

**CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**General Administration Building**  
**210 – 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW, Room 207**  
**Olympia, Washington**  
**January 10, 2008**  
**10:00 AM**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Fred King  
Representative Richard DeBolt  
Barbara Swift  
Representative Sam Hunt  
Senator Karen Fraser  
Patrick McDonald, Secretary of State (for Secretary Sam Reed)

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Alhadeff, Sally, DIS  
Albert, Jim, DIS  
Anderson, Jim, WSP  
Benedict, Randy, NBBJ  
Bremer, Linda, GA  
Broome, John, WSDOT  
Buker, Pat, GA  
Childs, Harvey, OFM  
Cox, Jennifer, DIS  
Dittloff, Larry, WSDOT  
Donald, Craig, GA  
Edens, Cindy, WRC  
Evans, Tom, GA  
Friddle, Steve, City of Olympia  
Gow, Valerie, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Gray, Donovan, DAHP/GA  
Hensel, Grant, GA  
Jacks, Liz, NBBJ

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Dennis Haskell  
Ron Tan

Johnson, Bill, WRC  
Lavene, Mindy  
Maher, Carol, ADA/EAS/GA  
Martin, Jim, DIS  
Masse, Steve, OFM  
Meier, Kurt, Meier Group  
Pressley, Bob, NBBJ  
Robinson, Gary, DIS  
Rushford, Jane GA  
Selby, Kim, NBBJ  
Shay, Perry, Shay, Carr & Jewel  
Stepelton, Andy, Leg Facilities  
Szumlanski, Paul, GA  
Watilo, Larry, LSC  
UndiHagen, Diane, WRC  
Watson, Pete, City of Olympia  
Wilson, Mary Sue, Capitol Campus Childcare Center

**Announcements and Introductions**

Chair King called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:08 a.m. Everyone present provided self-introductions.

*Representatives Hunt and DeBolt arrived at 10:09 a.m.*

**Approval of Agenda**

**Mr. McDonald moved, seconded by Ms. Swift, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried.**

**Approval of Minutes**

**Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Mr. McDonald, to approve the November 8, 2007 minutes as presented. Motion carried.**

**Director's Report**

GA Director Bremer provided a brief update on the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building project. The Department of General Administration (GA) completed the BEST Report and the Soils Report, which were submitted to the Legislative Finance Committees. Some of the BEST Report recommendations have been incorporated into the schematic design and some have not, which will be reviewed during the planning process. The next step of the project is solicitation of the General Contractor/Construction Manager (GC/CM) for managing the project, which is tentatively scheduled for February.

Chair King said there was some communication between staff and committee members about amending the Master Plan to include the project. He asked for the status of when that amendment might occur. Mr. Evans said the eastern half of the north edge of property is under consideration and the Legislature has approved the construction of the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building on the western half of the block. However, approval has not been received to construct anything on the eastern half, which is from Columbia Street to Capitol Way. However, planning has been undertaken through the assistance of the consultants for that site. The intent is to capture the planning effort in a subcampus plan for the Master Plan. That effort is just beginning. The committee will receive a briefing on the issue in May.

Chair King noted the committee requested the completion of additional work on the eastern half block to ensure that future development of the block is synchronized with the entire two-block area.

Mr. McDonald asked whether GA anticipates the Legislature approving the two studies for the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building project. Mr. Craig Donald reported the legislation indicates GA is not to proceed until February 1, 2008. GA is working on scheduling a series of meetings with both legislative staff and legislators to discuss the findings of the BEST Study and the Soils Study to see if there are any problems associated with proceeding with the project. Ms. Bremer advised GA will consult with Senator Fraser and Secretary Reed. The plan is to proceed after review with legislators to ensure goals are mutually in sync. Both Secretary Reed and Insurance Commissioner Kreidler received a briefing on the reports.

Chair King asked whether any of the BEST Study recommendations have any significant impact on the appearance, the site, massing, or building materials that would be of concern and contradictory of any previous approvals by the CCDAC. Ms. Bremer affirmed there were and that GA did not accept those recommendations that were not consistent with CCDAC's direction.

Mr. Donald said one of the suggestions was to use the existing GA footprint for the basement area of the building. GA likely will pursue the recommendation because it will save some resources. However, it will be below grade and will not be visible. Mr. McDonald clarified that the only difference is that the project will build onto the footprint and into the hillside. Mr. McDonald assured members that the building above grade is what has been previously approved by the committee. However, underground, there will be some differences that will be accommodated.

