

STATE CAPITOL COMMITTEE
Remote Access Meeting
Olympia, Washington 98504
March 18, 2021
10 a.m.

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

Draft Minutes

MEMBERS PARTICIPATING:

Denny Heck, Lieutenant Governor & Chair
Mark Neary (for Kim Wyman, Secretary of State)
Katy Taylor (for Hilary Franz, Commissioner of Public Lands)
Kelly Wicker, Governor's Designee

OTHERS PARTICIPATING:

Andrew Beagle, City of Olympia
Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services
Dick Binns, Citizen
Sue Lean, Citizen
Sharon Case, South Capitol Neighborhood Assn.
Annette Meyer, Department of Enterprise Services
Sarah Dettmer, Department of Enterprise Services
Jennifer Mortenson, WA Trust for Historic Preservation
Eliza Davidson, National Assn. for Olmsted Parks
Susan Olmsted, Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks
Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services
Paul Parker Citizen
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services
Anne Petri, National Association for Olmsted Parks
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Walter Schacht, Mithun Architects
Greg Griffith, Olympia Historical Society
Randy Wesselman, City of Olympia
Majid Jamali, Department of Enterprise Services
Eugenia Woo, DOCOMOMO WEWA

Welcome and Introductions & Approval of Agenda - Action

Lieutenant Governor and Chair Denny Heck called the regular State Capitol Committee (SCC) virtual meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

A meeting quorum was attained.

Lieutenant Governor Heck reviewed the agenda consisting of public comments, approval of the January 28, 2021 meeting minutes, consideration of the proposed Legislative Campus Modernization Project, and a briefing on a proposed compact roundabout proposed at the intersection of Deschutes Parkway and Lakeridge Drive.

No recommended modifications of the agenda were offered.

Mark Neary moved, seconded by Katy Taylor, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried unanimously.

Approval of January 28, 2021 Meeting Minutes – Action

Mark Neary moved, seconded by Katy Taylor, to approve the January 28, 2021 minutes as published. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Comment Period - Informational

Lieutenant Governor Heck outlined the format for offering public comment. He invited comments from the public.

Susan Olmsted said she is an architect and landscape architect and has been involved in the planning and design of Capitol Campus in various capacities for nearly a decade. She served as the lead planner and primary author of the 2009 West Capitol Campus Historic Landscape Preservation and Vegetation Management Plan. She subsequently served as a member of the design team for landscaping, drainage, and utilities improvements along Sid Snyder Avenue. She was an unsighted team resource for the 2017 Development Study by Schacht Aslani and Mithun. She also guided walking tours of the campus and was a former member of the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC). She is speaking on behalf of and as a member of Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks. The organization's mission is educating the broader community about the history of legacy of the parks, boulevards, and other landscapes throughout the Pacific Northwest designed or influenced by the Olmsted Brothers Landscape Architecture firm. One of the most well-known and important site is the state's capitol grounds.

Ms. Olmsted expressed concerns about the Legislative Campus Modernization (LCM) project surrounding both the design direction of the project and the expedited approval process currently in progress. Foundational aspects preceding all studies for enhancement of campus gateways, views, edges, arrivals, circulation, and visitor experience concluded the south edge of the historic West Capitol Campus located south of Sid Snyder Avenue between Capitol Way and Water Street SW was an ideal development site to help frame the great lawn and reinforce the gateway to the campus and the capitol group of buildings. Conversely, the preferred alternative in the LCM project depicts a preponderance of surface parking on the prime development site rather than a careful composition of enduring buildings to help frame the capitol and the historic Olmsted Brothers landscape. The Olmsted Brothers' historic correspondence provides clear direction on the subordination of parking so as not to dominate the campus or building entries. She acknowledged the important studies on parking and urged the committee to consider the proposal carefully, as the intent is to return the most civic aspects of the state to people rather than cars while improving safety and security. The proposed LCM directly contradicts this intent with a large field of surface parking as a prominent foreground, a frame, and a gateway to the some of the most important historic resources in the state. While she understands the need for convenient access to the capitol for legislators and staff, the perpetuation of the prioritization of single occupancy vehicles sets a low standard for 21st century development and moves the campus backwards in terms of sustainability. It amounts to an important missed opportunity to strengthen the overall campus character.

