



STATE CAPITOL COMMITTEE
Regular Meeting
Legislative Building, Senate Rules Room
Olympia, Washington 98504

March 14, 2019
10:00 AM

Final Minutes- Approved on 07/11/19

SCC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lieutenant Governor Cyrus Habib (*Chair*)
Brule Burkhart (for Commissioner of Public Lands Hilary Franz)
Mark Neary (for Secretary of State Kim Wyman)
Kelly Wicker, Governor's Designee

OTHERS PRESENT:

| | |
|--|--|
| Max DeJarnatt, City of Olympia | Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services |
| Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services | Nouk Leap, Department of Enterprise Services |
| Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services | Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services |
| Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services | Ron Major, Department of Enterprise Services |
| Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd Snider | Carrie Martin, Department of Enterprise Services |
| Caroline Hansen, Department of Enterprise Services | Annette Meyer, Department of Enterprise Services |
| Rose Hong, Department of Enterprise Services | Rachel Newmann, South Capitol NH. Assn. |
| Linda Kent, Department of Enterprise Services | Katy Stark, Department of Enterprise Services |
| Carly Kujath, Office of Financial Management | |

Call Meeting to Order, General Announcements, and Approval of the Agenda - Action

Lt. Governor/Chair Cyrus Habib called the State Capitol Committee (SCC) to order at 10:05 a.m. Members and staff provided self-introduction.

The agenda was approved as published.

Approval of January 8, 2019 Minutes - Action

The minutes of January 8, 2019 were approved as published.

Capitol Lake-Deschutes Estuary Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Scoping Report – Informational

Carrie Martin, Project Manager, Department of Enterprise Services (DES), introduced Tessa Gardner-Brown with Floyd|Snider. Ms. Gardener-Brown serves as the Project Manager for the consultant team that is assisting DES with completing the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Capitol Lake-Deschutes Estuary. Ms. Gardner-Brown briefed members on the status of scoping for the Capitol Lake-Deschutes Estuary Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) since the last update in October 2018.

By October 2018, scoping was mid-way completed. Scoping is the first and formal beginning step of an EIS process. The presentation will cover progress to date.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reviewed a project process map depicting the process and the steps. The map identifies the required process for conducting an EIS under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and the associated and supporting process with the Executive Work Group, Technical Work Group, Funding and Governance Work Group, outreach and dialogue with decision-makers, and community engagement beyond the requirements of SEPA at a level necessary to ensure the process is successful.

The work completed during the fourth quarter of 2018 and first quarter in 2019 focused on re-engaging stakeholders to assist in developing a transparent and inclusive process to ensure all stakeholders were comfortable and to avoid a surprise approach. It was important for all stakeholders to understand the scope of the study and the input from the community, agencies, and local jurisdictions.

Since the October briefing, the scoping period was initiated along with associated outreach events. The scoping was launched on September 26, 2018 with an expanded timeline of 48 days instead of the typical 14-21 days. The team met with the Work Groups during a series of meetings in October 2018. The subject of the meetings was to convey information and understanding of the input from the Work Groups early in the process and to describe how the EIS moves forward to ensure the Work Groups were comfortable with the process.

During the scoping period, a series of briefings were held with community interest groups that have followed the process for many years. Many of those groups included the Capitol Lake Improvement Protection Association (CLIPA), Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team (DETR), and other interest groups, such as the Recreational Boaters Association, LOTT Clean Water Alliance, Thurston County Chamber of Commerce, Olympia Downtown Alliance, and the Olympia City Council. The briefings were intended to re-engage stakeholders and to answer any questions, as well as sharing information on how each group could be effectively involved during the process. Feedback was positive from the meetings.

Meetings were held with each of the coordinating agencies (state resource/regulatory agencies and local governments) to share information on the EIS process and to acknowledge that there would be many areas of overlap, and to identify ways and opportunities to be consistent and to utilize available data. Two follow-on meetings occurred with the Department of Ecology to discuss its work on the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Study, which speaks to water quality for the EIS project area, and a meeting with the City of Olympia to discuss sea level rise and the City's planning efforts. It is important to have ongoing and open dialogue with all agencies. All the agencies are interested in coordinating during the study and expressed interest in sharing available data.

On November 13, 2018, the scoping period closed and the team began processing the volume of comments. The team initiated a draft of the scoping report in November/December 2018, as well as convening the full consultant project team comprised of nine discipline-specific experts to review the scoping comments and help define the scope of study and the body of work for the next several years.