Ms. Bremer referred to the supplemental capital budget and Heritage Park programming. There have been many discussions about the more effective use of the park, however there is no funding. GA has facilitated bringing different groups together to discuss what is necessary to fund some new initiatives for

the park. The work is proceeding in a conceptual phase related to programming and what to include in the park.

GA staff presented several briefings for combining the Parking Study and transportation planning. Based on input from the CCDAC and others, GA is looking at a transportation plan for the campus. GA is continuing the process and meeting with different stakeholder groups.

**Wheeler Site Development – Status Report**

DIS Director Gary Robinson provided an update on the status of the Wheeler site development project.

DIS continues to work with Wright-Runstad and NBBJ on design alternatives for the layout of the facilities on the property. Agencies participating in some of the meetings include DIS, GA, Washington State Patrol (WSP), Office of Financial Management (OFM) (representing smaller agencies), City of Olympia, and Fred King on behalf of CCDAC. The meetings involved reviewing the appropriate locations of facilities on the site and how they are responsive to the principles that are included in the Capitol Master Plan. DIS also held a meeting with community members to receive feedback from the neighborhoods surrounding the Wheeler site as well as others in the community to review similar options and alternatives.

DIS worked with the Governor's Office on alternatives for the relocation of the child care center. Within the supplemental budget recommendation, which is currently before the Legislature, there are funds to provide continued operations of the child care center at the Perry Street site in west Olympia. Additionally, there are funds for an evaluation of a location of a child care center on Capitol Campus. If endorsed by the Legislature, there will be more engagement with the CCDAC on options for Capitol Campus.

Representative DeBolt said this is an area that he is concerned about. He asked whether the Parent Board agreed with the new plan. Mr. Robinson said they had the opportunity to review the options. Representative DeBolt said the child care center serves the Capitol Campus but is moving some distance from the campus. Ms. Bremer agreed and noted that with the current legislation and with timing constraints, there was not an opportunity to create [a campus location] and maintain continuous operation. She stressed that the efforts are to ensure that there is no interruption of the [child care] service, given where the legislation is and the funding at this point, as well as the time constraints. Representative DeBolt cited a previous possibility of GA studying the availability of other buildings nearby. He asked if that option was considered. Mr. Bremer said all the options were examined in terms of making use of existing buildings. The opportunities that were on the table at one point were to build a new facility, but again timing constraints and funding were not in place. Representative DeBolt said his two main concerns are their needs and how they will return to the campus. Five years in west Olympia is a long time for the child care center as well as not promoting campus family friendliness. Ms. Bremer said the committee also had a discussion and Senator Fraser and Representative Hunt about using the session as an opportunity to pursue that initiative.

Representative Hunt said it's likely the ultimate goal is to have two centers; maintain the one that we are using and having another one closer to Capitol Campus. However, GA did look at virtually everything but was unable to find anything in the short-term for locating the child care center.

Mr. Robinson reported DIS is continuing to work with GA on the relocation of the other tenants that are located on the Wheeler site and to identify spaces for the other tenants to move to. There are some funds

in the supplemental budget for several of the tenants that will have increased lease costs. Costs associated with the move will come out of the project budget.

Chair King invited comments from the public.

**Mary Sue Wilson, President of the Parent Board**, referred to the Parent Board's goals and the hope that the child care center would return to Capitol Campus. Early on, the Board wanted to avoid moving twice, but now the Board has two goals – a quality childcare center at the Perry Street site at no additional cost to parents and continued work toward the return of the child care center to Capitol Campus. The parents appreciate the Governor's budget request that gives the Department of Personnel the funds for a study to take the first step toward a permanent center on Capitol Campus. The Board was disappointed that the budget did not include funds for the Pro Arts facility that GA has an option to purchase because that is one of the possible sites. If the study indicates a preference for the Pro Arts facility, the Board will have to wait until the 2009 legislative session, which means the Board loses additional time. Parents will be urging legislators to consider including it within the budget.

On a non-budget issue on the Wheeler lot, the Board had hoped the next phase of the design work would also include a child care center on the lot, which is another permanent Capitol Campus option. However, the Board has been informed that because of the timing associated with the Wheeler site project, it's not feasible to include the child care center as a consideration during the design phase.