The LCM project currently under review offers a single design solution for addressing current needs. Although the 2017 study that preceded the LCM included several possible options along with a clear need for new space, only the single design alternative currently under review is being offered for consideration. Members of the Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks are distressed to see a major capital improvement to an historic, publicly held property of such paramount significance to the citizens of the state would be considered with limited or nearly no public input. Design proposals for publicly held land should be shaped to benefit everyone. Frederick Law Olmsted, father of landscape architecture and designer of the U.S. Capitol Grounds embraced the then burgeoning idea of democratic space for all to use and enjoy. As he wrote in 1865, "In a republic like the United States, the richest citizens must not be allowed to monopolize

the most beautiful areas for their own enjoyment. Such areas must be reserved for the public.” His son’s firm, the Olmsted Brothers, employed the same thinking more commonly understood as America’s best idea in their design of the Washington Capitol Grounds. To practice this important civic principle and to avoid monopolizing design direction regarding improvements on the West Capitol Campus, the Friends of Seattle’s Olmsted Parks encourage the SCC and DES to take a step back in this process to explore with the public several design solutions. During the process, she urged serious consideration of what use and physical presence is to be located on the West Campus and southeast corner, which currently deserves better definition. The SCC is also urged to consider treatment along the campus periphery; particularly where it abuts residential neighborhoods that are more inviting with intentionally designed connections. Most important, DES is encouraged to make the process open and inclusive, a process befitting the dignity and the ideals embodied by the capital grounds. She asked to work together to ensure the Capitol Campus and its continuing legacy inspire a sense of democracy and civic pride symbolized by careful stewardship of the historic state capitol.

Eliza Davidson reported on her long association with the Capitol Campus as a landscape professional, advocate, and advisor to both the National Association for Olmsted Parks and Friends of Seattle’s Olmsted Parks. She co-authored with the Mithun firm the Historic Landscape Preservation Master Plan contributing in particular to the Vegetation Management Plan. She completed follow-up on the campus landscape as a consulting arborist in a number of ongoing contracts. During the time of her work on the project, she was confident the Olmsted landscape heritage would be secure and reinforced not undermined because it was an adopted part of the Campus Master Plan. It is deeply distressing and disappointing to find out the proposed LCM under consideration was created seemingly without reference to or respect for the historic context or the overall master plan. She re-emphasized that Washington’s capitol grounds are second only to the national capitol grounds in importance as part of the work the Olmsted firm completed for 10 or more capital campuses around the country. The campus is a jewel and was created with great intentionality by our forebearers who chose this magnificent location to create a truly civic, beautiful, and befitting place to conduct the business of the people. Putting a parking lot as an expanse in the 21st century in the critical southeast corner of the campus is a travesty and is disconnected from the present in terms of a green future. It is extremely counterproductive to the completion of this campus landscape in the manner the acreage deserves. She echoed the comments of Ms. Olmsted on behalf of the Friends of Seattle’s Olmsted Parks and believes the national association would also speak strongly to the same points.

Eugenia Woo, Boardmember of DOCOMOMO WEA (International Committee for Documentation and Conservation of Buildings, Sites and Neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement), reported the non-profit organization is focused on raising awareness and appreciation of modern design in Western Washington. Written comments were previously submitted by the organization. The previous speakers spoke eloquently about the importance of landscape design on the Capitol Campus. The organization is focused primarily on the Pritchard Building and whether the building is preserved and adaptively reused following the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, which is required under the RCW. The organization strongly supports a robust public engagement process and efforts by the committee for considering a public process. The 2002 Historic Structures Report, which the state commissioned for the Pritchard Building, is a helpful resource and guiding document to help inform future planning and design. Members also support a third party historic preservation specialist to conduct a preservation study of the potential preservation and expansion of the building. The study should be preservation-oriented with no predetermined outcome that might support demolition. The current proposal supports demolition of the Pritchard Building, which would be detrimental to the entire Capitol Campus. The building is one of the most important modern buildings in the entire state.

Jennifer Mortenson, Outreach Director, Washington Trust for Historic Preservation, described the organization as a non-profit dedicated to preservation. She thanked the committee for its response to public concerns and the plan for a more robust public engagement campaign. She is concerned about the Pritchard Building and its preservation and adaptive reuse as an event center or a visitor center. Several of the proposals do not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. She emphasized the importance of adherence to the standards, as it is required by the RCW. The organization and others would be willing to participate in an advisory or working group capacity along with the consultant who would complete the preservation study. She is appreciative of the committee's response. She expressed appreciation of the previous comments pertaining to the importance of landscaping on the campus.

Dick Binns spoke to the Pritchard Building as a citizen of the City of Olympia. In the mid-1960s, he and his family traveled from the Olympic Peninsula to the Pritchard Library for an award ceremony involving his father. At that time, he was 13 years old and never paid attention to buildings or architecture; however, he remembers walking into a type of pavilion with glass doors in front and was wowed by the building. He had never been aware of the impact a building could have on a person. Ever since, he became more interested in architecture and buildings. The Pritchard Building served as a reference for what true modernist architecture could represent in its best form. Much later in 2013 when he moved to Olympia as a retiree, he visited Capitol Campus and was disappointed to see the building had been closed and used as a storage area. He voiced concerns about tearing down the modernist jewel box complete with jewels inside such as the Callahan and Tobey murals because it would be a mistake. When he thinks of modernist buildings in the world, the Pritchard Building is one of the finest ones that he has seen, and it honors a great legislator in Joel Pritchard, which could be a model for what could occur today. He voiced concerns about tearing down the beautiful building, as it would be a mistake.