In January 2019, the team met with the Work Groups to share the information and the format for communicating the information to the community.

During the scoping period, two public scoping meetings were conducted in several locations in Olympia. Approximately 100 individuals attended the meetings and asked questions of the EIS project team. Attendees offered feedback to Bill Frare, SEPA Responsible Official, Carrie Martin, Project Manager, and other DES staff members. An online open house was hosted with over 1,000 visits recorded. Email notifications were transmitted to a mailing list containing over 5,000 addresses. When the comment period ended, over 900 individual comments were recorded from 271 separate comment submissions. Approximately 200 individuals, nine organizations, seven agencies, and the Squaxin Island Tribe submitted comments.

The scoping report is a document the consultant team and DES developed collaboratively to provide an overview of the project and the primary alternatives to describe the scoping process and the comments received during the scoping period. Within the document, comments on technical topics were separated. Because of stakeholder interest in the project, general direction was provided for the scope of the study based on the feedback during the scoping period. The scoping process also provided an opportunity to refine the project name to reflect the project area clearly both past and present. The refinement of the project name does not change the scope or the expectations. The new project name is Capitol Lake Deschutes-Estuary, Long-Term Management Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Ms. Gardner-Brown reported that all scoping comments were reflective of a community very involved in the process and well educated on the topics of study. Community concerns surrounding water quality included obtaining a better understanding of the sources of impairment, how water quality could potentially be improved, the issues, and how and if each of the alternatives would comply with state and federal water quality standards.

Additional water quality samples were requested within the Capitol Lake basin. Additionally, the Department of Ecology offered assistance and suggested some specific tools developed by the agency that could assist the project team.

Many comments pertained to the volume of sediment moving through the system and where is it being deposited and where sediment might travel should the system be opened under an estuary or hybrid alternative. The community asked the team to review how management of sediment under each alternative would occur in terms of dredging and disposal plans, as well as identifying potential impacts of sediment deposition to downstream resources.

The vast majority of comments on aquatic invasive species pertained to the New Zealand Mudsnail. Comments questioned the management of the New Zealand Mudsnail and how would it be managed under each alternative, and how to prevent the spread of mudsnails.

Fish, wildlife, wetlands, and vegetation comments focused on a desire to understand the habitat and species utilizing the lake and how that might change under each alternative. Should the ecological functions of the lake improve, many of the commenters wanted more information on habitat restoration opportunities and the species that might benefit. Similar questions pertained to the estuary alternative with some requests for specific evaluation of certain species (salmon or coordination with the southern resident Orca whale population).

An area of increasing concern in the Olympia area is sea level rise and climate change. The community and agencies expressed interest in analyzing sea level rise and the potential resiliency of each alternative. Other requests asked the team to remain in close coordination with the City of Olympia and its work around sea level rise.

Differences of opinion were evident with respect to scoping for air quality and odor. A majority of comments expressed either a negative or a positive opinion. Many community members complained about the odor an estuary could generate while others loved the natural smell of the environment. Scoping will describe historic conditions related to odor and how it has changed since wastewater is now treated. The team was asked to evaluate potential odor impacts of a restored estuary and consider tidal elevations, wind conditions, and hydrogen sulfide production.

Key messages for recreation and land use recommended evaluating changes or impacts to recreational use of the waterbody. The community values the lake as a recreational resource, specifically related to trails and the ability to walk and jog around the lake. Some commenters wanted to know whether those opportunities would still be available, as well as what changes would occur to recreational opportunities under each alternative.

Visual quality of the lake generated many comments with most commenters expressing a negative or a positive opinion. Most of the comments were related to an opinion, such as estuary mud flats would be ugly, an estuary would be beautiful, a lake is a pleasing aesthetic, or a lake is beautiful because of its natural appearance.

A number of comments were received on economics. The community and one participating agency are specifically interested in how the alternatives could potentially have an impact to downstream parties. The team was asked to evaluate the impact of those downstream resources and potential changes to recreation and tourism under each of the alternatives as it relates to economic impacts. Another request was consideration of ecosystem service values for each alternative.

