removal of the building and construction of a surface parking lot for 305 vehicles at a cost of \$11.3 million. The third alternative was renovation of the building for agency offices at a cost of \$190 million. The last scenario of demolition and replacement of the building would cost \$200 million.

Mr. Sturdevant asked for further clarification of the parking option with the renovation of the GA Building. Assistant Director Frare described the importance of providing equal comparisons between the alternatives. Renovation of the GA Building would provide 251,000 square feet, which is less than full build-out of the site and smaller than the existing building. The design concept creates an entryway atrium to increase light within the building. Additionally, the building would be modernized. The option incorporated some pre-design work previously completed for the GA Building. That option was estimated to cost \$140 million. Since it would not be possible to add a structured parking facility under the existing building, offsite structured parking would either be required above ground or underground at a costly rate. To ensure equal comparisons, the size of the buildings is consistent between the alternatives. Renovation of the GA Building would cost \$140 million for a 251,000 square foot facility while a new building of 251,000 square feet would cost \$150 million, acknowledging the site could accommodate a much larger building. The new facility scenario includes 420 parking stalls beneath the new building based on the limitations of the site. For an equal comparison between the alternatives, renovation of the building includes structured parking off-site of 420 parking stalls.

Mr. Neary noted that replacement surface parking would require demolition of the building to create parking. Assistant Director Frare said the option was viewed as an interim step, as using the site for surface parking is not the highest and best use of the site. The alternative served as a way to bank the land while providing a benefit and reducing operational costs until a final decision for the site was determined.

Planner Dragon reported the alternatives for the Pritchard Building include the do nothing option at no additional cost other than existing operational costs today. Another alternative of renovation and addition considers the cost to renovate the existing design of the facility to a new programmatic design. The costs are estimates based on programmatic assumptions. Another alternative of renovation and creating space for events and receptions without programmatic space was estimated to cost \$15 million. The option did not increase parking capacity. The last alternative of a new structure constructed on the parking lot site to accommodate House offices while retaining the Pritchard Building was estimated to cost \$75.6 million. Expanding and replacement to accommodate House and Senate offices would cost an estimated \$138 million to include parking for 420 vehicles. Some of the information within the alternatives was from previous studies of the Pritchard Building.

Alternatives for the Newhouse Building included replacement of the building for Senate offices at an estimated cost of \$80 million with parking capacity of 210 spaces. The second alternative replaces the building to accommodate House and Senate offices estimated to cost \$131 million with parking capacity of 420 vehicles. Demolition and replacement of the building with surface parking as an interim measure was estimated to cost \$4.4 million and would accommodate 350 vehicles. However, the alternative creates a programmatic issue of displacement of employees currently housed in the Newhouse Building.

Ms. Wicker inquired about the status of information on the current pre-design study for the Newhouse Building. Assistant Director Frare advised that the committee would receive an update later in the meeting.

Planner Dragon reviewed the alternatives for the ProArts site. The first alternative of retaining the two existing buildings with current parking capacity of 50 vehicles would not increase costs to the state. The alternative speaks to whether that would be the highest and best use for the short- and long-term. Two (1/2 block & full block) alternatives considered replacement of the existing structure(s) with agency offices. The half-block alternative was estimated to cost \$138.6 million while the full block alternative would cost approximately \$209.8 million.

The goal of the development analysis was to provide an integrated solution with multiple benefits, accommodate campus parking demand, and meet the immediate needs of the House and Senate. The analysis considered costs as a development constraint and the 60-year gap between the last campus building constructed (Pritchard Building) and the new Helen Sommers Building.

The study also bundled the sites into logical development scenarios. Three scenarios of the combined opportunity sites were identified:

Scenario 1:

- Mothball GA Building & maintain systems
- Retain Pritchard Building – do nothing
- Construct facility for House offices on Pritchard parking lot with below grade parking for 210 vehicles
- Replace Newhouse Building with Senate office building with below grade parking for 210 vehicles
- Retain ProArts site – do nothing

Scenario 2:

- Mothball GA
- Retain Pritchard Building – do nothing
- Replace Newhouse Building with legislative offices and parking for 420 vehicles
- Retain ProArts site – do nothing

Scenario 3:

- Demolish and replace GA Building with surface parking for 305 vehicles
- Expand and replace Pritchard Building for legislative offices
- Demolish and replace Newhouse with surface parking for 350 vehicles
- Retain ProArts site – do nothing

The three scenarios are intended to promote conversations about future steps for the opportunity sites. Because of the lack of a meeting quorum when the study was initially presented, the findings of the report were not approved. The request to the SCC is to approve the findings of the report, as well as pre-approve the development opportunity sites.