Paul Parker commented about his attraction to the modernization plan because he agrees the Pritchard Building is a jewel and it would be shame to see it demolished in order to meet the truly legitimate need for additional space for Senate and House members and staff. He remembers when he began working as part of Senate staff in 1986 when the Commissioner of Public Lands office was located two floors below his office in the Cherberg Building. Today, the Commissioner of Public Lands is housed in a new building located on the East Campus. He comments speak to his experience as a long-term staff member in terms of determining solutions and ways to solve the problem that the Senate and House are currently experiencing with the Newhouse Building. He suggested the committee should consider both short-term and long-term options to address the problem. The Newhouse Building likely needs to be addressed quickly. Space opportunities exist within the Insurance Building and in the Legislative Building to solve some of the challenges. It might be possible to move the Insurance Commissioner from the Insurance Building as a short-term solution for housing Senators and staff. The Legislative Building currently houses the State Treasurer on the first floor, which could help ameliorate some of the needs for additional space for House members, meeting space, and staff. Considering a short-term solution would provide the time and focus for true public engagement to consider the challenges other speakers have addressed, as well as evaluating needs. The work completed to date should be refocused in light of what has been learned in the last year because of COVID-19 and teleworking, and it should be evaluated in terms of safety of the legislative campus, buildings, and public access. It should also be looked at more strongly in terms of carbon reduction. The entire campus should be examined in terms of future changes in work patterns incorporating more teleworking, as a significant amount of parking would become available in the parking garage, which could help to solve some of the parking needs. A short-term solution affords time for determining a long-term evaluation of the real needs and solutions. He is hopeful it would include an evaluation of reusing the Pritchard Building as originally intended. The building could be utilized as a public space as it is highly utilized today. For research, the building could feature the return

of the Washington Room serving as a library and as research space. Some educational opportunities could be considered in terms of ways to utilize the stacks, such as exhibits from the Washington State Historical Society and other exhibits related to the campus and the political process. Mr. Parker added that he also submitted written comments.

Anne Petri, President, National Association for Olmsted Parks, said the organization is the only national association dedicated to protecting and preserving the life, legacy, and work of Frederick Law Olmsted and the Olmsted firms. The association supports a distinguished network of Olmsted parks and landscape conservatories across the country, including Central Park, Prospect Park, Louisville Park, Buffalo Park, and Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks. Membership is coast to coast with a substantial group based in Washington because of the extraordinary Olmsted heritage in the state, especially in Olympia. The organization owes a great debt to the state for a grant the state provided to expand the online portal, *Olmsted Online*, to provide a rich array of historic records relating to the Olmsted firm in Washington to the broader American public. The National Association for Olmsted Parks is profoundly concerned by and opposes the plans and the process that bring us here today. The statehouse and surrounding property are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The historic district's importance has been rightly acknowledged by the 2009 Landscape Master Plan, which was created to protect this property from ill-advised development plans. With all due respect, the Legislative Campus Modernization Predesign is just that. It ignores the underlying principles of the master plan. Its proposed expansion and intrusive parking lots would destroy the integrity of this landscape and reduce it to a mediocre, disconnected collection of buildings and pavement lacking the structure of the original design by John Charles Olmsted in 1911 and later by James Frederick Dawson of the Olmsted firm from 1927 to 1931. These changes would occur as attested to by other speakers with minimal public input and virtually no serious exploration of alternatives and the larger design. They would significantly undermine a cohesive historic district and landscape at the heart of Washington's capital city. Capital grounds are not just mere streets and parking lots; they are the vibrant civic square that bring people together from all places as a democratic nation. That is especially true here in Olympia where the capitol is distinctively cited on a forested bluff above the town with unique Northwestern views of the Sound and the Olympic Mountains. The capitol grounds represent an intentional designed complex of buildings set with sweeping lawns, major and minor axial drives, and outdoor rooms framed by layered vegetation. The bones of the original Olmsted Brothers design remain remarkably intact. It would be sad indeed to destroy such an iconic space by a rushed process that pays little attention to historic grandeur and coherent beauty of the capitol grounds. She respectfully requested the committee postpone a decision until further review can occur.