Historic, cultural, and tribal resources scoping comments supported both the managed lake and estuary alternatives. Some commenters expressed interest in the cultural significance of Capitol Lake and how it was established. The team was asked to evaluate the impacts to the Capitol Campus National Historic District, consider the importance of the lake to Wilder & White and Olmstead plans, consider cultural resource investigations to improve on archaeological and historic data available for the project areas, and consider the impacts of the dam on tribal treaty rights.

Environmental health scoping comments requested consideration of the impacts from existing and potential changes in contaminated sediment under the alternatives, and include updated sediment quality data to establish a baseline characterization of sediment within the waterbody. Other commenters asked for an assessment of the cost

of upland disposal of dredged sediment if sediment is contaminated. Other requests asked for consideration of any potential changes to algae concentrations and how an estuary would mitigate the occurrence and spread of toxic algae.

Scoping comments on transportation requested evaluation of potential impacts during project construction and operations, identify any changes needed to the 5th Avenue Bridge, 4th Avenue, and Deschutes Parkway, and whether any changes to the railroad trestle separating the north and middle basins would be required.

Project activities through mid-2019 include confirming the scope of study for the Draft EIS with DES and collaboration with the technical leads to describe and develop the methodologies for each of the technical analyses. Technical analyses will begin in summer 2019. The team will convene a Community Sounding Board comprised of community members to meet and exchange ideas and provide individual or collective perspectives on EIS topics. The team has solicited applications for membership on the Board earlier in the year. The recruitment effort generated 70 applications. Of the 70 applications, 25 applicants were selected to serve on the Board. The first meeting of the Community Sounding Board is scheduled on April 8, 2019.

The project team will meet with the Work Groups on April 15-16, 2019. Objectives of the meetings are to discuss development of measurable evaluation criteria and methodologies for key technical analyses. Technical analyses will begin during summer 2019.

Chair Habib thanked Ms. Gardner-Brown for all the community outreach efforts. Subjectively, he asked whether the team could assign a value to the level of intensity, mobilization, or motivation of the commenters with respect to the intensity of opposition as the EIS moves forward because there have been different levels of opposition irrespective of the scope of the EIS. It would be beneficial to know the level of mobilization upfront. Ms. Gardner-Brown said the question served as the basis for developing an active community engagement process. In the past, there have been perceptions of both opposition or skepticism and the intent of this process is to work with those individuals through a community sounding board process or provide additional opportunities for input to the process to assure everyone how the process will move forward in an objective manner. Many in the community are eager for a management decision. Additionally, the level of understanding is beginning to evolve as the EIS process provides an opportunity to make a decision.

Director Liu said the public process was planned to be public and transparent. Everyone was invited to attend Work Group meetings to view the process as it occurs. Many stakeholders have been provided with avenues to offer input for consideration evolving around opposing science, different methodologies, or different modeling methods. All input was considered during the scoping period. Director Liu said he was pleasantly surprised as to the level of engagement by the public.

Chair Habib cautioned that many times there is a tendency to overestimate the degree to which people care about process and underestimate the degree to which they have substantial opposition. Experienced professionals often reflect on how well the process was executed and the extensive engagement by the community only to be surprised at the amount of opposition to the outcome. He advised of the importance of continually tracking and to be aware of the level of underlying substantive concerns because it is important not to assume that because the process was well-executed it would neutralize or help sway opinions.

Ms. Gardner-Brown responded that one key theme conveyed in the comments was a readiness to complete the process and take an action to address the issue, which reflected a slight difference in the level of previous skepticism and opposition, which speaks to the reason for moving through the process so that the final result can be defensible should opposition continue at the end. The process affords the ability for everyone to weigh in and ultimately achieve a community-supported outcome and decision.

Ms. Burkhart asked about the potential of litigation from specific groups. Director Liu replied that as the process is undertaken, anyone could pursue litigation as it speaks to something that could happen that could not be avoided; however, when DES and the project team formulated the process, it was to ensure that any risks could be mitigated recognizing that 100% of the risk would not be possible to mitigate as there always would be a possibility. The process has been reviewed by a number of people to ensure the right steps have been pursued and nothing has been overlooked that should have been included. The work completed today, as well as other work completed

previously has been provided to the public to include the CLAMP process from 15 years ago. Transparency is very important for the process and ensuring that everyone is engaged and the team is listening to everyone. However, mitigating 100% of the risk is not possible.

Project Manager Martin noted that one area of focus to help mitigate risk is a third-party review panel. The team invited experts in some of the more controversial areas, such as water quality and sediment modeling to provide a review of the methodologies to ensure they were on track. The experts will also review the completed analyses.