Ms. Wilson said the Board is working on the Perry Street Center cooperatively with the agencies to ensure the facility is a quality center and that the budget request is sufficient to create an adequate facility.

Ms. Wilson addressed representative DeBolt's questions on whether the Parent Board is on board with the agencies. The Board is working cooperatively but the Board hasn't expressed an official "on board" and that's because the Board doesn't have complete confidence that Perry Street will include everything that is needed and that it will be as short-term solution only.

#### **Preliminary Site Plan Review**

Mr. Robinson introduced Cindy Edens, Wright-Runstad. Ms. Edens introduced the project team of Randy Benedict, NBBJ, Lead Designer; Bill Johnson, Urban Planner and Landscape; Bobby Pressley, Project Manager; Diane UndiHagen, Project Manager, Wright-Runstad; and Mindy Lavene, Design Lead.

Mr. Benedict reviewed the process to date and the current status of the design process. Mr. Benedict displayed a map of the Wheeler site and described the current organization of the site and surrounding buildings and landmarks.

Mr. Bill Johnson briefed members on the site factors for the Wheeler project. Mr. Johnson outlined several factors that are important in the context of the campus and the neighborhood that will influence what happens on the site. The factors are not in any order of priority because they relate to one another, much like a circle.

Mr. Johnson identified and described in detail what the factors are and what they encompass:

1. Capitol Campus Continuity – *Olmsted Legacy* – *in the extended campus, abide by the Olmsted principles of casual tree groves with an open, see-through quality on both sides of Jefferson forming a distinctive 'Campus Green'*

2. Gateway Threshold & Green Edges
3. Site Identity - *Campus green character for campus identity; "see through" project identity; pedestrian character*
4. Campus Connectivity
5. Site Accessibility
6. Neighborhood 'Landing'
7. Jefferson as a 'Green Street'
8. Building Scale Transition
9. Future Building Site

Mr. Johnson said the nine factors are not the only factors but are the ones of importance.

Representative Hunt inquired about access to the site in terms of limited or open access since WSP and the data center will be located on the site. Mr. Johnson said those details are pending as the team hasn't delved into that arena but the issue is on the docket.

Mr. Johnson responded to questions about a route through the Transportation Building and whether there will be an accessible route. Mr. Johnson said at some point, the team would like to develop a site plan that considers that accessibility.

Ms. Wilson referred to the efforts several months ago to locate a site for a permanent child care center on Capitol Campus. There were three that were considered. One is the Pro Arts facility and the other is on the Wheeler site. However, another one is an area that has been designated as an opportunity lot near the green forested area. Integrating a child care center into that area would be consistent with the kind of use that has been conveyed. She said she is hopeful that others share that view as opposed to saying it wouldn't be consistent because parents would hate at this point if that option was developed in a way that wouldn't keep that option on the table of integrating a child care center. Mr. Johnson said the site if developed, could be a site for a "building in the green." It's a great site for the right kind of building.

Representative DeBolt asked if there is any possibility that the JLARC Building could be an option for the child care center, such as retaining the building until the Capitol Campus site design is completed and then moving the child care center to its new site. Mr. Robinson replied that the contractor to look at potential sites for the child care center evaluated the JLARC Building and the work that would need to be done on the facility would not render it as a reasonable site to transfer the child care center.

Ms. Swift said it would be helpful to include a piece of information tied to the child care center that was discussed during the October 18 meeting identifying that the Wheeler project RFP requires the developer to address inclusion of a child care center either in a stand-alone building or incorporated into one of the new buildings. She said she wants to ensure that as part of the presentation that discussion is included. Mr. Robinson acknowledged the request.

Representative DeBolt asked about the cost adds to the project based on the presentation of factors and the Olmsted design and features. Mr. Robinson said there are initial cost estimates that were based on the previous design, which will need to be evaluated and revised based on final conclusions on the layout of the site. There are cost estimates that are comparable with regard to square footage for each of the facilities that are under consideration.

Ms. Edens reported that Mr. Johnson's presentation was a greater campus plan, and what the team will be doing is including that cost for the Wheeler site, but future budgeting would be required for the other site across 14<sup>th</sup> and across Jefferson.