Sharon Case said she is representing the South Capitol Neighborhood Association, which also submitted a letter with more details. She conveyed appreciation for the responsiveness the committee provided to speakers at the last meeting. It was gratifying to hear the committee's comments regarding the need to strengthen the process for campus development. As a result of that meeting, the association believes its obligation was to raise concerns as well as collaborating to determine a solution. One way was through the presentation of a draft budget proposal to the local legislative delegation for consideration. The association remains hopeful that the upcoming capital budget will include language that focuses on the need for a comprehensive planning process for campus development with emphasis on the fundamental role of both the SCC and the CCDAC. The planning process is envisioned to serve as an overarching template that is applied to the development of any new buildings to be located on the campus. This tool is focused on the broad view of the campus and the conductivity of its buildings to inform a more narrow view of an individual building project. It is this overarching view that prevents a myopic piecemeal approach that could be so detrimental to the beauty and the lasting legacy of the campus. Further, the association

emphasizes that it views the committee's stewardship and leadership authority to be fundamental to achieving the goals. By embracing the principles of the previous campus master plan and addressing the issues as outlined in the letter and in the proviso language, the association is confident of success moving forward. The issues are capitol access, traffic, public transportation, parking and pedestrian use, security and safety measures, west campus workforce projections, complementary building and landscape design, and a public engagement plan. The Association believes the well-conceived DES stakeholder and involvement plan used for the Capital Lake project is a great model. As an example of the issues that have been raised, Principle 5 in the master plan addresses the design and edges of the campus, which is of paramount of importance to the neighborhood. Without robust stakeholder participation and inherence to this principle, the nexus to the neighborhood could end up being a wall of buildings with a parking lot and landscaping buffer the size of a narrow parking strip. This is just a narrow example. Other issues could include addressing the building height of Newhouse without considering the height of the Pritchard and the GA Buildings, or failing to consider the gateway to the campus that is adjacent to the Newhouse footprint. Those are examples of monumental decisions that are part of the system that defines the campus. It points to the critical need for a comprehensive approach for planning development on the campus. Members are confident that it would result in a lasting legacy for the campus and urges the committee to support the neighborhood's advocacy efforts to accomplish the goals.

Greg Griffith said he is representing the Olympia Historical Society Bigelow House Museum. The organization previously submitted comments to the committee and to the CCDAC in December 2020. He echoed comments from previous speakers who have spoken well to the important issues under consideration by the committee for the LCM project. The previous speakers spoke to the Pritchard Building, importance of the landscape, parking space needs, Newhouse Building, and the edging of the campus with the South Capitol Neighborhood. Another aspect of the LCM project pertains to the Press Houses that would be affected by the LCM project. The plan calls for the removal of the Press Houses; however, there has been some discussion about offering the houses for sale and removal and placement in another location for preservation and rehabilitation. Mr. Griffith supported the option of preserving the two buildings as the two buildings have a local context and architecture that are worthy of preservation. Additionally, sustainability is enhanced by preserving and recycling buildings rather than demolishing and adding material to the landfill. Should the option prevail for moving the two buildings, the state and DES should be proactive in supporting the process because the process could be complex and lengthy requiring diligence by the recipient. He would like the option considered as part of the record to ensure the option is not overlooked.

Sue Lean reported she is an historical exhibit designer and has completed exhibits in the Temple of Justice and the Legislative Buildings. She supports the endeavors to protect the Olmsted design landscape. She applauded the comments from previous speakers.

DES Program Manager Kevin Dragon provided a summary of the eight public comments received by DES prior to the deadline of 4 p.m. March 17, 2021:

- Importance of considering the Wilder and White and Olmsted Brothers plans for the West Campus specifically how the Pritchard Building enhances planning efforts.
- The GA Building is not reflective of the historical campus plan.
- Consider options for accommodating legislative space needs within the current space of the Insurance, Legislative, and Pritchard Buildings, and the replacement of the GA Building.
- A need for an independent study of the Pritchard Building, as well as the historical and cultural aspects or mitigation of the loss of the Press Houses as part of the Newhouse Building project.

- Importance of the SCC Workgroup and the need for preservation professionals.
- Other comments spoke to the need for comprehensive planning across the campus and the need of benchmarking for access, traffic, security, safety, workforce projections, preservation, and landscaping.
- A series of comments spoke to public engagement for the LCM process. Several citizens expressed concerns about the need for more public engagement while others thanked the SCC for additional engagement.

All committee members received a copy of all written comments submitted to DES.

Legislative Campus Modernization (formerly Newhouse) Predesign) (2nd Read) – Action

Lt. Governor Heck recognized Bill Frare, Assistant Director, Facility Professional Services, DES, to provide the briefing.

Assistant Director Frare reported DES considered public comments and the wishes of the SCC very seriously since the last meeting. Since the last meeting, DES staff worked with the Project Executive Team, the governance team tasked to oversee the Legislative Campus Modernization project. Funding was approved by DES to complete a Pritchard Building Preservation Study that includes an independent historic conservationist and technical evaluations of geotechnical, architectural, seismic/structural, and a robust public process. The process is scheduled to begin in April with completion anticipated in a year, if not sooner. DES understands from the comments how important it is to improve public engagement throughout the process. Enhanced public engagement for the Newhouse Building design includes more investigation and analysis on the comprehensive impacts that might affect traffic, access to the South Capitol Neighborhood, security, parking, landscaping, visual buffers along the south edge of the campus, viewscales, gateways into the campus, and improved public engagement.