Next Century Campus Study - Informational

Chair Habib recognized Bill Frare, Assistant Director, Facility Professional Services, DES.

Assistant Director Frare said the Next Century Campus Study project is a follow-up to a prior review of the Power Plant. The Power Plant generates and provides chilled water and hot steam to heat and cool campus buildings. That effort was initiated by performing an Investment Grade Audit and Energy Study through University Mechanical Contractors several years ago. Part of the evaluation acknowledged that the boilers generating the steam were placed into service in 1964. The general lifespan of a boiler is approximately 30 years. Approximately 67% of the heat generated at the Power Plant is lost before it ever reaches campus buildings. The study was undertaken as an investigation as to whether it would be possible to shut down the steam plant over the course of a summer when heat was not needed. The study determined that it would not be possible because of the impossibility of restarting the system because the pipes that experience expansion and contraction from steam would likely encounter problems with seal failures. Instead, the focus reverted to exploring the cost for replacing the entire system. DES completed the Investment Grade Audit (IGA), which identified a number of options that were evaluated. The IGA explored cost savings and offered a guaranteed price for a guaranteed level of savings. The cost was estimated to be \$125 million. The evaluation and estimating was completed with minimal stakeholder input with the results presented at the end of the process. Not surprisingly, the cost generated concerns within DES, the Office of Financial Management (OFM), and the Governor's Office. Generally, for projects exceeding \$5 million, a predesign is completed. Although staff believes the IGA was equivalent to a predesign as it provided a cross comparison, and, in some instances offered more information than a predesign might provide. To provide decision-makers with a complete package and to include more stakeholders in the process, OFM authorized an appropriation of \$150,000 to complete a predesign utilizing IGA information and augmenting other information to prepare a predesign.

Assistant Director Frare introduced Ron Major, Project Manager, and Resource Conservation Manager, for the Capitol Campus. Manager Major briefed members on the status of the project and next steps.

Manager Major displayed an illustration of the steam system distribution piping throughout the campus. The Power Plant is located on the eastern shore of Capitol Lake. Piping extends through the west campus and to east campus buildings. Two east campus buildings currently not served by the Power Plant include the Natural Resources Building (NRB) and the Department of Transportation Headquarters Building. The chilled water plant is located within the Power Plant and serves west campus buildings only.

Manager Major reviewed an illustration of the proposed site for a new Central Plant. After consulting with Master Planning staff and considering Opportunity Sites on campus, the location of the new plant was selected as a site located to the rear and east of the OB2 Building, which was the former site of the DIS Data Center. The site was selected because of an area referred to as Level 50 that previously housed the generators for the DIS Data Center. That site affords an option of placing the plant below grade with a single story above grade and level with the existing Plaza affording an opportunity to extend the Plaza while concealing most of a new Central Plant Building.

During a similar briefing to the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC), a representative with the Secretary of State's Office suggested an option of utilizing the old Archives Building site should the Secretary of State receive funding for a new facility. Staff plans to explore that option during the predesign.

Manager Major shared some concepts of design opportunities for the campus gateway area at the 14th Avenue tunnel to Capitol Campus, which was of concern to the CCDAC when the proposal was presented. The project enables enhancement of the gateway to the campus through landscaping and tree plantings.

The status of the predesign effort includes seeking more information, evaluating, exploring the changing energy landscape in the state, and re-evaluating design assumptions. Stakeholder meetings will be scheduled with legislative staff, Governor's Policy Office, Department of Commerce, City of Olympia, LOTT Clean Water Alliance, and the local neighborhood and others interested in the project. Another briefing is scheduled to CCDAC and to the SCC to review preliminary findings. The final report for the predesign is scheduled for completion by June 30, 2019.

Mr. Neary asked whether the final report would include an evaluation of the Archives Building as an option for siting the Central Plant. Manager Major affirmed that the final report would include a high level assessment of the site; however, a fair cost comparison against the current plan would not be possible other than for providing some indication as to whether the option should be reviewed in addition to the potential of more design work.

Capital Projects Status Report – Informational

Chair Habib invited Assistant Director Frare to provide a status report on capital projects. Assistant Director Frare updated members on the status of several key projects.