Ms. Wilson responded to the request by Ms. Swift to include information about the child care center. The Parent Board understands that the bidders conveyed, with very little detail, that it would be possible to consider bringing a day care into the Wheeler lot either stand-alone or as part of a building, but that the decision has been made not to carry that forward into the design phase because it's a separate decision from the Legislature and others about whether that would be the location for a permanent child care center and that timing is insufficient to make a decision.

Ms. Swift acknowledged the information and asked that the response to her question should be from the design team as well. Mr. Benedict said the team will comment on the issue as it moves forward.

Mr. Benedict said as a point of transition, it's important to understand that what occurs when evaluating the site, is taking a broader look to consider the potential in the future. Those nine factors have begun the framework for the development of the architectural schemes. The team began looking at having the two buildings sit on the front of Jefferson and 14<sup>th</sup> so that the buildings hold the two street edges as well as addressing the identity corner. The key element is the transition that occurs to elbow the two buildings into the remainder of the site with the thought that the data center would be more central to the site.

Mr. Benedict described the team's placement of buildings on the site and reasons for some of the proposed placements at this point in the design schemes.

Discussion ensued about programming needs, access and entry locations, visitor parking, and loading access points. Mr. Benedict said placement of air handling equipment, generators, and cooling towers were moved to another location adjacent to the substation to avoid having the mechanical elements located next to the neighborhood. The current design configuration verifies the programmatic arrangement is in a better relationship to key factors as Mr. Johnson discussed during his presentation. He explained how a building configuration is stepped down to three stories that are near the neighborhood. The larger building sits on 14<sup>th</sup> and because it's larger, it actually is at a lower elevation and the buildings begin to align the height of the two buildings. The data center is located central to the site and has the [noisy] cooling towers and generators located adjacent to the substation. The conceptual drawings provide a sense of where the team is in the process. The team has begun reviewing the architecture but is at the point of configuring the programmatic elements on the site. The next phase will include the architecture.

Mr. McDonald inquired about the access to the highway onramps. Ms. Edens said traffic scoping with the City has been initiated. Mr. McDonald pointed out a challenge with the access from the north to the onramps, which will require traffic traveling north to cross lanes.

Mr. McDonald asked about the appearance of the data center. Mr. Benedict said there are two data halls that sit over a mechanical space. It's actually three stories tall. It exposes the top level, which has air handlers on the roof. The screen wall is at a height to visually screen the air handlers from visibility. He described the layout, which incorporates open space and foliage to screen the site.

Ms. Swift said the Master Plan identifies the site as #9. She said as she looks at the [earlier] Perkins and Will site strategy, it appears the [current] team has moved away from the eastern edge of site #9 and it is

left as either a landscape area or as a future building site. She said she is concerned that this remaining portion of the site might be too small to be buildable. Mr. Benedict replied that more soil test borings were completed to understand the quality of soils on the site. Originally, the notion was that the soil conditions would be better in a particular area and that the data center should sit on stable earth. However, the tests reveal soil quality is consistent throughout giving flexibility in placement of the buildings. Based on the best use of the site, the illustration places the buildings in relationship to the streets with buffers.

Chair King inquired about the dimension of the data center. Mr. Benedict replied the footprint is 150 feet in length plus corridors that will go on either side of the data hall or approximately 170 feet overall. Each data hall is approximately 100 feet in width. The mechanical space that exists on the lower level is actually a larger floor plate.

Mr. Benedict answered questions about the air handlers, mitigation measures for noise, and the quantity of air handlers at full build-out. He described the purpose of the Link Program, which is a production and testing facility, which tests equipment prior to installation in the data halls.

Representative Hunt asked whether the buildings will be built to LEED standards. Mr. Benedict said the office buildings will be LEED standard but not the data halls.

Mr. McDonald asked whether WSP is on board with the design as presented. Mr. Benedict confirmed WSP is involved and has attended a number of design charrettes. Jim Anderson, WSP, advised that both the WSP Chief and Deputy Chief have reviewed the site plan and concur with the proposal.

Ms. Carol Maher expressed concerns that no one is championing the cause of ensuring an accessible route to the main campus. Approximately 22% of the employees who work for the state have disabilities. This is an important issue and said she hopes that someone will champion that element. There are also many consultants that have ADA consultants on staff. Mr. Benedict advised NBBJ also has in-house ADA consultants. The project will be ADA accessible throughout the perimeter of the project. He said Ms. Maher is right that once the project reaches the property line, there is nothing the team can do to maintain ADA access beyond that. Ms. Edens said her team will develop conceptual design ideas that can be pursued by others.