In response to the comments regarding the Carlyon and Ayer Press Houses, staff drafted a contract and advertisement to place both buildings for sale and relocation. Staff worked with the Project Executive Team. The team authorized DES to move forward. The first step is some tenant improvements within the Legislative Building to relocate the press corps from the two buildings followed by the release of the advertisement for the sale and relocation of both buildings.

Assistant Director Frare introduced Walter Schacht, principal architect for the predesign. The predesign identified a number of alternatives for addressing space needs for the House and Senate and concerns with respect to the buildings and building systems that would need to be updated. The predesign study was based on previously completed studies. Mr. Schacht has been involved in the planning process for several years.

Mr. Schacht reported Mithun has been involved in the planning for the Capitol Campus for over a decade. Mithun completed the Landscape Preservation Master Plan and was engaged in numerous site development projects on the campus. He became involved in 2016 with the State Capitol Development Study and has worked on predesigns for Newhouse, Pritchard, and the GA Buildings. The firm is invested and involved in the project as well as other projects over the course of many years. The company is committed to preservation and the Olmsted legacy. As a child growing up in New York City, he watched the preservation activities of Grand Central Station. He shares the same values and thoughts that were conveyed by many of the speakers but may have a different perspective as to how to achieve some of the project's goals.

Mr. Schacht reviewed the historical context of planning on the campus. A substantial amount of study of the Capitol Campus has been completed since 2006 and architects have explored options for the Pritchard

Building and the Newhouse sites since the 1970s resulting in significant consideration of the sites and how they might be redeveloped. To date, no one has achieved any resolution for moving forward. The question before the committee, community, and stakeholders based on research and studies completed to date by different architects and landscape architects, is how to use that foundation of information to inform decision-making moving forward. Since 2006 when the current Master Plan was completed, one of the many completed studies was the 2017 State Capitol Development Study, which was adopted by the SCC as an addendum to the State Capitol Master Plan.

The 2006 State Capitol Master Plan was intended as a values-oriented plan focused on principles and policies as opposed to specific design solutions assuming future generations would determine design solutions in alignment with the policies. Currently, two definitions of the West Campus exist. One is defined by the National Register Historic District in alignment with the area planned by the Olmsteds. The boundary excludes the Pritchard, Newhouse, and Press Buildings. Opportunity Sites 5 and 6 i.e., Newhouse & Pritchard sites, respectively, were not planned by the Olmsteds but were eventually included as part of the ongoing evolution of the south campus area. The transformation of a single-family residential neighborhood within the State Capitol Campus speaks to many of the same issues under discussion today. The two blocks under consideration were recognized near the end of that evolution as they represent part of the campus while also representing remnants of the historic neighborhood. The current question pertinent to the LCM project is considering ways to integrate those areas within the campus that were originally not included in the planned landscape by the Olmsteds.

The design team is considering the first two principles from the Capitol Campus Master Plan of Public Use and Access and Delivery of Public Services. Principle 2 of the Master Plan recognizes that it is appropriate to place new functions critical to Legislative Building activities on the south edge of the campus, as well as identifying the highest and best use of Opportunity Sites 5 & 6. The team understands the importance of Principle 4, Historic Preservation, and applicability of the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Principle 5, Design, places the focus on the original capitol group as the central element and that development on the north and south edges would be secondary. New buildings should blend with established style of the west campus and be representative of their own era.

Mr. Schacht identified west campus buildings listed on the National Register. Newhouse and the Conservatory are eligible for listing but are not included on the National Register. The Secretary of Interior's Standards for historic rehabilitation provide guidelines that should be respected moving forward. The application for the National Register Historic District defined the boundary of the Historic District as the area planned by the Olmsteds. The sites under consideration are transitional as they transition between the neighborhood and the Historic District. The design team is considering organizational space on the campus relative to building setbacks and information contained in the 2006 Capitol Campus Master Plan, as well as the 2009 West Capitol Campus Historic Landscape Preservation and Vegetation Management Plan. Within the zone of development for the LCM project, no specific landscape plan other than additional trees included in the 2009 plan guide future development. The 2009 plan focuses on the area planned by the Olmsteds, which excludes Newhouse, Press Houses, Visitor Center, and all associated parking. Mr. Schacht suggested the committee and others involved should develop a vision for the area as the 2009 plan lacks a vision for the area.

Mr. Schacht reported the team also explored all issues involving view corridors, definition of gateways, and relationships with the South Capitol Neighborhood, which should be revisited as part of the public engagement process to ensure all options developed are still appropriate for the project.

In 2017, the Legislature directed a more detailed evaluation of specific sites of the historic West Capitol Campus with information specific to the use of the Pritchard Building and ProArts site, renovation or replacement of the GA Building, replacement of the Newhouse Building, and identification of potential tenants, project costs, and schedules. Mr. Schacht said his professional involvement began with that evaluation.

