STATE CAPITOL COMMITTEE
Lieutenant Governor Cyrus Habib (Chair), Secretary of State Kim Wyman (Vice Chair), Governor Inslee’s Designee Kelly Wicker, and Commissioner of Public Lands Hilary Franz

Legislative Building, Senate Rules Room
Olympia, Washington 98504

JANUARY 8, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>1- Call Meeting to Order, Introductions, &amp; Announcements; and Approval of the Agenda</td>
<td>Lt. Governor Habib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:05</td>
<td>2- Approval of SCC Minutes</td>
<td>Lt. Governor Habib</td>
<td><strong>Action</strong>: SCC approves the minutes for SCC’s Oct 18 Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>3- Library-Archives Building Predesign Update</td>
<td>Mark Neary, SOS</td>
<td><strong>Action</strong>: SCC will review findings and preferred alternative(s), and will offer SCC’s decision of approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45</td>
<td>4- Newhouse Replacement Predesign</td>
<td>DES Staff</td>
<td><strong>Information</strong>: DES will provide a status update and next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>5- Master Planning Update</td>
<td>Bill Frare, DES</td>
<td><strong>Information</strong>: DES will provide a status update and next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>6- Capital Projects Update</td>
<td>Bill Frare, DES</td>
<td><strong>Information</strong>: DES will provide a status update and next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>7- Public Comments and Closing Remarks</td>
<td>Lt. Governor Habib</td>
<td><strong>Information</strong>: Public comments inform the Committees and DES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>8- Adjourn Meeting</td>
<td>Lt. Governor Habib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upcoming Committee Meetings Schedule:
Next CCDAC Meeting (2019 Qtr1): Thursday, February 21, 2019; 9:00 AM- 11:00 PM (1500 Jefferson)
Next SCC Meeting (2019 Qtr1): Thursday, March 14, 2019; 10:00 AM- 12:00 PM (Senate Rules Room)
MEMBERS PRESENT:
Cyrus Habib, Lieutenant Governor (Chair)
Megan Duffy (for Hilary Franz, Commissioner of Public Lands)
Drew Shirk, Governor’s Designee
Kim Wyman, Secretary of State

OTHERS PRESENT:
Bob Covington, Department of Enterprise Services
Debra Delzell, Department of Enterprise Services
Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services
Linda Farmer, Department of Enterprise Services
Bill Frace, Department of Enterprise Services
Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Rose Hong, Department of Enterprise Services
Linda Kent, Department of Enterprise Services
Carly Kujath, Office of Financial Management
Ann Larson, Department of Enterprise Services
Nouk Leap, Department of Enterprise Services
Jean-Claude Letourneau, Schacht Aslani Architects
Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services
Carrie Martin, Department of Enterprise Services
Steve Masse, Washington State Legislature
Allen Miller, NCCHPDA
Rachel Newmann, S. Cap. Neighborhood Assn.

Welcome, General Announcements & Approval of Agenda
Chair Cyrus Habib called the State Capitol Committee (SCC) meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. A meeting quorum was attained.

Lt. Governor Habib announced a scheduled earthquake drill during the meeting. Members provided self-introduction.

The agenda was accepted as published.

Approval of Minutes – SCC June 21, 2018 Minutes - Action
The minutes of June 21, 2018 were approved as published.

Election of 2019 Chair and Vice Chair – Action
Lt. Governor Habib invited nominations for Chair during 2019.

Secretary Wyman nominated Lt. Governor Habib to serve as Chair. No other nominations were offered.

By acclamation, Lt. Governor Habib was elected to serve as Chair during 2019.

Lt. Governor Habib invited nominations for Vice Chair during 2019.
Lt. Governor Habib nominated Kim Wyman to serve as Vice Chair during 2019. No other nominations were offered.

**By acclamation, Kim Wyman was elected to serve as Vice Chair during 2019.**

**Approval of SCC 2019 Regularly-Scheduled Meeting Calendar - Action**

Lt. Governor Habib reviewed the proposed meeting dates in 2019:

- Thursday, March 14, 2019
- Thursday, June 20, 2019
- Thursday, October 17, 2019
- Thursday, December 12, 2019.

Members unanimously approved the proposed meeting calendar as presented.

**CCDAC Member Recruitment - Information**

Assistant Director Bill Frare reported DES received notice of resignation from Dennis Haskell, a long-standing member of the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee since 2004. Mr. Haskell was instrumental in achieving some of the following accomplishments while serving on the CCDAC:

- Redevelopment of Heritage Park
- Redevelopment of East Capitol Campus
- 1500 Jefferson Street site development and landscape
- South Edge sub-campus planning effort
- Heritage Center/Executive Office Building planning
- Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes Watershed (Phase 1) – information and planning

Additionally, Mr. Haskell was fundamental in supporting the vision of the 2006 Master Plan, the 2009 Historic Landscape Master Plan, and the 2017 State Capitol Development Study. Mr. Haskell’s time and efforts are appreciated by DES.

Next steps include advertising to professional organizations to solicit interest of potential candidates. DES will review applications and forward a recommendation to DES Director Chris Liu.

Lt. Governor Habib asked staff to identify the membership of the CCDAC. Director Frare reported the role of the CCDAC is to review and provide recommendations to the Director of DES and to the SCC for decisions relating to building sites, landscape plans, Master Plan, and other issues affecting the character and culture of Capitol Campus. Membership on the CCDAC includes five elected officials and four appointed citizens representing landscape planning, urban planning, and two architects. The Secretary of State’s membership on the committee as a state-wide elected official serves as the link between the CCDAC and the SCC. The remaining four elected officials from the House and Senate include Senators Sam Hunt (D) and Ann Rivers (R), and Representatives Beth Doglio (D) and Vicki Kraft (R).

Lt. Governor Habib asked whether the composition of the CCDAC is established by statute. Director Frare affirmed the statute defines composition of the committee. Lt. Governor Habib remarked about a possible oversight by the Legislature when the statute was established by not including a security expert member given that in addition to the important work of the committee, it is secondary to ensuring the campus is a
safe environmental for employees and visitors. Designing for security is an important part of design. It might be worth some consideration to amend the statute. He asked about the possibility of the Director having some leeway to appoint an ex-officio member representing the Washington State Patrol. Director Frare acknowledged the importance of campus security over the last several years and how the recent Capitol Campus Security Study has demonstrated the importance of incorporating security into design features at the onset of design. The suggestion is valid and more conversation is warranted on the proposal as having a representative on the committee representing security is a good suggestion. Lt. Governor Habib suggested including an action item on the next meeting agenda to move forward to include representation of law enforcement or security. It might also be possible to seek a replacement candidate for Mr. Haskell’s position who has some design experience with security or sensitive-type facilities.

The Great Washington Shake Out – Drill
Lt. Governor Habib recessed the meeting at 10:16 a.m. to enable members, staff, and visitors to participate in the Great Washington Shake Out earthquake drill.

Lt. Governor Habib reconvened the meeting at 10:29 a.m.

Secretary Wyman referred to the previous discussion and suggested an alternative of forming a CCDAC subcommittee to focus on campus safety and security in alignment with the ongoing study to improve campus security. Lt. Governor Habib supported the recommendation and asked Secretary Wyman to serve as the chair of the subcommittee. An effort by a subcommittee enables more focus on the issues and participation by more than one security/law enforcement expert.

Capitol Child Care Center Predesign – Action
Lt. Governor Habib recognized Assistant Director Frare.

Assistant Director Frare introduced Jean-Claude Letourneau with Schacht Asiani Architects, who briefed the committee on the Child Care Center predesign.

Mr. Letourneau reported the predesign effort included a Steering Committee comprised of representatives from the Governor’s Office, Office of Financial Management (OFM), DES, and the architecture team of architects, landscape architects, and engineering experts.