Representative Hunt asked if soil sampling has been completed. Mr. Benedict said sufficient soil sampling has been completed to understand the quality of soils across the site. Other sampling will be conducted by geo engineers when it is determined how the structures will function.

Mr. McDonald asked whether DIS is ready to break ground in May and move forward on the project. Ms. Edens said there is a team of approximately 42 people on the project. Basically, the team is moving toward selling bonds in May, which will enable breaking ground by the first of June. The schedule shows that if the permitting process with the City of Olympia proceeds on schedule and site work is initiated in June, the first building will be delivered by the end of December 2009 that WSP will occupy. The goal is to complete all the buildings by February 1, 2010.

Representative Hunt noted the habit of placing cafeterias in the basement of state buildings. He said he is not supportive of that practice. Ms. Edens agreed with the comment.

Ms. Swift reported the project is important for the campus. She conveyed appreciation for the approach of the presentation, which puts the project in a larger campus context and sets some important principles in how the project will move forward. It also means that everyone will have to be diligent to the erosion of a layered experience. For example, up near the northeast corner of the DIS Building it appears there could be some erosion of principles. The next issue, which goes to the balance of massing of programmatic blocks on the site, is something that the team has right in terms of the way the design is layering up. And, the team is doing it in a way to minimize impact on the surrounding community, as well as using the landscape threshold backed by a layer of building to strengthen that. The downside relative to the massing is that the plan appears to be a little parsimonious in the scaling of the open space in terms of the transition from the west of greens in through this part of the campus. It feels right now like it's one or the other and it appears that the team has developed a generous frame around Jefferson but is not bringing the campus into the area. She suggested working at that aspect a little more.

Ms. Swift returned to the child care issue and noted the team did not answer her previous question. As this process developed initially through the predesign there were several things that were identified as being really important in terms of child care and in terms of the larger campus. Child care is one of the things that were identified that binds the campus together and it will force issues of connectivity. It deserves a better response than the committee has heard today. What was heard today doesn't address the question that was identified in the RFP of seriously investigating an important programmatic component not only of the community of the larger campus but of the community of this site. It is something that is due a serious look and it's important that CCDAC make itself available. The team is off to a good start, but there are some stumbling blocks.

Mr. Benedict concurred. Right now, the team is trying to illustrate something that shows green space versus space that is built. Ms. Swift said it's all uniform right now. Ms. Edens confirmed that the team understands the comments.

Mr. McDonald said he likes the idea of the option of the day care center located in the area called the "iron works" [next to the Transportation Building]. That's not a bad idea. He acknowledged that it would probably have to undertake a study process, but it might be a good idea to consider in future planning. The last issue is the last space of land north of 14<sup>th</sup>, that triangle of land, which is a gravel pit right now. He suggested some good landscaping along 14<sup>th</sup>. That area shouldn't be missed in this plan. Mr. Benedict agreed. The team identified that area as a critical part of the campus approach.

Representative DeBolt acknowledged the outstanding work to date and the fiscal constraints that may set up the project for failure in terms of the design and how the development will look. He said he hopes to do due diligence during the session to ensure the project moves forward with a key design. The second part is that we are all about our children and the fact that we look for valuable state employees every day who are informed that one of things that state government can provide is a quality of life as a state employee with one being the importance of children on the campus. He said he is bothered by the consideration of the issue and that there is no overwhelming consideration to solve the problem. He suggested that by setting the child care center aside there is the likelihood it will not be addressed, and he wants to be an advocate for parents because having that quality of life for parents who work is very important.

Chair King compared the footprint of the existing Transportation Building with the proposed footprints of the Wheeler buildings and commented that the Transportation Building is dwarfed by the proposed Wheeler site proposal. There is a significant difference in scale. As the team begins to articulate the

buildings in terms of design, the team will be challenged to ensure the buildings belong on the campus. Chair King said in his mind that will be a problem. Secondly, it has been suggested that the access through the DOT building that leads to [the main] campus should be a point of interest into the Wheeler site as it will cut through what is viewed as another building site. He suggested consulting the Master Plan to avoid losing a valuable piece of buildable property. Mr. Benedict said he understands that the Master Plan looks at only the south half [of the area just east of the Transportation Building] as a future building site and that the [east-west] access is maintained in the Master Plan. The team looked at some documents to verify the issue.