Mr. Schacht shared an illustration of Opportunity Site 5, Pritchard Building and the parking lot and Opportunity Site 6, Newhouse Building and the current site of the Visitor Center and parking lot. At the onset of the predesign study, the team recognized planning for the sites had been ongoing for the last 40 years. Prior to beginning the process, the team catalogued all plans developed over time. The encyclopedia of information on the sites is informative to anyone engaged in a dialogue about redevelopment of Opportunity Sites 5 and 6. In 2004, a plan was completed to redevelop the Pritchard Building for House offices. In 2006, another plan was completed to expand the Pritchard Building for House offices. Over time, multiple plans were developed for Opportunity Site 6 including the Executive Office Building in 1974 designed by a well-known Pacific Northwest architect.

Mr. Schacht identified the multiple studies for redevelopment of Opportunity Site 6. Additionally, numerous parking studies were completed in addition to a recent parking study as part of the LCM project with the understanding the study was preliminary and additional parking analysis would be required in the next phase of development. In addition to previous planning for the sites prior to the 2017 study, the design team started from scratch and evaluated multiple options for redevelopment of the Pritchard Building site as a conference/event center or visitor services center. The team studied retaining the form of the building, adding to the building, exploring constraints of using the stack area for redevelopment given the small footprint, and considered the limited floor-to-floor height and limited assembly occupancy for events that would require restrooms, elevators, and stairs leaving a limited amount of usable space. The team documented the maximum development capacity of Opportunity Site 5. A similar analysis was completed for different development options for Opportunity 6. Some of those options included a single building replacing the Newhouse Building, colocating the House and Senate offices in a large building, or building out the entire site. The 2006 Master Plan and the 2017 Master Plan underpin what has transpired with the LCM project.

The initial request by the Legislature was to explore three different scenarios of separate House and Senate office buildings, colocating Senate and House offices in one building, and a building for the Senate offices only. The evaluation of the options included a response to the following identified needs:

- New space for offices that are currently housed in the Newhouse Building.
- House offices (currently located in the O'Brien Building) are small and many employee workspaces are located outside of offices impeding communication with legislators. Other issues pertain to privacy and security of important correspondence. During the legislative session, advocacy activities crowd the narrow hallways creating a compromise to public safety and egress. The House has requested office space that are right-sized similar to Senate houses with legislative aides located within the office suite similar to the Senate configuration.
- Remodeling the O'Brien Building would be necessary to expand office spaces and relocate House office spaces to another building.
- Legislative agencies that support legislative functions are appropriately located at the south edge of the campus but in spaces not built for those purposes. Recognizing the importance of the Pritchard Building as an architectural historic landmark, the Pritchard Building is compromised in terms of the environment it provides for occupants and needs to be rehabilitated.

The team developed an initial functional program that included a discussion on the possibility of colocating the House and Senate on Opportunity Sites 6 or 5. However, following conversations with the Legislature and legislative agencies about the importance of adjacencies and relationships between House offices, O'Brien and Legislative Buildings, and Senate offices located in the Cherberg and Legislative Buildings, the team recognized the importance of effective functioning for all the stakeholders, particularly during the legislative session when the Legislature often works overtime to complete work. Consequently, the logic for the proposal was driven by the legislative process.

Both the Newhouse and Pritchard Buildings have significant physical issues. The team considered three alternatives of a separate House and Senate office space, colocated office space on the Pritchard site, a stand-alone Senate building, and re-examination of an option to renovate the Newhouse Building (later proved impractical). The options were presented to the Legislature, which considered them for a year. Following a review of the options, the Legislature provided direction for separate House and Senate office buildings, replacement of the Newhouse Building, consideration for the renovation, expansion, or replacement of the Pritchard Building, and consideration for renovating the O'Brien Building, as well as several other provisional requirements. The program was expanded because part of the analysis reflected value in locating production and design on the campus to improve the flow of work during the legislative session. The scale of the new Newhouse Building should match the scale of the Insurance and Cherberg Buildings. The result would be a four-story building to house legislative agency functions to improve efficiency. A more detailed analysis was completed for parking and security in consultation with a security consultant and traffic consultant. The analysis identified the appropriate security setbacks for cars, roads, and buildings. A program goal designated a provision of secured parking within the campus perimeter. Because of recent national events and events on the campus, the provision for security within the campus was reinforced. Current parking exists on Opportunity Sites 5 and 6. The intent of the design is to utilize landscaping and buffers to create an orderly organization of parking and reduce the number of vehicles as part of an incremental evolution of buildings framing the Great Law with replacement of Newhouse as a first step. Framing campus buildings is an incremental process with the goal of the project to reorganize the space and refocus development over time.