The legislative proviso directed the evaluation of five items. The briefing focuses on three of the items of process and evaluation of the Opportunity Sites on campus, an update on the survey of state employees to help determine the need and capacity for a child care center, and a review of an earlier survey on the capacity of existing child care centers located within a five-mile radius of the campus.

Previous planning efforts guiding the process are the 2006 Master Plan and the Opportunity Sites identified within the Master Plan, as well as the principles for organizing planning on Capitol Campus. Additionally, a State Capitol Development Study completed in 2017 evaluated Opportunity Sites 1, 5, 6, and 12 to determine the maximum development potential of each site.

Opportunity Sites shortlisted for evaluation included Site 5 (Pritchard Building), Site 7 (Old IBM Building, Site 8 (East of Transportation Building), and Site 12 (Professional Arts Building/State Farm Insurance Building/Centennial Park). Heritage Park (per proviso) and the top of the Plaza Garage (Kiwanis Club Foodbank Garden area) were also evaluated. The results of the state employee survey indicated a strong desire for year-round care for infants through preschoolers (one month to six years). Approximately 3,100 individuals participated in the survey and expressed strong interest for year-round care. Approximately
30% of survey respondents work on or near the State Capitol Campus (accounting for 1,200 children). The child care study identified existing child care capacity of approximately 3,400 children served by 37 child care centers and 78 child care home providers. Approximately 40% of existing capacity does not provide care for infants. Child care centers within a five-mile radius serve between 16 and 161 children. The Steering Committee and the consultant team were interested in maximizing the impact by providing child care to as many children as possible.

The Steering Committee identified a list of project needs and goals based on the survey:

- The child care center could serve a capacity of 150 to 200 children providing continuous care from one month through six years of age
- Provide outdoor, nature-based play opportunities
- Achieve net-zero energy and LEED Gold to comply with Executive Order 18-01
- Provide exemplary, state-of-the-art spaces
- Project could serve as licensing model and training resource for the Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF)
- The child care center could serve as an example for other state organizations interested in providing on-site child care
- Provide flexible space for training, events, movement activities, and STEM education
- Accommodate children with special needs
- Provide a 50-year facility with construction completed by December 2020
- Bring joy to the Capitol Campus with parent and child interactions during the day
- Provide appropriate vehicle circulation, safety, and security
- Seize the opportunity to pursue a non-partisan endeavor that serves everyone
- Prioritize state employees on and near the Capitol Campus

The Steering Committee agreed the site design should incorporate the following for the outdoor play environment:

- Include requirements for special needs population
- Provide direct accessibility from all classrooms
- Activity areas to meet age appropriate physical development goals
- Specific spaces for different modes of learning: sensory, kinesthetic motion, social, self-directed
- Provide covered space for outdoor activities during inclement weather

The Steering Committee recommended the following for parking:

- Provide parking near front door and entry plaza for drop-off of approximately one drop-off space per 10 children
- Provide 25 staff parking spaces
- Include no compact spaces.

Criteria for the alternatives analysis of each site considered:

- Access (vehicular & pedestrian)
- Safety and security
- Conducive to early learning & outdoor play
- Conducive to community
- Maximize site development potential
- Solar access for outdoor play and net-energy goal
- Site utility infrastructure availability
• Compatibility with the Capitol Campus’ physical context
• Site development risks
• Funding success

Based on the qualitative assessment of the six sites, two sites were recommended for more in-depth analysis. Those sites are the Old IBM Building and the ProArts site. The team believes the Old IBM site provides good pedestrian access, is safe, and maximizes site development potential. One concern was the limited solar access because of existing trees along the adjacent boulevard and park. Because of potential access restrictions to the site, some trees would need to be removed.

The ProArts site is conducive to outdoor play because of its connection to Centennial Park, has vehicle access from Interstate 5, and offers the potential of connection of pedestrians from Capitol Campus to downtown Olympia. However, the site would require displacement of existing building tenants, maximizing site development potential might not be possible, and the site is located within an urban setting.

The East Transportation site is not recommended because the site is heavily shaded and solar access to the site is minimal. The Pritchard Building would require renovation of the building affecting the schedule and delivery of the project, as well as requiring a significant amount of funding.

The top of the Plaza Parking Garage site would require close coordination with the garage re-roof project, risking delivery timeline. There are too many unknown costs associated with retrofitting the garage structure.

Heritage Park has no discernible sites for potential development and is not conducive to creating a sense of community within the Capitol Campus. The park is not conducive to early learners because of safety concerns.

A detailed analysis of the Old IBM site with the Master Plan reflected that the site has some constraints because of required setbacks from Maple Park Avenue, limited access confined only off Maple Park Avenue, and no available on-street parking. The advantages to the site is its smaller scale, site is appropriate for a campus gateway building, it has a strong connection to the campus, provides safe access through green space, and parking could be provided by the adjacent Plaza Garage for staff. Because of site constraints, the building would be L-shaped bordering the west and south edges of the site creating a protected outdoor space facing the north and the green space of the plaza. To accommodate parking on the site, the building would need to be two stories. A conceptual site development could accommodate 150 children requiring 11 classrooms. The classrooms could not be accommodated on one level. Preschooler classrooms would be on the second level to meet code requirements. All eight classrooms on the main level would open out to the outdoor play space. To provide sufficient parking, three trees along the boulevard would need to be removed for access to the site. The site accommodates sufficient space for drop-off and half of staff parking. Proximity to the Plaza Parking Garage could accommodate additional staff parking.

Disadvantages of the IBM site include limited solar access, as initial studies of the sun path revealed a loss of solar access to the site for a large part of the year through winter months, and traffic impact fees of approximately $475,000 at a rate of $25 per square foot.
The ProArts site is identified in the Opportunity Sites Development Study for a large office development; however, no partner has been identified. The Master Plan depicts the use of the site to be compatible with Centennial Park. Because the site is located in the City of Olympia’s downtown zone, traffic impact fees are much less. Street improvements would be required with urban development standards applied placing the building close to the sidewalk. The test to fit reflects that the site has significant advantages both physically and visually in its connection with the park. All classrooms could fit on one level in an L-shaped configuration bordering the west and south (Washington Street and 11th Avenue). The play area would be configured on the northern side of the building. The site provides direct solar access to the roof and to the play area. Lower traffic impacts would be approximately $25,000 versus $475,000 for the IBM site.

Disadvantages of the ProArts site include a requirement to underground power lines as required by the City, half of staff parking would need to be accommodated either by street parking or within an existing campus parking structure, existing tenants would need to be relocated, and 60 parking spaces would be lost.

Project and life cycle cost of both sites reflect that the IBM site would have a higher construction cost because of the two-story configuration and energy costs would be higher over the long-term. The ProArts site would achieve higher energy savings and cost less to develop as a one-story building with less impact fees. Both sites would be able to meet the delivery schedule.

The ProArts site emerged as the preferred choice because it is appropriately sized, provides a nature-based play yard, has direct access from classrooms to play yard, would provide net-zero energy potential, has solar access to play yard, and the cost would be less to develop.

Programming for the site includes an even split between infant/toddler and preschool classrooms with four infant classrooms, four toddler classrooms, and three preschooler classrooms. The site offers a natural zone between the proposed development and the play area and Centennial Park.

Mr. Letourneau shared recommendations offered by members of the CCDAC during its September 20, 2018 meeting. The CCDAC recommended identifying the development capacity of the ProArts site and potentially include the development capacity within the Child Care Center project or phase over time. Members expressed concerns that the proposal was not maximizing the development potential of the site. The 2017 Development Study indicated that the half-block site provides a capacity for a 150,000 square foot building. The entire site has a development capacity of 225,000 square feet. The recommendation by the CCDAC was to amend the recommendation to include a facility that maximizes a half-block with new development either in one phase or phased over time.