Mr. Sturdevant asked whether the building costs include demolition. Planner Dragon affirmed that new building costs include demolition of the existing building.

Assistant Director Frare added that the costs are based on 2017 estimates and do not include future escalation.

Mr. Sturdevant asked whether parking within the study was considered expansively or creatively in terms of considering satellite parking with shuttles or other factors. Assistant Director Frare reported the Schacht/Aslani study did not consider parking expansively; however, the parking study completed in 2014/2015 explored different parking scenarios during legislative sessions to include parking availability along Deschutes Parkway, which is owned by the state. An option was developed using that space in addition to a shuttle bus to the campus.

Ted Sturdevant moved, seconded by Kelly Wicker, to approve the Schacht/Aslani study, State Capitol Development Study, Opportunities Sites 1, 5, 6, & 12 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Ted Sturdevant moved, seconded by Kelly Wicker, to pre-approve Development Opportunity Sites 1, 5, 6, and 12 as identified in the Schacht/Aslani study.

Carly Kujath, Office of Financial Management (OFM), asked whether the preapproval only pertains to the findings or whether it includes a plan to align the proposed Capitol Childcare Center with development opportunity sites 1, 5, 6, & 12. Director Liu noted the approval does not commit the location of the childcare project to those specific development sites as the Legislature renders those decisions through the legislative process. The Senate and House provide the funds for programmatic needs with DES implementing that direction.

Assistant Director Frare added that the SCC approves the Master Plan, as well as any new buildings on the campus. Additional information on the Newhouse Building and the childcare study will be shared later in the meeting.

Motion carried unanimously.

FY2017-19 Enacted Capital Budget and DES Work Plan – Information

Assistant Director introduced Chris Gizzi, Campus Architect, who is responsible for the implementation of Capital Work Plan projects.

Assistant Director Frare advised that because of the delay in approval of the capital budget this year, the budgeting process also experienced some delay and staff is striving to meet timelines for studies and critical work necessary to complete during the construction season. He reviewed progress on four studies underway:

1. ***Newhouse Building Study.*** DES is currently selecting the architect to complete the study by December 2018 for approval by OFM and the SCC prior to the legislative session.
2. ***Capitol Childcare Study.*** Schacht/Aslani Architect was selected as the consultant. A number of locations on the campus have been identified for the building. Current focus is on the IBM site located at the corner of Capitol Way and Maple Park Drive. Another site under consideration is the ProArts site. A draft report is anticipated by the end of August 2018 for presentation to the CCDAC in September and the SCC in October.

3. **Capitol Campus Security Study.** The study is being led by consultant, iParameters, to complete a comprehensive security study. The study should be completed by August 2018 with presentations to the CCDAC in September and the SCC in October 2018.
4. **Capitol Lake Environmental Impact Study (EIS).** DES is currently in the selection process for the consultant to lead the study. A preferred candidate has been identified. The Legislature approved \$4 million for the EIS during the biennium. That amount may be insufficient to complete the EIS with DES likely submitting an additional funding request of \$1 million to complete the study. The study is anticipated to take at least three years to complete.

Campus Architect Gizzi reviewed progress on several projects funded within the capital budget:

- **East Plaza –Water Infiltration & Elevator Repairs** – The project is focused on the East Plaza Garage. Water infiltration issues have occurred over many years. The phased project initiated over a decade ago includes completion of the north area of the garage. Work is beginning in the south area of the garage with focus on an area close to the Washington State Department of Transportation Building. That project includes removal of the top surface to include existing landscaping and sidewalks to access the water-proofing membrane for repair and reinstallation. Additionally, electrical repairs were identified in the west area of the garage because of water infiltration of existing electrical systems. DES is releasing a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a consultant. DES anticipates the project will be completed using the GC/CM delivery method. The GC/CM delivery method is an alternative public works delivery process that can accommodate COP funding deadlines. The complexity of the project justifies the GC/CM delivery method because it enables early participation by the contractor and the ability to interact with the design team. The project will likely entail some investigative work during the design process, which is also facilitated by that delivery method.
- **Building Envelope Repairs** – The project is focused on the exterior cladding of the Capitol Court, Cherberg, and Insurance Buildings. Cracking was discovered several years ago on some of the exterior stone on the Capitol Court Building, increasing concerns about the condition of the stone cladding and its attachment to the building. The study identified concerns about the clips holding the stone to the building. Focus this year is on design and repair work. It is likely some stone will be removed and reattached over building entryways. Initial investigative work will determine the extent of damage and any limitations of the structural clips. The exterior preservation project consists of cleaning, repairing and tuckpointing stone, as well as repairing some windows in the building. Previous installation of interior window inserts helped to increase energy efficiency; however, old exterior windows require some attention. During the biennium, design work will be completed for the Cherberg and Insurance Buildings for exterior cladding. The three projects were combined as one funding request for the biennium as the smaller project replaces the roofs on the Cherberg and Insurance Buildings. Because of the overlap between the two projects and exterior detailing work overlapping stone and roofing elements, the work needs to be combined. DES has completed the design selection process. Building Works from Seattle was selected as the design firm and negotiations are underway to develop an agreement.
- **Capitol Lake Long-Term Planning Process.** DES is working with Floyd|Snider from Seattle. Selection of the consultant for completion of the EIS was recently completed. The parties are negotiating an agreement .

- **Legislative Building Exterior Preservation and Cleaning** – DES has examined a number of different approaches. The project manager recommends working with the same firm that completed a similar project in 2012 as the firm has the building drawings and has completed preliminary investigation. The firm will update any changes in scope. Funding for the project is less than the funding request. DES is working to ensure efficient use of available funds. The primary focus is on the central dome and four mini dome features. The firm is currently in the design process and has begun to test material for cleaning surface stone with a biocide product. The soap product breaks down organic material growing on the surface of the building, which should extend the lifespan of the cleaning. The consultant is preparing a bid package for release next month for a contractor to begin work at the end of August. The expectation is not for a completely cleaned dome; however, DES is striving to achieve that outcome. The challenge is the inability to do the work during cold weather because joint repair is required at the time of cleaning to ensure the building is protected from leaks.
- **Capitol Campus Utility Renewal Plan** – The project addresses a number of utility issues across the campus. The existing utility system is old. DES has had to deal with many challenges to keep the system functional. The project scope addresses the entire system with a long list of deficiencies and issues requiring correction. The work will begin with the highest priority items during the biennium.
- **Newhouse Replacement Pre-design** – DES is currently in the selection process. Submittals from design firms are due later in the day. Steve Massi and Richard Ramsey are members of the selection panel, as well as individuals representing DES. The two-step process begins with a packet of information from firms identifying qualifications and experience and answering specific questions. Following a short-list of the qualification packages, approximately three firms will move to interviews. Interviews are scheduled for July followed by selection on the day of the interview.
- **Relocate Mural from GA to 1063** – Funds remaining from the 1063 project covered the costs for initial investigation. The funding allocation specifically ties the work to fundraising. Staff is working through that process. The consultant completed some preliminary cost estimates reflecting higher costs than previously projected. The amount included in the capital budget was based on an assumption that the work would commence during the construction phase of the 1063 Building. However, moving the mural today requires an additional scope of opening the Helen Summers Building, which increases the cost.
- **Thurston County Childcare** – Schacht/Aslani Architects is the consultant for the project. The firm is very familiar with the campus. The consultant team is working with stakeholders to identify the scope of the project and appropriate sites on campus to complete some site placement studies to ascertain if a particular site would be appropriate. Current efforts shifted the site to the former IBM site and the ProArts site. Both sites have challenges as well as benefits. A report by the design team is anticipated by late August .

Ms. Wicker inquired about the status of the State Archives building project. Mr. Gizzi replied that the Isabella Bush Building was a building of interest by the Secretary of State as an option to relocate the archives. However, attention has shifted away from the site with a pre-design currently underway of another site near the Labor & Industries Building off Tumwater Boulevard.