The team studied multiple alternatives of an addition to the Pritchard Building, three and four story building options for the Newhouse replacement, and a Newhouse replacement. The Pritchard Building analysis resulted in questions that could not be resolved. The proposed capital budget proviso presents an opportunity to address resolution of the issues. The Pritchard site presents significant hillside issues. Regardless of a setback from the hillside of either 25 feet or 100 feet, stability of the hillside remains an issue and determining the appropriate method for shoring the hillside to preserve Pritchard is an important consideration. The team plans to explore options during the next round of development of the project.

Today, the team has overlaid the proposed LCM predesign over the 2009 West Capitol Campus Historic Landscape Preservation and Vegetation Management Plan (with the understanding that the development of the Pritchard site would be considered). The proposal is not a design but rather a planning document to accommodate dialogue and conversations about the specifics of design; however, in terms of overall intent, landscaping is reflected at the entry of the campus along Sid Snyder, a buffer is included between the neighborhood and Newhouse parking, and there would be less parking on the site by 60 cars. The proposal will be considered in more detail as the team considers the problem statement with the focus on the principles in the 2006 Capitol Campus Master Plan and the 2009 West Capitol Campus Historic Landscape Preservation and Vegetation Management Plan.

Next steps including moving forward on the selection of a design and construction team for the Newhouse replacement. As emphasized earlier, the predesign is not reflective of the design of the buildings, but rather

defines the scope of the project and aligns the project with the budget to provide a foundation for the design. An evaluation is planned for the Pritchard Building to examine the possibility of rehabilitating and/or expanding the building rather than replacing the building. Once, the issue is resolved, the design can move forward. Following completion of the Pritchard project, renovation of O'Brien Building will be scheduled to expand House spaces.

Lieutenant Governor Heck reviewed the proposed proviso language and recommended any action on the LCM project should be contingent upon the proposed budget proviso language as presented. He described his ongoing conversations with stakeholders resulting in the development of a highly iterative process on how committee could positively affect the project moving forward. At first, he believed the project would never move forward because of the inability to agree on proviso language. His frustration centered on some of the discussions but he never stated or implied that he was authorized to negotiate on behalf of the committee. In fact, the open public meetings law inhibited his ability to engage in discussions with the committee. Within the last 72 hours, he was sure the proposal would not move forward. He conveyed appreciation to Senators Frockt, Honeyford, and Representative Tharinger for their participation in many conversations over the last 48 hours. The proposed language will not make everyone happy, but it is much further along than two months ago. Furthermore, it is important to consider that the Legislature previously proceeded in proposing and building the Helen Sommers Building without SCC approval. That option, according to the Legislature, is available despite the collection of statues reserving SCC's approval authority for design. It continues to be an open question for the Legislature despite the process for examining the SCC process and what it should entail moving forward. Regardless of the outcome of oversight by either the SCC or another entity, it is important that an entity is responsible with jurisdictional authority to provide stewardship oversight of the campus. At this time, however, the Legislature could still proceed without any budget proviso language or additional input from the SCC.

Assistant Director Frare previously commented on several elements of the proposal language. The language provides that the SCC in consultation with the CCDAC, can review the architectural design proposals for continuity with the 2006 and 2009 plans, provides for a SCC review of design criteria and standards, require an analysis of the comprehensive impacts to the campus and the surrounding neighborhood, and require an evaluation of future workforce projections, traffic impacts, parking needs, visual buffers, campus aesthetics, and a public engagement process. The proposed language requires a preservation study of the Pritchard Building, which much include an analysis of seismic, geotechnical, building codes, constructability, and costs associated with renovation and expansion of the Pritchard Building to accommodate needs. The department shall contract with a third party historic preservation specialist to ensure the study complies with the Secretary of Interior and any applicable standards for historic rehabilitation. The study must include a public engagement process. The study is subject to review and approval by the SCC.

Lieutenant Governor Heck added that his intent is transparency within the process while admitting that he has some inherent biases, such as removal of Newhouse Building as soon as possible, the lack of emphasis on public engagement, and a rush to judgment with respect to the Pritchard Building and its disposition in the process to date. He also is biased in terms of the stewardship of the Capitol Campus, which to some degree resides with the SCC and should be considered seriously by everyone. He also is biased that should the committee move forward with the unprecedented action and act upon the LCM project contingent upon adoption of the proposed budget proviso language, the result will be a much better outcome. Lieutenant Governor Heck invited questions and comments from the committee.

Ms. Wicker advised that she recently received the proposal and wants to ensure she understands the details. However, based on the Chair's explanation and description, she has no other questions.

Ms. Taylor said she has no questions and thanked Lieutenant Governor Heck for developing the proposal.