Lt. Governor Habib asked whether maximizing the development potential was included in the legislative proviso. Mr. Letourneau replied that it was not included in the legislative proviso. However, the 2017 Development Study identifies a higher square footage potential for both a half-block or full-block development. Development of the southern half of the block would reserve capacity on the northern half of the block for future development. No projects are included in the 10-year capital plan to develop the site for other programming needs. A predesign of the site was completed several years for an office building project. Other Opportunity Sites are available on the campus that could be developed. Since the CCDAC meeting in September, the team considered options for phasing the project. Planning the child care center in a larger building during one phase of construction would be challenging as programming information and budget is lacking for a larger project, which could risk the goal of occupying the child care center by 2020. Expanding the child care center vertically later on the ProArts site to include parking and outdoor play space would consume the entire southern half of the site. With regard to
whether the site be considered as a phased-construction opportunity, additional development would need to be built vertically on an existing one-story child care center. The feasibility of that scenario would require relocation of children and staff during the construction of the second phase for approximately one year. The Development Study also indicates that an underground parking structure would be required, which might need to be considered as part of the initial child care facility in anticipation of future development. A multiple story facility would require additional space for elevators, stairs, and utility cores and significantly increase first phase costs for infrastructure to accommodate future development. Additionally, there is no guarantee that the building would meet future building codes. Adding an additional story to an existing structure would be subject to unknown future building codes and seismic requirements.

Lt. Governor Habib acknowledged the informative presentation and the detailed information on the decision-making process for the findings and recommendations.

Secretary Wyman inquired about the number of parking spaces included in the development option for the ProArts site in lieu of the 60 parking spaces that would be lost. Mr. Letourneau replied that the development scenario would provide 15 drop-off spaces and 25 spaces for child care center staff. Secretary Wyman questioned how the lost parking spaces would be absorbed on campus. Assistant Director Frare advised that the proposal includes sufficient parking to meet the needs of the new development in terms of drop-off sites and staff parking acknowledging that the proposal would eliminate an existing 60 parking stalls. The loss of parking spaces would be absorbed within the current campus parking.

Secretary Wyman inquired about the possibility of bidding the project privately as an alternative. Assistant Frare advised that the project is envisioned as a state-owned facility operated through a private/public agreement. Bidding and construction would be subject to applicable public works laws as such.

Lt. Governor Habib commented that legislators have shared information with him about the challenges of being a parent and the availability of child care on campus. This project is important for the campus and he is supportive of using the facility for the newly formed Department of Children, Youth, and Families to train child care providers.

Drew Shirk moved, seconded by Lt. Governor Habib, to approve the siting of a child care center on the ProArts site (Site 12, Development Study) and the findings and recommendations, as outlined in the Capitol Campus Child Care Center, Predesign Study prepared by Schacht Aslani Architects dated September 2018. Motion carried unanimously.

Campus Physical Security and Safety Improvements - Informational
Lt. Governor Habib recognized Bob Covington, Director, DES Campus Security and Visitor Services.

Director Covington updated members on the status of efforts to improve safety and security on the State Capitol Campus.

The State Capitol Campus encompasses 468 acres housing more than 6,000 employees and elected officials in approximately twenty-seven buildings totaling over 2.7 million square feet. The campus is served by four parking garages accounting for more than 1.4 million square feet and features five campus parks (Sylvester, Heritage, Marathon, Centennial, and the Capitol Lake Interpretive Center). The
Washington State Capitol is the largest capital in the nation; however, staffing levels for law enforcement/security are at the bottom 20% in the nation.

In February 2018, the committee reviewed the decision by DES to form the Division of Capitol Security and Visitor Services. Director Covington reported at that time, he moved from his Deputy Director position to manage the new division and to develop a security program for the campus. Since January, when the division was created, the focus has been on those efforts. Funding for supporting the new division is temporary and expires in June 2019. During that time, the intent is moving the program forward substantially, as well as identifying a path within the authorizing environment for funding to create a sustainable and ongoing security organization for the campus. The progress update will share information on some of the activities accomplished and next steps.

In December 2017, the Washington Interagency Security Committee (WISC) was formed. Director Covington and Washington State Patrol (WSP) Captain Alexander co-chair the committee. Committee membership includes all representatives of all tenant agencies on and off the campus. Typically, attendance at each meeting includes 40 to 50 participants. The effort has assisted in making some headway provides value by meeting with and working as a community to leverage experience, expertise, and products existing within all agencies. The committee is approximately 60% completed in the development of an Active Threat Resource Manual. Committee members contribute to building the network and community of personnel representing the security needs of their respective agency. Training has been provided to the committee through various resources, such as the WSP Criminal Investigations Division training on its process and best practices for responding to threats of public officials or public employees. It is important for each agency to have a person with knowledge to share within the agency, as well as implementing best practices in response to actions people might take when receiving a threat because of the potential impact on the ability of law enforcement to conduct and pursue investigations or prosecutions.

Each month, members share information on different types of incidents and activities that have occurred on the campus. Many members were surprised to learn of the significant number and type of incidents. Incidents over the summer included a reported abduction involving six individuals attacking three youths. A 10-year old child was also involved. The incident required 12 hours of investigation before the incident was determined to be a hoax perpetuated by a family on another family member. Those incidents are real and consume time and resources. During the summer of 2017, a 911 call was received about gunfire shots on the campus. It was at that time that there was some realization about the state of current campus security and necessary next steps to ensure implementation of preparedness, resources, plans, policies, and training.

Another major activity the committee is undertaking is the acquisition and deployment of a campus building access control system. DES has acquired and is deploying the Genetec Security Center, a unified security platform replacing outdated legacy building access control systems with an integrated video, duress, intrusion detection, and analytics platform setting the foundation for future programs. The system has been deployed at the O’Brien Building with a goal to deploy the new system in all legislatively-occupied facilities before commencement of the next legislative session through a partnership with House and Senate Security and Legislative Support Services. Deployment of system will be on West Campus first followed by East Campus by June 2019.

The Division is also evaluating all public space use rules. The last update of the rules was in 2009. The environment has changed considerably since 2009. The evaluation will determine whether some elements need to be enhanced. Rules created in 2009 did not forecast displays of projections on
legislative buildings. The review speaks to the changing environment and the need to evaluate all use rules to include public space rules and ensuring alignment with security goals.

The Division continues to develop structured security policies, procedures, and protocols in the Capitol Security Office. The Division includes a team of six employees previously staffed within Buildings and Grounds. Buildings and Grounds was not focused on security with security personnel reporting at the same level as custodial teams, electricians, and other shops. Creation of the Division provided an opportunity elevate the importance of campus security. Many steps have been accomplished for managing and controlling through a structured environment to establish security contact points in all agencies.

In addition to the efforts to implement the access control system, a Study of Capitol Campus Security was directed during the 2018 Legislature session through a proviso to study campus security. The study is underway in partnership with House and Senate Security, Life Support Services, Temple of Justice, WSP, and others. IParametrics was selected to complete the study through a competitive procurement process. All security partners participated in the selection process. The study is in the final stages of completion. In addition to the size of the campus as the largest in the nation with security staffing at the lower end of the spectrum compared to other state capitals, other study elements are an analysis of organizations, staffing, physical security systems, and capitol campus infrastructure. The study is anticipated for completion by the end of October 2018. Director Covington offered to provide a briefing on the results of the study during a joint executive session with the SCC and CCDAC because of the confidential nature and the vulnerabilities identified in the study.