- ***Conservatory Demolition*** – The project is on track to be released for advertisement after the end of the legislative session for contracting for removal.
- ***East Plaza Infiltration & Elevator Repairs (Phase 5B)*** – 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 5A, reconstruction of the stairways has been completed. Phase B is the area adjacent to the Department of Transportation Building. The scope of the project includes removal and replacement of the membrane over the garage roof. Over the years, the membrane has deteriorated causing significant leaks to the garage that eventually degrades existing infrastructure. DES selected the architect. The project will use the General Contractor-Construction Manager (GC/CM) delivery method to enable both the architect and the contractor to work together to stage some constructive investigation that must occur prior to finalizing the design.
- ***Relocate Mural from GA to 1063*** – The project has been completed. The work included removal of the mural from the GA Building to re-install within the Helen Sommers Building. The effort involved removing the front of the GA Building and removing the façade of the Helen Sommers Building and reinstalling the mural on a designated wall located on the ground level near the Union Street entrance. The removal proceeded smoothly with the contractor and the Conservator working closely together. A steel cradle was constructed to house the mural and the wall. The mural was well-protected by bubble wrap. Master Planner Dragon added that the restoration of the GA glass front has been deferred until decisions are rendered on the final disposition of the GA Building. Plywood has been placed over the opening to protect the building. Staff is working with the Department of Historic Preservation on those efforts. Staff is working with the family of the artist to schedule a ceremony for dedication of the mural. Director Liu said the move was video recorded as the mural was moved from the GA Building to create a time lapse video of the moving process. The video is included on the DES website along with a number of photos.
- ***Newhouse Replacement Predesign*** - Throughout the biennium staff met with the House, Senate, and Legislative Support Services to identify project needs. DES engaged an architect to prepare a Problem Statement and Alternatives Analysis. Walter Schacht with Schacht Aslani Architects briefed the committee at its last meeting on the report. The Alternatives Analysis Report was submitted through OFM to the Legislature. The report identified three alternatives of one building for the House, one building for Senate, and one building for the House and the Senate with Legislative Support Services located in the center of the building. A last option would replace the Newhouse Building, which mirrors the proviso for the appropriation. DES is seeking direction from the House and the Senate on which alternative is preferred. DES staff continues to address a number of questions from Senate and House budget writers. DES granted the budget writers direct access to the architects to assist in developing the preferred alternative.

Chair Habib questioned whether the purpose of the SCC and the CCDAC is to provide guidance to legislators rather than providing three options without some level of filtered guidance and recommendation from the SCC and the CCDAC. Assistant Director Frare affirmed the intent of the both the SCC and the CCDAC to approve the Master Plan, approve the limits of the Capitol Campus, approve new buildings on the campus, and to

provide advice on the construction of new structures on the campus. The Newhouse project is somewhat different as the Legislature allocated the funds. Typically, clients of DES are other state agencies, such as the Department of Transportation, which works through the Executive Branch and the Legislature. The Childcare project is a model that has been directed through the SCC and the CCDAC. DES is treating the Newhouse Replacement Predesign somewhat differently as the Legislature would assume tenancy in the building(s). Chair Habib added that he presumes that is why he is a member of the committee. As his role is as the President of the Senate, it is unclear as to why the project would be treated differently. Additionally, several members of the CCDAC are legislators. The Legislature is represented on both committees. It seems that the project skipped both the CCDAC and the SCC. From a best practices perspective, a public accountability perspective, and frankly from keeping and House and Senate from fighting perspective, to have guidance from the statutory committees would be preferable because it is why the committees were established. Guidance should be sought similar to any other executive agency. It appears odd that the committee's were bypassed. Assistant Director Frare advised that the committee would have another opportunity to comment on the process as the predesign is finalized. A briefing is scheduled for the committee's June meeting.

- **Legislative Building Exterior Preservation (Dome Cleaning)** – The dome has been cleaned. Approximately \$2 million in repairs to the exterior are pending completion. DES has delayed work until the weather begins to improve and legislative session ends prior to embarking on the repairs.

Chair Habib inquired about any building issues that arose because of the snow storms. Assistant Director Frare advised that the only building damaged from the storms was the Conservatory. He was not aware of any damage to other buildings on the campus.

Capital Budget Update – Informational

Chair Habib invited Assistant Director Frare to provide an update on the status of the Capital Budget.