Chair King agreed that the spaces between the data center and the two large buildings appear to be cramped and that it may be sterile space that will need some attention.

Mr. Donald reported that at the charrette, there was discussion about some future development and ADA and pedestrian access along 14<sup>th</sup> which would join with the overhead access to Capitol Campus rather than through the middle of the DOT Building. Mr. Benedict said the team can design that plaza area to receive that connection.

Ms. Edens offered to provide the CCDAC with photos of plazas the firm has designed and built in the cities of Bellevue and Seattle.

Chair King said he also want to ensure that the development does not create serious noise problems for the neighborhood to the south.

Representative Hunt expressed concerns about visitor parking. He proposed an option for the child care center as an area east Office Building 2 (OB-2) at the very top across 14<sup>th</sup>, which is currently grassed but was planned as a formal entry into OB2 but was eliminated because of the location of the backup power generators and diesel exhaust. Those issues may be resolved making it a possible site to consider for the child care center.

Representative Hunt expressed support of the configuration of the data center security and because of its proximity to I-5.

Ms. Bremer acknowledged that it's the first time she has had the opportunity to review the designs. She recommended the projects should continue connecting with the transportation study. Additionally, there are several components of the Master Plan that should be updated. She suggested staff should be connected with the team regarding the Master Plan. Another element is the ADA piece that is important. The state has not paid as much attention to that population as it should. The issues will not get smaller. As the campus grows, it's really important. The state has an ADA Advisory Committee and it's important that the consultants and employees connect. Meeting the minimum ADA requirements does not seem to be fair as these buildings will be here for 50 to 100 years.

Representative Hunt said the project should not move forward without a solution for visitor parking.

Chair King summarized the committee's input to the process indicating the team's made good progress and is heading in the right direction, but there are still some challenges associated with the design.

Mr. Robinson expressed appreciation for Chair King's willingness to attend planning meeting as well as the guidance he's provided.

Ms. Edens echoed similar comments. Chair King said the CCDAC stressed the willingness of committee members to attend interim meetings to ensure projects move forward.

Chair King recessed the meeting at 11:53 a.m. for a lunch break.

Chair King reconvened the meeting at 12:30 p.m.

**Traffic/Parking Study – Status Report**

Mr. Evans opened the discussion by cautioning the members that the numbers in the presentation are not reflective of final numbers and at this point are based on available information, which will be refined as the study progresses. Mr. Evans introduced Perry Shea, Shea, Carr & Jewell. Mr. Shea briefed the committee on the parking needs for the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building and the DIS/WSP Buildings.

*Senator Fraser arrived at 12:35 p.m.*

Mr. Shea identified the campus parking study areas campus-wide. The presentation focused on Area A - Heritage Center/Executive Office Building and Area H – DIS/WSP Buildings. The presentation covered anticipated staff numbers in 2012 and in 2022, project square footage, existing staff, new staff, and visitor parking demands based on a low to high range with a parking need determined based on average demand. Commute Trip Reduction is also factored into the numbers to account for the rideshare component.

Mr. Shea said the information will provide the agencies with data on what to program and plan their parking needs.

Mr. Shea reviewed construction parking impacts, which will need to be factored.

Members and staff discussed parking requirements created by the use of conference space in the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building.

Chair King referred to Columbia Street Garage parking, which the study assumes will be retained until the eastern half of the block is developed. In effect, the study is isolating the eastern block and assigning to the future project sponsor the burden of replacing all of the parking in the GA Garage plus new parking for the entire population of the new building, which will make the property very expensive for the state to develop in the future. Ms. Bremer pointed out that the costs are there regardless of the projects. Ms. Swift said it's a portion of costs and the lack of distribution of the costs. Mr. Evans clarified that the study has identified the minimum and maximum [parking] demand. Ms. Swift said a master planning objective exercise would point to the project as a master planning sub-unit and that there ought to be an objective of reasonable, intelligent dispersal of the parking requirement across that site.

Ms. Bremer cited discussions with Senator Fraser acknowledging that there is parking demand, but it may be preferable to have parking off campus by enabling other vehicles, shuttles, and buses to transport visitors, employees, and others to the campus.