Mr. Neary said the new building site was selected for further review because the Isabella Bush site houses the State Printer, which presented a number of challenges. Cost estimates for the new site are being

prepared for construction of a new facility. No improvements to the site currently housing the Archives are planned other than regular maintenance.

Campus Architect Gizzi added that the DES Work Plan includes those projects where funds were appropriated for DES. DES is also involved in the project for the Secretary of State, as well as other projects not listed within the work plan because funding was funneled to those agencies.

Assistant Director Frare asked whether the revised pre-design for the new site would be presented to the SCC in the fall. Mr. Neary acknowledged an update to the SCC would include the status of the project and some of the findings from research by the architects. The Legislature will also receive an update to help determine next steps moving forward. A number of challenges include cost escalation and direction by the Legislature to work with DES to research other sites with the premise of presenting a plan that could be funded through the existing fee structure of the Secretary of State. The Archives and Records Center is funded through the agency's central services billing model whereby each agency is charged for each FTE for archives storage and per box for records storage. The facility would also include the State Library and three other divisions within the agency currently housed in other leased facilities. The costs of those leases could be used to help pay the debt for the new facility.

Operating and Capital Budget Preparations for FY 2019-21 – Information

Assistant Director Frare shared that in response to the direction from the CCDAC and the SCC to ensure the Master Plan is actionable and the capital plan includes those incremental steps to achieve the vision of the Master Plan, DES is examining ways to improve the processes to provide an improved operating capital budget. Ongoing efforts have included a review of additional data in the development of the capital budget, the organizational structure, conditional assessments of buildings, and the maintenance costs of buildings with an objective to provide more DES leadership for the development of the capital plan and the Master Plan.

DES plans to submit a request for the Newhouse Building for design funding in 2021 and construction during 2021-2023. The amount of the funding request will be informed by the pre-design and presented in December 2018.

DES plans to submit a request for design and construction funding for the childcare facility in 2021.

DES is currently incurring costs for the GA Building with no funds received by DES as the building has been mothballed. The Legislature authorized DES to move the art from the building, which appears to reflect that it might be time to move forward with demolition of the building. DES is also exploring available swing space, which may require portable buildings. Demolition of the GA Building would provide more parking capacity and reduce GA operating costs, as well as minimizing the impact from the loss of parking used for swing space during the construction on the Newhouse site.

The Master Plan includes both a capital component and an operating component. The current Master Plan is inspirational and describes the history of the campus; it speaks to the viewsapes, and other elements of the campus that are important but not achievable. The plan lacks direction for new buildings over the next 20 years and it does not help to solve questions related to parking.

Since the recession in 2008, capital planning and master planning has been an activity pursued during staff's "spare time." As spare time does not exist, the planning aspect has not received the attention that it needs and deserves to provide well-vetted budgets and projects and positioning DES to deliver the best possible service. Consequently, DES is proposing a capital request for completing an update to the Master

Plan of \$1.3 million. The request includes contracting with a consultant to complete stakeholder outreach, collect all ideas, and create a common vision for the campus over the next 20 years. The consultant would also assist in defining required organizational support to maintain the Master Plan on a biannual basis. DES developed an incremental approach for implementing the strategy. The request includes the addition of 4.5 FTEs phased over several biennia to focus on master planning. DES lacks a GIS system that is used by many other planning departments. Thurston County and many cities use GIS systems. The system is a computer modeling program that uses tables of attributes for assets, location of assets, and the condition of assets. The program provides a graphic presentation of all assets. For example, the system is capable of conducting analysis of seismic versus ADA access of buildings or the remaining life of HVAC systems versus electrical capacity. The system provides information for infrastructure replacement or update needs to make necessary changes. Additional staffing provides the ability to develop the different GIS base layers and perform analytics on buildings and infrastructure across the campus. The master plan funding request addresses managing the work and enables organizational capabilities for GIS reporting for maintaining an up-to-date inventory and condition information for each asset.

Capitol Campus Master Planning Efforts – Update – Information

Dragon reminded the committee the last update included information on next steps for master planning. Efforts have stalled to prepare the capital and operating budgets. The update process is dependent on both budget requests for additional FTEs and the consultant. The intent is ensuring master planning is a programmatic function within the team with an objective of vetting and sequencing actions and ideas into projects early to ensure successful outcomes. DES intends to build staff resources and use GIS as a tool. GIS is readily available within DES to all employees. However, staff capacity with GIS skill sets is necessary.