Lt. Governor Habib maintained that there could be a structural misunderstanding because he views security threats as three categories of crimes or violence on campus, ordinary risk associated with disgruntled employees or domestic disputes spilling into the workplace, and unique threats of political violence. The most serious threats on the campus are to executive office holders i.e., legislative and judicial office holders housed in five buildings across the campus. During his visits to other state capitals, all buildings have metal detectors and all appear to consider the threat of political violence very seriously. He is concerned about several dynamics. The first is that any security effort should be managed by a law enforcement agency, such as WSP or the FBI. The second dynamic is fear that the recommendations to the Legislature and Governor would not focus on the requirements necessary for safety and security of the campus, but on a set a recommendations based on presupposition of a political outcome, e.g. opposition to metal detectors or focusing on guns or bombs that might be politically controversial or employing a walkie-talkie system or text and email notifications. The political elements of the study need to be managed by those elected by the voters and the decisions need to make sense. Other state capitols are making decisions with political security in the forefront. He acknowledged the work of Director Covington and others as directed by the mandate, but during the next legislative session, he plans to urge legislators and the Governor to join forces to target actual threats unique to the campus.

Director Covington appreciated the comments, as there are many other comments he would like to share and discuss. The points offer great value. An opportunity to have the consultant brief the committee would help provide some insight and value. Many of the same issues are being evaluated and addressed by the consultant. Ultimately, policy decisions will be through the authorizing environment of the House, the Senate, and the Executive Branch. His interest is developing a security program whether it is part of DES or a different organization that identifies a security path the campus currently lacks.
Secretary Wyman noted that the consultant met and interviewed her. Based on her experience, the consultant team’s experience and background was in law enforcement. One member of the consultant team was a member of campus security at the U.S. Capital. The team’s perspective was comprehensive and acutely focused on the level of occupancy on the campus. After 911, when the campus was locked down and metal detectors were installed, there was a huge outcry about the importance of the campus being the people’s house. Many people did not like standing in line. Subsequently, many people found ways to bypass the line because they were too important to be screened by a metal detector.

Lt. Governor Habib suggested any recommendations should be direct and realistic and not watered down. He is unsure as to why the previous security protocols were unsuccessful. However, other state capitals have successfully implemented security measures. Additionally, if it is possible to screen 68,000 people during a football game, a similar process could be implemented on campus rather than diffused into a broader discussion of the entire campus, when it is known there is a significant and targeted threat profile related to the actions conducted within the five campus buildings. Legislators would thoughtfully consider how to address security on campus; however, the information should be provided in a realistic and clear-eyed set of suggestions for best practices.

Secretary Wyman commented that she is optimistic the next briefing by the consultant will include no presupposed recommendations or outcomes. Although the world is different from when 911 occurred, it is not that different with many of the same factors and moving parts preventing an easy one-size-fits-all answer.

Mr. Shirk asked whether the effort would entail a re-examination of the factors that led to the previous security failure in terms of the challenges and alternative solutions to address those issues that undermined the original approach. Understanding what and why it happened and the barriers might assist in defining an alternative plan that might be effective.

Director Covington explained that some of the challenges have been in identifying the timing of the installation and removal of metal detectors. Currently, the source of the information is through several media articles and some speculations by several individuals. His speculation is that the metal detectors were extremely unpopular from the day the detectors were funded. If the political environment is not supportive of the agency responsible for staffing and managing the screening process, the result is failure.

Lt. Governor Habib conveyed the importance of any security solution(s) to be based on recommendations by security/law enforcement professionals with implementation by legislators who must bear the political consequences.

Secretary Wyman shared that the prior political reality included the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the Secretary of State exclaiming that the Capitol Campus was the house of the people and the state should not make people go through a metal detector screening to access buildings. The metal detectors were not the problem. The reality was the 30 degree weather and hearings people needed to attend. The consultants will present facts and recommendations that will be vetted in the political arena.

Lt. Governor Habib added that he is hopeful the presentation includes a discussion on improved ways to implement a metal detector program to prevent some of the larger threats of guns and bombs on the campus.

Lt. Governor Habib thanked Director Covington for the update.
Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes Watershed, Long-Term Management Planning (EIS) – **Informational**

Director Frare introduced Tessa Gardner-Brown, Floyd|Snider, who briefed members on the process to complete an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) study on the Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes Watershed to determine a long-term management approach for the water body.

Floyd|Snider is a Seattle-based environmental consulting firm. Floyd|Snider worked closely with DES during Phase 1 and with stakeholder groups to move to an EIS. Ms. Gardner-Brown reported she is serving as the project manager.

The EIS process began approximately three weeks ago. Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes Watershed is part of the State Capitol Campus. It includes the 260-acre Capitol Lake basin maintained by DES under a long-term lease agreement with the Department of Natural Resources. The lease expires in 2028. For many years, long-term management of the basin has been studied by many stakeholders in partnership with DES. The primary alternatives for long-term management of the resource include:

- A managed lake – Similar to the lake today except with additional strategies and actions to improve water quality, manage sediment, manage or eradicate invasive species, and restore active use of the resource
- Restored Estuary – Restored tidal flow throughout the basin
- Hybrid – The option would restore tidal flow but also retain a portion of the reflecting pool
- No Action – Used as a baseline for comparison of other alternatives (required in an EIS)

While the four alternatives will serve as the basis of the evaluation, it is recognized that there other sub-options or variations of the options submitted by interest groups, which will be evaluated at the beginning of the process.

Common goals were identified collectively by all stakeholders during Phase 1 that concluded in 2016. The long-term management alternatives will be reviewed against the four goals and the ability to improve water quality, manage sediment, remove or eradicate invasive species, and restore community use of the water body.

The Legislature provided a funding appropriation in early 2018 requiring DES to evaluate the four primary alternatives at a minimum, consider sediment transport, work with stakeholders to develop potential mitigation measures to avoid, reduce, or minimize impacts from the project, and conduct an economic analysis (not typically required in an EIS) to ensure all potential economic impacts are identified and how they could be mitigated. An EIS is required prior to implementing a long-term management plan.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reviewed some of the key milestones required as part of the EIS conducted under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). Currently, the process is in scoping initiated on September 26, 2018 with a 48-day comment period for the public, agencies, and interest groups to provide input on issues to be studied as part of the EIS. Following the close of the public comment period, all comments will be documented and a scoping report will be issued summarizing primary comment themes and a definition of the scope of the EIS. The report will be issued in early 2019.
The next step is a technical evaluation of alternatives analysis through 2019 with a Draft EIS issued in 2020. The Final EIS will be issued in 2021. The Final EIS will include a preferred alternative for long-term management of the water body.

Ms. Gardner-Brown reviewed four phases of the EIS process. The graphic outlined the required steps of an EIS, as well as other actions above and beyond the requirements of SEPA. The purpose of the process map is to reflect how the process includes a robust engagement process to help conclude the process with a community-supported EIS and a community-supported preferred alternative. The process map outlines the quarterly meetings of the work groups - Executive Work Group, Technical Work Group, and a Funding and Governance Work Group. The Executive Work Group serves in an advisory capacity and includes the mayors of Olympia and Tumwater, Thurston County Commissioner, Port of Olympia Commissioner, Squaxin Island Tribe, and Director Liu. The Technical Work Group is comprised of technical staff from the entities, as well as state resource agencies. The work group will review technical issues and ensure any long-term management alternative can receive a permit by state entities to help streamline future work in Phase 3. The Funding and Governance Work Group includes staff from the local taxing authorities. The work group is tasked to develop or evaluate a potential shared funding model for future long-term costs, as well as potential governance structures.

The process will also work closely with decision-making bodies engaged by DES. The SCC and CCDAC will receive quarterly briefings, as well as meetings with the Governor’s Office, legislators, representatives from the Ways and Means Committee, and OFM.

The process map clearly outlines the community engagement process.