Chair King reiterated the desire to develop a comprehensive approach to parking where the expense is not necessarily borne by individual buildings as they develop.

Mr. Evans said the intent of the study is to provide the magnitude of the numbers; how that demand is met is outside the scope of the study.

Discussion ensued about project-specific parking needs, the intent of the larger study, and the need to distribute parking costs equally.

Mr. Shea reviewed next steps. Density changes occurring on both sides of the campus and how that will impact parking in addition to the two projects are important to consider. Additionally, traffic/pedestrian circulation is also a critical component that needs to be factored.

Mr. Shea provided additional details on the numbers, current and future demand, visitor demand, and designated agency parking stalls.

Mr. Evans commented on how the estimates of the parking demand will likely put parking pressure on adjacent neighborhoods.

Mr. Shea described the necessity of conducting a parking turnover study to confirm parking availability on campus during session and non-session.

Ms. Swift commented that the data is important and that it suggests policy recommendations. CCDAC, it seems, is the body that should be generating policy recommendations.

Chair King inquired about the timeline for completion of the study. Mr. Evans advised that staff and the consultant will work on the next steps and produce a final report. The original thought was to provide the two projects with information to enable them to make better decisions. However, another goal is to make this study the beginning of a broader study that will look at transportation as a regional system.

Ms. Bremer suggested staff should share the project plan with members as well as an outline of the report elements.

Representative Hunt shared information about a bus tunnel at the DSHS building.

Representative Hunt said Area H does not include lost visitor parking stalls. Mr. Shea said the information needs to be incorporated into the campus-wide study. There is an ongoing effort to look at the displacement of Dash bus service. Ms. Bremer said GA is working with Intercity Transit regarding parking for Dash bus service. Mr. Evans shared information on an alternative site for Dash parking that will provide 38 stalls. The site is east of the Transportation Building parking lot or near opportunity site #8.

Senator Fraser said she remains concerned that everything seems to be driven by projects. She suggested with the session, a recommendation to the Legislature to fund an appropriate study would be a good idea. She said she is also concerned about some of the assumptions in the bigger picture in that all visitors will continue to drive to Capitol Campus and park. She suggested it's not realistic and that the state must be smarter and more visionary, which will likely require some type of shuttle system. Another issue is the assumption that the current 70% drive-alone [factor] is going to continue.

**South Edge Sub-Campus Plan -Endorsement**

Mr. Evans reported the CCDAC at its meeting in November asked staff to format the information as a master plan document for consideration as an Appendix to the Master Plan. It's likely the Appendix will also require a non-project SEPA review process.

Mr. Evans introduced Kim Selby from NBBJ, who provided a review of the document.

Staff looked very specifically at the site discussions within the design section of the Master Plan. There is much policy in the Master Plan that encompasses everything on campus. In Policy 5.1 and 5.2 there are specific discussions about what the design should entail and many elements of the policies were used in developing the Appendix.

The South Edge sub-campus area is immediately adjacent to the historic Capitol Group structures, the historic South Capitol Neighborhood and Capitol Way. Currently, there are four buildings on the sub-campus edge that includes the Newhouse Building, two press houses, Visitor and Information Center, and the pedestrian bridge connecting east and west campus. In the Master Plan, the site is designated as Master Plan Opportunity Site #6.

Within the Appendix, the section on Spatial Relationships discusses the adjacencies with the historic Capitol buildings. For open space requirements of the Master Plan, the area should be pedestrian-friendly and attractive with opportunities of east-west movement along Sid Snyder Avenue and a discussion on replacing the pedestrian bridge with a new structurally sound and ADA accessible bridge.

Ms. Bremer inquired about the community connection features. Ms. Selby said the idea is for open spaces for community, visitors, and staff with various amenities. Landscape buffers are included to help protect the neighborhood.

Ms. Selby reviewed the zoning analysis of the sub-area. The language pertaining to campus entries notes that the south edge is adjacent to a primary campus entry from the 14<sup>th</sup> Street tunnel and I-5. The Master Plan considers the intersection of 15<sup>th</sup> Street and Capitol Way as a transition zone between east and west campus. Redevelopment of the South Edge must consider the dominant views across the site to the Legislative Building. Minimum setback on Sid Snyder Avenue should be established at a minimum of 20 feet with a preference of 30 feet. The view north on Water Street terminates and is centered upon the Insurance Building. South Edge redevelopment must mirror the setback of the Cherberg Building across Water Street to frame this neighborhood view.