Assistant Director Frare reported DES requested additional funds for planning within the operational budget. The Governor's budget includes an additional 1 FTE for a GIS Administrator to assist DES in constructing a geographical database across the Capitol Campus to assist in planning efforts.

DES requested funding to update the Capitol Campus Master Plan within the Capital Budget. The master plan has not been updated for 20 years other than a partial update in 2008 completed by staff. The department's 10-year Capital Plan identifies approximately \$620 million in projects that have been identified as needs on the campus. To expend funds wisely through a coordinated process, DES needs to be aware of cumulative impacts relative to electrical systems, stormwater systems, sewer systems, parking, and other infrastructure. DES requires upfront planning to expend the funds wisely.

DES completed the predesign on the Capitol Childcare Center and identified a preferred option as the ProArts Building site. The process is currently at the Legislature with a decision pending as it moves forward.

Another important project is a new grounds maintenance facility. Grounds maintenance personnel have worked from the basement of the Conservatory for many years. The site serves as a meeting space, as well as for equipment storage and materials. During the snow storm, staff repaired critical equipment necessary to clear snow during the storms. The work was critical during the snow storm. With the demolition of the Conservatory, the facility will no longer be available to staff. Some temporary accommodations have been provided to staff in the basement of the Legislative Building. The critical component is the equipment repair shop. A new building is necessary as no other building could accommodate the needs of the program. DES identified the area adjacent to the Governor's Mansion, which is screened by trees. Staff proposes rehabilitating the area and constructing a maintenance facility to support the grounds crew operation.

Another important project is elevator modernization. Within the last biennium, DES initiated a project to assess all campus elevators and prioritize modernization improvements. DES is responsible for approximately 80 elevators in campus building. Most of the elevators are over 30 years old. Within the private sector, elevators are modernized on a 15-year cycle. Some of the campus building elevators are older than 30 years. Because of age and condition, failures are frequent creating entrapments and a number of other issues that are problematic for

DES. The project is of high importance to DES. The report is nearly completed. DES will share the information with OFM and the Legislature.

Chair Habib commented on the importance of providing industry-standard accessibility for all elevators, such as floor announcements, particularly those elevators that serve the public regularly. Assistant Director Frare agreed and noted that to ensure compliance with accessibility and ADA requirements, all new elevators would include those features.

The electrical vehicle charging infrastructure is included in the Governor's Budget at \$5 million to install some charging stations on campus. Additionally, DES included within the Minor Works Program, some funds to support electrical vehicle charging infrastructure. However, because of emergent technology supporting electric vehicles, the Capitol Campus has experienced some uncoordinated activity. Legislative Support Services sponsored a project next to the Pritchard Building to install some charging stations in addition to several charging stations installed by the Department of Transportation in the garage. The NRB is also planning to install some charging stations. The efforts are not coordinated and as infrastructure begins to age, components experience failures, and new technology is employed. It is likely DES would be contacted to replace the infrastructure. Because the charging stations were not installed by DES, repairs to those systems would be the responsibility of the agency owning the charging stations. Subsequently, a comprehensive review of the campus is necessary in conjunction with other agencies to develop policies for usage of the facilities and to provide some clarity surrounding the infrastructure. A body of work is necessary for planning, structure building, and planning from the standpoint of identifying a source and availability of electricity to add charging stations. All those issues need to be considered as part of the appropriation request.

Ms. Burkhart asked whether DES plans to organize an effort to reach out to the agencies. Deputy Director Meyer responded that DES is working with the Governor's Office, which has assigned work groups with agencies represented in the work groups. A major amount of the \$5 million is funding projects. DES continues to meet with work groups to identify needs by agency and how to maximize efficiencies.

Public Comments and Closing Remarks - Informational

There were no public comments.

Chair Habib reported on the recent adoption of a resolution by the Senate recognizing DES for its efforts and hard work during the recent snow storms. The resolution expressed unanimous agreement that DES performed an amazing job under difficult circumstances. It is also important to recognize that there is broad support and appreciation from the Senate for the work completed by DES. Chair Habib thanked staff and the agency for its work.

Assistant Director Frare commented on the importance to staff of the action by the Senate to recognize their work and efforts. Staff developed a video of the storm response with comments interspersed by several Senators.

Chair Habib reported the next meeting of the SCC is tentatively scheduled for June 20, 2019.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Habib adjourned the meeting at 11:12 a.m.

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

Approved by SCC at the July 11, 2019 Meeting without modifications.