Scoping officially was initiated with a notice issued on September 26, 2018. At that time, the website and online open house were launched. Email notices were sent to the mailing list of approximately 5,000 email addresses. Facebook and Twitter ads were also placed. Posters and flyers were provided to over 100 businesses in the community. Stakeholder briefings have been underway with the first public scoping meeting held on Wednesday, October 10, 2018 with approximately 50 community members in attendance. Approximately 650 community members visited the online open house. On Monday, October 22, 2018, the second public scoping meeting is scheduled. The project team will also attend the Olympia City Council study session on October 23, 2018.

Project activities through early 2019 include successfully completing the robust public scoping process, issuance of a Scoping Report in early 2019 to include community comments; continuing work with the Work Groups to review community input and help define the scope of the EIS, and initiation of technical analyses.

The project team will brief CCDAC and the SCC quarterly. The SCC is envisioned to be part of the decision-making process to help identify the preferred alternative in the Final EIS.

Lt. Governor Habib thanked Ms. Gardner-Brown for the briefing. He recommended scheduling the next briefing early next year following the conclusion of the scoping process.
Capital Projects Update – Informational
Lt. Governor Habib recognized Assistant Director Frare. Assistant Director Frare updated the committee on the status of several major projects:

- **Newhouse Replacement Project** – The Legislature authorized an appropriation for a predesign to replace the Newhouse Building. A consultant was contracted and a design team of stakeholders was established. Several workshops have been held. Next steps include completing an alternatives analysis and presenting the results to the CCDAC and SCC. The CCDAC is scheduled to receive a briefing at its November meeting followed by the SCC at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

- **West Capitol Campus Grounds Beautification** – The project is possible through a one-time grant through the Department of Commerce. Projects elements include flower baskets, replacement of sod, hiring an additional ½ FTE for grounds maintenance, and purchase of equipment for maintenance of West Capitol Campus grounds. No long-term funding commitment was created in recognition that the funds were one-time funds only. DES has submitted an operating budget request to OFM to add an additional FTE grounds maintenance position to complete long-term maintenance on the West Campus.

- **East Plaza Infiltration & Elevator Repairs-Landscaping** – The project is Phase 5B of a long-term project initiated 18 years ago for replacement of the garage membrane. The project is in an area located on the south side of 14th Avenue removing existing landscaping to install a new membrane. The architect has been hired and the project will be completed using the General Contractor/Construction Manager (GC/CM) delivery method. The contractor will be involved prior to the development of final design to lend expertise to improve construction phasing, construction methodologies, and develop a better design.

- **Relocate Mural from GA Building** – DES released a bid for the relocation project and received no proposals. The day following the close of the bids, DES was contacted by a contractor expressing interest in the project. DES repackaged and released the bid and increased marketing efforts to reach more potential contractors. DES received seven bids. Currently, staff is verifying bids and responsibility criteria to ensure all bidders have the necessary requirements to complete the job successfully.

- **Legislative Building Exterior-Preservation Cleaning (Dome)** – Lt. Governor Habib noted the project is very popular on social media at this time. Assistant Director Frare reported on the budget request to the Legislature to clean the dome and complete some exterior preservation to include some repairs to windows, doors, and skylights. Recognizing the importance of cleaning the dome, staff streamlined the project and focused on exterior cleaning and preservation work holding work on windows, doors, and skylights in abeyance. Subsequently, the dome cleaning project was expedited with DES receiving favorable bids. The original scope was cleaning the dome to the mini domes with the remainder of the building to be cleaned later dependent upon the availability of additional funding. Since the bids were favorable, staff was able to restage bid alternatives with prices requested for the entire building enabling the project to proceed to clean and complete masonry tuck pointing on the entire building. Staff anticipates no problems except for weather and the potential for freeze/thaw situations. Staff plans to make as much progress as possible during the weather window with completion by early December or stopping and resuming the remainder of the project next spring.
Public Comments & Closing Remarks – Informational
Allen Miller provided an update on the status of litigation to preserve the view corridor of Capitol Campus and the Capital Center Building project. He is speaking as the President of the North Capitol Campus Heritage Park Development Association. The primary goal of the association is to ensure the 1911 Wilder and White Plan and the 1928 Olmsted Brothers Plan are implemented. He is also speaking as an attorney representing former State Capitol Committee Members and Governors Evans, Fellman, Locke, Gregoire, former Secretary of State Ralph Munro, former CCDAC and Senator Karen Fraser, Behind the Badge Foundation, and the National Association of Olmsted Parks in a suit currently residing with the Washington State Supreme Court regarding the Capital Center Building project. The parties have worked many years (31) to turn the north campus into a park. The Supreme Court has not ruled on whether to consider the case or transfer it to the Court of Appeals in Tacoma. The parties believe the State Capitol Committee should consider intervening in the litigation because of the importance of the view corridor from the Law Enforcement Memorial and north campus trail, which has been developed over the years. As Mr. Munro has mentioned, the view from the water up to the dome is obscured by the Capital Center Building. Mr. Allen said his goal was to convey the information and generate some action by the committee.

Next Meeting Date – Information
The next meeting of the State Capitol Committee is scheduled on December 6, 2018 in the Senate Rules Room, Legislative Building from 10 a.m. to noon.

Adjournment
With there being no further business, Lt. Governor Habib adjourned the meeting at 11:59 a.m.

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services, pmsoly@earthlink.net
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3- Library-Archives Building- Predesign Update

Purpose: **Action**

Sponsor(s):  Kim Wyman, Secretary of State

Department(s): Secretary of State and Department of Enterprise Services
Contact(s):  Bill Frare, DES Assistant Director, 360-407-8239, bill.frare@des.wa.gov  
Patrick McDonald, SOS, 360-902-4148, patrick.mcdonald@sos.wa.gov

Presenters:  Assistant Secretary of State Mark Neary and  
Patrick McDonald, Office of the Secretary of State

**Description:**
In November 2016, CCDAC recommended approval of site selection for the new Washington State Library-Archives Building on the Modular Building Site in Tumwater, WA. The State Capitol Committee (SCC) was subsequently briefed on the Predesign Report findings, and acted to approve the preferred site alternative in December 2017.

The Modular Building Site is not available for the planned building as outlined in the original predesign report, and a new development site must be identified to meet the operational demands for the Office of the Secretary of State.

In the 2018 Supplemental Budget, the State Legislature set forth a provision for the Secretary of State to research alternative development sites, including possible leased areas, for this planned new building. A site analysis was performed of readily available development sites based on the Secretary of State’s programmatic needs. Based on this analysis, a preferred alternate site was selected.

The 2016 Predesign has been amended to include the alternate sites considered for the development of the Washington State Library-Archives Building, and identifies the preferred site alternative at the corner of Linderson and Tumwater Boulevard in Tumwater, WA.

**CCDAC Recommendation**
During a meeting held on November 8, 2018, CCDAC recommended the State Capitol Committee approve the amended Predesign Report, which identifies the preferred development site for the Washington State Library-Archives Building as a parcel of land located at the corner of Linderson and Tumwater Boulevard in Tumwater, WA.
**Next Steps:**
The findings and recommendations outlined in the Washington State Library-Archives Building Predesign will be presented to the State Capitol Committee for approval of the preferred site selection.

The updated Predesign Report will be submitted to OFM for approval, and will be subject to review and approval, and budget appropriations, by the State Legislature to move ahead with project.

**Requested Action(s):**

*Move to approve the amended Predesign Report, which identifies the preferred development site for the Washington State Library-Archives Building as a parcel of land located at the corner of Linderson and Tumwater Boulevard in Tumwater, WA.*

**List of Attachments:**
Site Change Update

- Modular Building site unavailable
- Legislative authority to change sites
- New site available and meets SEPA standards
- Predesign Addendum completed
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4- Newhouse Replacement Predesign

Purpose:  Informational

Sponsor(s):  Bill Frare, FPS Assistant Director, and Ron Hill, Project Manager
Department(s):  Department of Enterprise Services
Contact:  360-407-8239, bill.frare@des.wa.gov

Presenter(s):  Walter Schacht, Schacht Aslani Architects

Description:
In 2018, the Washington State Legislature requested DES to prepare a Predesign Report for the replacement of the Newhouse Building.