Mr. Neary reported he reviewed the proposal with Secretary Wyman prior to the meeting. The first section of the proposal reflects Secretary Wyman's wishes as she supports more public engagement and additional analysis of the Pritchard Building. She understands the current impacts to buildings and the likelihood that they are not safe at this time. Some of the public comments referred to the Press Houses. He assumes that relocation of the houses would need to occur prior to any other development proceeding. He asked about any additional public comments or concerns other members might have received regarding the Press Houses. Both he and Secretary Wyman appreciate the efforts by Lieutenant Governor Heck. Secretary Wyman is supportive of the proposal.

Lieutenant Governor Heck requested consideration of a motion to approve the LCM project contingent upon the adoption of the budget proviso language.

Kelly Wicker moved, seconded by Katy Taylor, to approve the Legislative Campus Modernization Predesign contingent upon adoption of the proposed budget proviso language. Motion carried unanimously.

Proposed Compact Roundabout for Deschutes Parkway/Lakeridge Drive Intersection (1st Read) – Informational

Lieutenant Governor Heck recognized Assistant Director Frare.

Assistant Director Frare introduced Randy Wesselman, Project Manager, and Andrew Beagle, Transportation Engineering Supervisor with the City of Olympia.

Prior to the briefing, Manager Dragon advised that DES received a proposal from the City of Olympia for a roundabout at the intersection of Deschutes Parkway and Lakeridge Drive. DES reviewed the proposal and is working with City staff on a series of technical comments. Several public questions were submitted from the prior presentation. The comments have been retained as part of the record.

Mr. Wesselman thanked the committee for the opportunity to present the proposal for the Lakeridge Drive protected bike lane and compact roundabout at the intersection of Lakeridge Drive and Deschutes Parkway.

Deschutes Parkway is owned and operated by the state of Washington. Lakeridge Drive is under the jurisdiction of the City of Olympia. The project supports the City's Transportation Master Plan by increasing bicycle connectivity between east and west Olympia. Currently, the City has two primary connections between east and west Olympia. The project would create a low stress bicycle network for all ages and abilities for transportation, as well as creating a low-cost multimodal option for low-income individuals, veterans, minorities, seniors, and the disabled who live in many of the areas surrounding Lakeridge Drive and Evergreen Park Drive. The project supports connectivity for people bicycling eastbound and westbound on Deschutes Parkway.

Mr. Beagle briefed members on some of the design features of the proposed project. The purpose of the compact roundabout is to create space by enabling the removal of auxiliary turn lanes on Lakeridge Drive and converting that space within the existing roadway to a protected bike lane traveling up the hill. Additionally, secondary benefits of the project include speed reduction at the intersection, improved traffic management, and multimodal safety enhancements. The sidewalk modification at the north corner of the intersection enables transition of bicyclists from Deschutes Parkway to the protected bike lane off

Lakeridge Drive and it improves the pedestrian crossing on Deschutes Parkway by minimizing the length of the crossing and exposure of pedestrians to traffic. The primary trade-off is the loss of parking along Deschutes Parkway on the lakeside edge of the road.

Design features include a raised area within the center of the roundabout to accommodate larger vehicles and turning movements.] Restriping, tubular markers, symbols, and advisory speed signs will guide drivers on the approach and through the compact roundabout while providing delineation for bicyclists along the lake edge of the street traveling north around the roundabout. Typical traffic control will be applied during construction.

The City of Olympia currently has two compact roundabouts within its transportation system located on Henderson Boulevard, an arterial roadway and one of the City's primary truck routes. A wide range of features and styles can be used to design the roundabouts, which is typically at a lower cost than a light-controlled intersection. The use of roundabouts assist the City in addressing more locations, user needs, and they increase safety and access to destinations for community members.

Mr. Beagle directed the committee to a conceptual visualization of the roundabout design.

Mr. Wesselman advised that much of the improvement would reuse existing pavement with the central island of the roundabout featuring a raised concrete feature with the remaining features consisting of striping, signage, markers, and a slight modification to the sidewalk curb within the northwest quadrant. The City anticipates construction to begin in late summer 2021. The proposal is at 60% design. Construction will occur over a two-month period. The construction budget is estimated at \$402,000 with the City of Olympia assuming all costs for the improvements. Mr. Wesselman invited questions from the committee.

Lieutenant Governor Heck mentioned that he lives near one of the City's compact roundabouts and was nearly hit as a motorist increased speed after entering the roundabout because the center of the roundabout was not of sufficient height to inhibit speeding.

Manager Dragon advised that DES did not receive any additional public comments. The public can submit comments by referring to information on how to submit email comments.

Lieutenant Governor Heck thanked the City of Olympia and DES for providing the briefing.

Future Announcements and Adjournment of Meeting – Action

The next meeting is scheduled on Thursday, May 2021 followed by a June 17, 2021 meeting. The meetings will be remote meetings. DES posts meetings agendas and packets on the DES website prior to each meeting.

With there being no further business, Lieutenant Governor Heck adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m.