Planner Dragon cited possible forecasting opportunities by using and leveraging GIS tools.

Public and Closing Comments

Allen Miller, President, North Capitol Campus Heritage Park Development Association, said the organization was created in 1987 and continues to address Capitol Campus issues today. In 1911, the Wilder & White Plan and the 1928 Olmsted Brothers Plan contained four design elements of the Capitol Group of buildings on the Hill, Capitol Lake to reflect the buildings on the bluff, a promenade similar to the National Mall to physically connect the campus to Puget Sound, and a view corridor similar to the Olmsted Brothers design for the Rainier Vista connecting the University of Washington to Mount Rainier. Karen Fraser and Ralph Munro would have attended and offered similar comments but are attending a TVW Board meeting. Mr. Miller provided members with photographs from 1954 of the Capitol Campus reflecting the view corridor from the campus to Puget Sound and the Olympics. In 1965, a building was built within the view corridor known as the Capital Center Building or commonly referred to as, “the mistake by the lake.” The building was not envisioned by the State Capitol Committee in 1911 and 1928 when the committee adopted the Wilder & White Plan. The vision was to maintain a clear view corridor. Recently, a proposal was submitted to renovate the building. The building is currently under construction.

Ms. Wicker asked whether the state owns the property. Mr. Miller responded that the state does not own the property. The building was constructed in 1965 as a bank. The State Department of Corrections leased the building for many years. The building has been empty since 2006. Two owners who live in Southern California along with a local resident purchased the property 18 months ago for \$6 million and plan to renovate the building at a cost of \$30 million to include adding two building on the same block. Mr. Miller said he has been representing the “Behind the Badge Foundation” responsible for the construction of the Law Enforcement Memorial. Some foundation members include former Governors Evans, Locke,

Spellman, and Gregoire, former Senator Karen Fraser, Susan Olmsted, and Jane Hastings (widow of Norm Johnston, author of the book on the State Capitol Campus). The foundation received a recent ruling from Thurston County Superior Court that the foundation does not have standing with respect to the future of the property. Only the state of Washington has standing to protect the State Capitol Campus view corridors. He has contacted the Attorney General's Office. The contact expressed interest but would prefer to receive direction from the State Capitol Committee. He asked members to contact their respective agency directors to consider eminent domain action, as it would be the most effective and timely course of action. The property could be purchased for \$9 million to \$10 million.

Bob Jacobs, North Capitol Campus Heritage Park Development Association, shared that he has lived in Olympia since 1974 when he began working for the state. He has always believed that those who live in Thurston County have a special obligation to pay attention and support the State Capitol Campus. The campus is a beautiful setting that is enjoyed every day. It is unfortunate the Olympia City Council decided to allow the building. The building mars the main feature of the Capitol Campus setting. The setting of the campus is clearly the most beautiful in the country as it relates to the vista of Puget Sound to the Olympics. It would be shame if the building were allowed for another 50 years. However, that is the issue and any help the SCC could offer would be appreciated.

Ms. Wicker asked about the details of the recent ruling. Mr. Miller replied that the judge ruled the foundation has no standing, as it does not own the property or the Capitol Campus, although as members of the public, many believe they own the campus. The Land Use Petition Act, as interpreted by the judge, includes a strict standing measure that was not satisfied by the foundation. However, the state of Washington would meet the measure. Should there be an appropriation to purchase the property it should be conditioned on the state contributing half and the City of Olympia required to contribute the other half.

Ms. Wicker asked about the proposed use of the building. Mr. Miller said the development proposal includes 140 small apartment units in addition to two 35-foot tall building on the corners of the site to include a parking garage. The owners are removing the siding, retaining the girders, and renovating the buildings with new siding. Mr. Miller offered to send members an email with more details and information. He also offered to meet with members individually.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Capitol Campus Design Review Committee is scheduled on Thursday, September 20, 2018 at 1500 Jefferson Building in Conference Room 2208 between 10 a.m. and noon. The next State Capitol Committee meeting is scheduled on Thursday, October 18, 2018 at the Senate Rules Room, Legislative Building from 10 a.m. to noon.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Mr. Neary adjourned the meeting at 10:39 a.m.