According to the capital budget legislation, the Predesign Report is required to consider the following options as a minimum:

Option A: An office building (50,000 to 70,000 square foot) to support Senate offices, with (4) levels of underground parking and a 50,000 to 70,000 square foot office building to support House of Representatives offices to be located on the Pritchard Building parking lot, with necessary underground parking.

Option B: An office building (115,000 to 140,000 square foot) to support both House and Senate offices with four levels of underground parking.

Option C: An office building (50,000 to 70,000 square foot) to support Senate offices with no parking.

Each of the above options is requested to meet high-performance and net-zero energy standards as outlined in the legislative provision and applicable RCWs, codes and executive orders.

A project design team was established, and is comprised of staff members from DES, House Capital Budget Committee, Senate Ways and Means Committee, and consultant staff.

A total of five design workshops have been held to date. In general, these workshops have focused on a functional needs assessment, outlined the requirements for high performance building systems and net-zero energy standards, and identification of proposed conceptual alternatives to meet the Predesign Report requirements. Additionally, potential strategies for addressing net-zero standards and parking impacts were also discussed.
Key findings from the workshops are summarized below:

1. The functional needs assessment for the Senate, House, and Legislative agencies determined less area will be necessary than initially identified in the *State Capitol, Development Study, Opportunity Sites 1,5,6&12* (SA Report), dated March 2017.

2. The initial assessments of potential parking impacts for the new offices may require less area than initially identified in the *State Capitol, Development Study, Opportunity Sites 1,5,6&12* (SA Report), dated March 2017.

3. The repurposing of the north pavilion of the Pritchard Building is being considered in options 1 and 2 to meet functional needs in options 1 and 2. As determined by previous development and historic structure studies, the Pritchard Building was uniquely designed and constructed as the Washington State Library. As such, the book stack portion of this building would require removal in order to repurpose this building.

4. The largest option (i.e. option 2) under consideration includes space for the Senate, House, and the Legislative agencies. Three sub-options are being studied in order to meet this large option’s overall objectives. The redevelopment of the north pavilion of Pritchard is included in two of the sub-options under consideration.

5. The use of the existing state’s steam plant as an energy source is an important consideration during the planning of the Newhouse Replacement. The current plant is approximately 34% efficient in its operation. Connecting a new facility to the existing steam system may fail to meet the high-performance and net-zero energy standards. This study should carefully assess short and long-term operational impacts and future capital needs relative to selection of the energy source to be used for the Newhouse Replacement.

6. A series of conceptual options have been developed, and are currently under consideration. The design team is performing additional analysis to assist the design team and future decision-makers so a preferred alternative can be identified.

The design team is preparing a briefing document for legislative decision-makers. The brief will summarize findings to date, and seek additional guidance for the Alternatives Analysis phase.

The brief is intended to:
- Clarify how to address high-performance and net-zero energy standards, and identify the appropriate energy source (i.e. use of steam plant or new source).
- Clarify parking requirements, assess cumulative impacts, and develop appropriate parking mitigation strategies.
- Prepare cost analyses and Life Cycle Cost Models for each option considered.
- Describe the “No Action” alternative.
- Prepare a high-level summary table, which outlines the advantages and disadvantages of each option considered and relative conceptual-level costs.

The completion of the briefing document is anticipated in January 2018. This document will be provided to key decision-makers (to be identified by the Senate and House) for feedback and further guidance on the alternatives under consideration.

**CCDAC Recommendation**
During a meeting held on November 8, 2018, DES provided CCDAC with an informational status update of the predesign efforts, and the different alternatives under consideration.
CCDAC provided initial feedback to DES and the design team on the information presented. CCDAC took no specific action on the information presented.

**Next Steps:**
Enterprise Services and the design team will return and brief CCDAC on the findings of the Newhouse Replacement Predesign Report. CCDAC may be requested to provide additional input in relation to the options under consideration along with a recommendation for action by SCC at a future regularly-scheduled meeting.

**Requested Action(s):**
No Action is required at this time.

**List of Attachments:**
- Attachment B: Presentation of the *Newhouse Replacement Predesign- Status Update*, prepared by Schacht Aslani Architects and dated November 6, 2018.
APPENDIX A: PREDESign CHECKLIST

A predesign should include the content detailed here. OFM will approve limited scope predesigns on a case-by-case basis.

❖ Executive Summary

❖ Problem Statement, Opportunity or Program Requirement

☐ Identify the problem, opportunity or program requirement that the project addresses and how it will be accomplished.

☐ Identify and explain the statutory or other requirements that drive the project’s operational programs and how these affect the need for space, location or physical accommodations. Include anticipated population projections (growth or decline) and assumptions.

☐ Explain the connection between the agency’s mission, goals and objectives; statutory requirements; and the problem, opportunity, or program requirements.

☐ Describe in general terms what is needed to solve the problem.

☐ Include any relevant history of the project, including previous predesigns that did not go forward to design or construction.

❖ Analysis of Alternatives (including the preferred alternative)

☐ Describe all alternatives that were considered, including the preferred alternative. Include:

☐ A no action alternative.

☐ Advantages and disadvantages of each alternative. Please include a high-level summary table with your analysis.

☐ Cost estimates for each alternative.

☐ Provide enough information so decision makers have a general understanding of the costs.


☐ Schedule estimates for each alternative. Estimate the start, midpoint, and completion dates.

❖ Detailed Analysis of Preferred Alternative

☐ Nature of space – how much of the proposed space will be used for what purpose (i.e., office, lab, conference, classroom, etc.)

☐ Occupancy numbers.

☐ Basic configuration of the building, including square footage and the number of floors.

☐ Space needs assessment. Identify the guidelines used.

☐ Site Analysis

☐ Identify site studies that are completed or under way.

☐ Location.
☐ Building footprint and its relationship to adjacent facilities and site features. Provide an aerial view, sketches of the building site, and basic floorplans.

☐ Stormwater requirements.

☐ Ownership of the site and any acquisition issues.

☐ Easements and setback requirements.

☐ Potential issues with the surrounding neighborhood, during construction and ongoing.

☐ Utility extension or relocation issues.

☐ Potential environmental impacts.

☐ Parking and access issues, including improvements required by local ordinances, local road impacts, and parking demand.

☐ Impact on surroundings and existing development with construction lay-down areas and construction phasing.

☐ Consistency with applicable long-term plans (such as the Thurston County and Capitol Campus master plans and agency or area master plans) as required by RCW 43.88.110.

☐ Consistency with other laws and regulations

☐ High-performance public buildings (Chapter 39.35D RCW).

☐ Greenhouse gas emissions reduction policy (RCW 70.235.070).

☐ Archeological and cultural resources (Executive Order 05-05 and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966).

☐ Americans with Disabilities Act implementation (Executive Order 96-04).

☐ Compliance with planning under Chapter 36.70A RCW, as required by RCW 43.88.0301.

☐ Information required by RCW 43.88.0301(1).

☐ Other codes or regulations.

☐ Identify problems that require further study. Evaluate identified problems to establish probable costs and risk.

☐ Identify significant or distinguishable components, including major equipment and ADA requirements in excess of existing code.

☐ Identify planned IT systems that affect the building plans.

☐ Describe planned commissioning to ensure systems function as designed.

☐ Describe any future phases or other facilities that will affect this project.

☐ Identify and justify the proposed project delivery method. For GC/CM, link to the requirements in RCW 39.10.340.