The Appendix also includes language concerning boulevards and streets with direction to ensure buildings are clearly identified as belonging to the Capitol Campus, and not just an extension of the downtown commercial core. Widening Sid Snyder Avenue to the south, which will impact existing trees, suggests a timing of development occurring on the South Edge or when the trees are damaged by weather.

Chair King asked why the Newhouse Building replacement is designated for redevelopment first rather than the new legislative buildings as they will be constructed at different times. Switching them would create open space.

Ms. Liz Jacks said the reason for the timing is that staff expressed a preference for locating closer to the campus. Mr. Evans confirmed the replacement of the Newhouse Building will likely be an office building

for members of the Senate and consideration for members to reach the campus quickly was the major reason for the location and timing. He acknowledged that the Appendix can be changed.

Representative Hunt suggested the site reflects too many buildings on the site. Two buildings rather than three would be a more appropriate placement in terms of open space.

Ms. Swift said when the information was previously presented; it was presented as a capacity study, which is very different than a comprehensive sub-area master plan. The proposal has moved away from a capacity study effort into something more comprehensive. However, it's being described as a capacity study, which Ms. Swift said she disagrees with. The graphics intend to represent proportionate actual size and relationships, such as the potential commons plaza.

Ms. Bremer offered that the study may provide possibilities but perhaps it's not ready to be used as part of the Master Plan. Ms. Swift said if it's considered a capacity study, it shouldn't be included within the Master Plan. If it is in fact, a sub-area plan, which is the intent of the proposal, then it should be inserted into the Master Plan.

Mr. McDonald referred to the potential common plaza areas and whether there is the intent to remove the parking. Ms. Selby said it wasn't necessarily a physical solution but there were ideas from staff about the movement occurring at that intersection as well and much congregation occurring outside the buildings and that the potential replacement of the Newhouse Building offers the opportunity for configuring and linking common plazas that currently exist outside existing buildings. Mr. McDonald commented about the challenge of removing Columbia Street, which will funnel much traffic into the street and potential problems associated with the loss of parking and how it may impact visitors.

Senator Fraser recommended against including the study as an Appendix to the Master Plan at this time. The suggestion for modeling three to five-story buildings that are deemed reasonable and appropriately scaled would be a big concern by the neighborhood. She suggested pursuing the SEPA review without adoption of the plan because it's too premature to include it in the Master Plan. Additionally, the media hasn't been addressed and it's odd to include some of the discussion in a plan.

Ms. Bremer suggested having the team consider some master plan elements that were suggested from the DIS study that could be included in the Master Plan. The study hasn't undertaken the same degree of review, such as focus groups or community groups. She suggested determining what elements should be included and how the study can be improved. Members agreed with the suggestion to pull back the study for additional work. Ms. Bremer said she senses a disconnect between the work completed for the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building and the South Edge and that perhaps the sub-area hasn't been examined in the same context.

Chair King asked about the impetus for pursuing the sub-area study. Ms. Bremer said the Newhouse Building was one factor. Mr. Evans added the original driving factor was finding a way to accommodate temporary housing for the residents of the O'Brien Building during that building's rehabilitation. One of the [temporary housing] options was to construct a permanent building thus avoiding the use of modulars. That option resulted in the need to examine the entire site and all the issues on a holistic basis and in a thoughtful planning process. However, after examination of the costs for a quality permanent building, decision makers determined it wouldn't be affordable or satisfy the timeline. Nevertheless, staff wanted to capture the planning effort and create an appendix to the Master Plan to avoid losing the work that has

gone into the effort. With the input offered by the committee, staff will step back and consider the feedback and return at a later time with a proposal.

Chair King agreed with Representative Hunt's comment that the site is too crowded. He noted that five stories are overwhelming. Ms. Selby advised that not all the massing models were five stories. She agreed if all the buildings were five stories it would overwhelm the site.

Chair King agreed with the comments from the committee and suggested considering an alternative that is focused on what has been learned about the site, the surrounding area of the site, and the degree of site utilization. Ms. Swift recommended establishing a group of principles that will influence the development of the site.

Mr. Evans acknowledged the direction from the committee.

### **Adjournment**

**Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Mr. McDonald, to adjourn the meeting at 1:57 p.m.  
Motion carried.**