☐ Describe how the project will be managed within the agency.
PHASE 1
1. Needs Assessment/Programming
2. Alternatives Analysis
   • Submit Briefing Document

PHASE 2
1. Detailed Analysis of Preferred Alternative
2. Project Budget Analysis for Preferred Alternative
3. OFM Review of Predesign Document

SCHEDULE
FALL 2018
September 2018
September - December 2018
December 2018

SPRING 2019
ESSB 6095 Section 1035

(1) In determining the program space required the predesign will consider:

(a) The necessary program space required to support senate offices and support functions

(b) The necessary program space required to support house offices and support functions;
and

(c) Parking impacts of new office space construction

FUNCTIONAL PROGRAM

PROGRAM                      | GSF  |
------------------------------|------|
Senate Newhouse Replacement   | 26,373|
House of Representatives Add'l | 28,442|
Legislative Agencies (Code Reviser, LSS, Leg Tech) | 32,025|
**GROSS SQUARE FEET**         | 86,840|
Efficiency                    | 60%  |

Includes:

- Additional House hearing room
- Pritchard Cafeteria
ESSB 6095 Section 1035
(4) The buildings must be higher performance buildings and meet net-zero-ready standards, with an energy use intensity of no greater than 35. The building construction must be procured using a performance-based method such as design-build and must include an energy performance guarantee comparing actual performance data with the energy design target.
KEY ISSUES
- EUI target = 25
- Central plant efficiency
- Occupant behavior
- Structured parking

NET ZERO ENERGY

ESSB 6095 Section 1035
(a) A 50,000 to 70,000 square foot office building to support senate offices with four levels of underground parking, and a 50,000 to 70,000 square foot office building to support house offices to be located on the Pritchard Building parking lot, with necessary underground parking.
(b) A 115,000 to 140,000 square foot office building to support both house and senate offices with four levels of underground parking.
(c) A 50,000 to 70,000 square foot office building to support senate offices, with no parking.

Senate Building
26,373 SF/2 stories
83 stalls/2 levels of underground parking
$xx million

House and Leg. Agencies Building
60,467 SF/3 stories
50 stalls surface parking
140 stalls/2 levels of underground parking
$xx million

New construction with demolition of Pritchard
$xx million total

Pritchard Renovation/Addition
- S Senate Offices 26,373 SF
- H House Offices 28,442 SF
- LA Leg. Agencies 32,025 SF
- 86,840 SF/3 stories
- $xx million
- Pritchard north pavilion with new construction

Parking Option A
- 24 stalls surface parking
- 250 stalls/4 levels of underground parking
- $xx million

Parking Option B
- 157 stalls surface parking
- $xx million

OPTION B

NEWHOUSE REPLACEMENT PREDESIGN

SCHACHT ASLANI ARCHITECTS

Senate Building
26,373 SF/2 stories
$xx million
KEY

S  SENATE
H  HOUSE
LA  LEGISLATIVE AGENCIES

OPTIONS SUMMARY
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5- Master Planning Update

Purpose: Informational

Sponsor(s): Bill Frare, FPS Assistant Director, and Kevin Dragon, Master Planner
Department(s): Department of Enterprise Services
Contact: 360-407-8239, bill.frare@des.wa.gov
360-407-7956, kevin.dragon@des.wa.gov

Description:
Enterprise Services has long identified the need to revisit and refresh the document that has been serving as the State Capitol Campus master plan since 2006. The document lacks many of the standard elements common to master plans, and is no longer current enough to provide meaningful guidance to ongoing work on campus.

Enterprise Services also lacks the dedicated resources and technology to perform both short- and long-range planning functions necessary to support informed, economically-sound decisions. Even the best master plan can atrophy if it is not maintained. Improved planning capacity is needed to maintain and preserve existing facilities and support decision-makers in planning for growth and development on the State Capitol Campus.

As part of the agency’s FY2019-21 budget proposal, Enterprise Services has submitted budget requests to address these needs. The two requests are summarized as follows:

Master Planning (Capital Budget Request)
Enterprise Services has requested $1.3 million for consulting services to assist with the preparation of a full and comprehensive State Capitol Campus Master Plan. The plan would be developed in a collaborative process with Enterprise Services and stakeholders. The contents of the master plan and the expected role of the consultant are described in the attached table.

Establish a Facility Planning Team (Operating Budget Request)
Enterprise Services has requested funds ($618,000 per year) to establish a planning team within Enterprise Services’ Facility Professional Services (FPS). This request includes adding two facilities planners and two GIS specialists to the FPS team. The team would assist the consultant in the development of the master plan and then have responsibility for maintaining and supporting the plan. The roles of the team in master planning are described in the attached table.
In addition the team would:

- Develop comprehensive planning processes, and guide achievements toward the master plan’s vision, goals, objectives, and related metrics for the preservation and development of the Capitol Campus.

- Ensure consistency with the Capitol Campus Master Plan and other state and local comprehensive plans, studies and reports.

- Develop and implement a GIS program for the Capitol Campus and its surrounding area.

- Assemble and analyze baseline facility data to support future decision making.

- Assess and put plans in place to stop the deterioration of campus facilities and address maintenance and replacement of building systems (i.e. HVAC, elevators, electrical, etc.).

- Assess and put plans in place to address seismic upgrades, ADA access and future space needs.

Using the updated master plan, this team will develop short and long-range operational and capital plans, develop project-specific plans and scopes, properly sequence and schedule projects, develop and manage a GIS data systems, explore development impacts, investigate project impacts to parking and transportation, and coordinate with other state, regional and local planning authorities as required by the GMA to support the preservation and development of the State Capitol Campus. The team will also support compliance with federal, state and local laws and standards.

**CCDAC Recommendation**
During a meeting held on November 8, 2018, DES provided CCDAC with an informational status update on the master planning budget requests. CCDAC took no specific action on the information presented.

**Next Steps:**
None at this time.

**Requested Action:**
No action is requested at this time.

**List of Attachments:**
## Master Plan Content

**Vision, goals, and objectives for State Capital Campus**
- Common vision for the future of the State Capitol Campus.
- Strategic goals and objectives.
- Identify statutory requirements and planning criteria to guide and evaluate development and management options.
- Includes other DES-managed facilities in Thurston County.

## Capital Budget Request

A highly-qualified consultant team will work closely with DES and key stakeholders, through workshops and public meetings, to develop.

The key stakeholders would include, but not be limited to, state executive, judicial and legislative agencies and bodies, tribal representatives, local and regional governments.

## Operating Budget Request

The FPS Planning Team will support the consultant in developing the master plan.

Ongoing, the FPS Planning Team will keep this section of the plan current in coordination with advisory and decision-making bodies and other stakeholders.

## Description of current conditions

- Comprehensive campus mapping, including all infrastructure layers.
- Facility and owned-space utilization inventories.
- Facility and infrastructure assessments.
- Deferred maintenance backlog.
- Connections with relevant state, local and regional comprehensive plans.

The consultant will collect data and assess the condition state of existing facilities and infrastructure.

Focus will be how the conditions of the existing facilities and infrastructure support various government functions on the State Capitol Campus.

The FPS Planning Team will perform data collection, develop a GIS program and mapping for the campus and assist with the analysis during the development of the Master Plan.

Ongoing, the FPS Planning Team will maintain GIS base maps and perform on-going facility-related data collection and analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Plan Content</th>
<th>Capital Budget Request</th>
<th>Operating Budget Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Analysis</strong></td>
<td>The consultant will:</td>
<td>Both as part of the study and ongoing, the FPS Planning Team will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What needs can be met?</td>
<td>• Recommend a planning horizon (at least 10 years) for projecting future demands of the campus based on projected trends relating to campus facilities and infrastructure.</td>
<td>• Research, prepare, analyze and monitor growth, demand and trend data from state, local and regional sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projected growth</td>
<td>• Analyze the current condition of facilities and infrastructure, and develop growth metrics and related trends.</td>
<td>• Identify development limitations, opportunities, and impacts for the State Capitol Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demand trends</td>
<td>• Assess the ability of the capitol campus to meet existing and future demands based.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Societal trends and changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Recommendations and Alternatives** | This plan element would begin to identify specific needs or deficiencies and the need for improvements in order to meet existing and future preservation and programmatic demands. | During and following plan development, the FPS Planning Team will: |
| | During the assessment, alternative structural and non-structural development solutions would be studied. Previous plans, studies and reports would be reviewed. | • Prepare 10-YR Capital Plans and Operating Plans to address needs consistent with the master plan. |
| | The consultant together with the key stakeholders and DES would establish the means for establishing priorities for constructed improvements. | • Develop scopes, schedules (phased) and estimates in support of biennial operating and capital budget requests. |
| | | • Support and help implement non-structural solutions, such as: workplace, space-use and commute trip reduction strategies |
| | | • Establish and monitor planning “development milestones” in relation to the 10YR capital and operational plans to ensure these plans remain useful and current with emerging political, societal and economic conditions and needs on the State Capitol Campus. |
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FY2017-19 Capital Projects Update

Purpose:  **Informational**

Sponsor(s):  Bill Frare, FPS Assistant Director, and Kevin Dragon, Master Planner  
Department(s):  Department of Enterprise Services  
Contact:  360-407-8239, bill.frare@des.wa.gov  
360-407-7956, kevin.dragon@des.wa.gov

Description:
SCC and CCDAC have expressed interest in Enterprise Services providing project status updates on the following key capital projects:

1. **Conservatory Demolition:**
   In 2018, the Washington State Legislature included appropriations in the FY2017-19 Capital Budget for the building’s removal.

   To date the following efforts have been accomplished:
   - Enterprise Services has selected and contracted with a professional consultant team.
   - The consultant team is currently exploring demolition alternatives based on the limited capital funds allocated.

   Next Steps:
   - Enterprise Services anticipates completion of the alternative analysis, and relative cost estimates in early January 2019, and will provide SCC with a project status at future CCDAC and SCC meetings.

2. **East Plaza Infiltration & Elevator Repairs (Phase 5B):**
   In general, the scope for phase 5B includes the following:
   - Demolition of the plaza surface between the DOT building and the south east stair tower (including asbestos abatement);
   - Replace the garage roof and waterproof plaza planters and vertical walls; and
   - Install new plaza walkways and landscaping.

   Design and construction of this project will be funded by a Certificate of Participation (COP) in lieu of dedicated State Building Construction Account (SBCA) or other capital funds. COP funded projects must comply with strict timelines and specific terms and conditions.

   To date, the following efforts have been accomplished:
   - Enterprise Services has selected and contracted with a professional consultant, Cornerstone Architectural Group.
   - Schematic Design (SD) drawings are complete for the project.
• The GC/CM team selection was completed in October 2018.
• Washington Patriot was selected as the GC/CM Contractor, and will be providing Preconstruction Services for the project.

Next Steps:
• Project is on schedule to establish a maximum allowable construction cost (MACC) by January 2019, which is necessary to secure COP funding.
• DES will submit documentation to the State Treasurer’s office for an April COP transaction.
• Enterprise Services will provide a project status and solicit input about this project at future CCDAC and SCC meetings.

3. Relocate Mural from GA to 1063:
The 2018 Capital Budget included a specific budget provision to relocate the mosaic mural located within the General Administration (GA) Building into the Helen Sommers (1063 Block Replacement) Building.

To date, the following efforts have been accomplished:
• The design work for the mural relocation, which includes initial demolition and asbestos abatement, is complete.
• An initial public works bid solicitation was issued in August 2018, and Enterprise Services did not receive any bids.
• Bid documents were modified, and a second public works bid solicitation was held in September 2018.
• Enterprise Services received a total of seven bids.
• A to B Builders LLC is currently under contract and work is proceeding on-site.

Next Steps:
• Enterprise Services anticipates completion of the mural’s relocation in early January 2019, and will provide a project status at future CCDAC and SCC meetings.

4. Legislative Building Exterior Preservation (Dome Cleaning):
This project generally includes masonry inspection, repair, and cleaning of the building’s exterior. The work will be performed in three phases: 1) the central dome atop the building; 2) the band circling the building beneath the dome, including the parapet walls; and 3) the plaza area.

To date, the following efforts have been accomplished:
• A Notice to Proceed was issued to Pioneer Masonry on August 31, 2018.
• Pioneer Masonry mobilized to the work site on September 4, 2018, and began work.
• Dome cleaning and preservation work is complete.

Next Steps:
• Enterprise Services has requested a reappropriation of reserved funding to perform other much needed preservation work. This work would be performed during the FY2019-21 biennium.
5. **Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes, Long-Term Management/EIS:**

The state legislature requested Enterprise Services to perform an alternative evaluation for long-term management of the Capitol Lake/Lower Deschutes estuary. The primary alternatives to be evaluated, at a minimum, include a Managed Lake, a Restored Estuary, a Hybrid, and a No Action Alternative.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared. This EIS will ultimately study and document potential environmental impacts of various management alternatives in relation to long-term management objectives.

At its conclusion, the EIS is envisioned to identify a preferred environmentally and economically sustainable long-term management alternative. Enterprise Services anticipates an EIS of this size and complexity will take about three years to complete.

The first step in the development of an EIS is Scoping. Scoping simply helps to identify the range and nature of alternatives to study. Scoping began in late September 2018.

To date, the following efforts have been accomplished:

- Two public scoping meetings were held, and were attended by approximately 100 community members.
- A public website has been developed to exchange information about the EIS and capture public comments.
- Public comments were recorded at each of the two scoping meetings, and are being reviewed by the Enterprise Services and the consultant team.
- Several project workgroups were formed, including an Executive Work Group (EWG), Technical Work Group (TWG), and a Finance & Governance Work Group (FGWG). Representation on these groups include both local and state representatives.
- Initial project meetings were held with the Executive Work Group, Technical Work Group, and Funding & Governance Work Group.
- Enterprise Services and the consultant team have conducted briefings with the following interest groups: Capitol Lake Improvement and Protection Association (CLIPA), Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team (DERT), Thurston County Chamber, Recreational Boating Association of Washington, LOTT Clean Water Alliance, and Olympia Downtown Alliance.
- Additional briefings and presentations have been held for various other stakeholders and special interest groups, including presentations to the CCDAC, SCC, City of Olympia Council, and various in-person meetings with State Legislators.
- The consultant team maintains communication with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The intent is to exchange information and encourage federal participation for overall understanding of the state’s EIS efforts and decision-making relative to future federal permitting once a Preferred Alternative is determined.
- The Public comment period for **EIS Scoping ended on November 13, 2018.**

**Next Steps:**

- Enterprise Services and its consultant team is currently reviewing and categorizing all of the public comments received.
- Consolidated comments will be made publically available via the project’s website.
- Enterprise Services and the consulting team will prepare an initial EIS scoping report.
- The scoping report will be reviewed with the workgroups and stakeholders.
6. **Capitol Child Care Center (SCC Action Update):**
   The Governor’s 19-21 Capital Budget recommends capital appropriations be provided for the development of a Predesign Report for a child care center on the State Capitol Campus.

   Enterprise Services understanding the recommended appropriations are based on the findings and recommendations outlined in the [Capitol Campus Child Care Center, Predesign Study](#) as reviewed and approved by CCDAC and SCC.

   **Next Steps:**
   - This project is subject to further funding legislation and adoption of the FY2019-21 Capital Budget by the State Legislature.

**Requested Action(s):**
No actions are requested at this time.

**List of Attachments:**
None.