

CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
General Administration Building
210 – 11th Avenue SW, Room 207
Olympia, Washington
February 25, 2008
8:00 AM

MEMBERS PRESENT

Fred King
Dennis Haskell
Barbara Swift
Ron Tan
Senator Karen Fraser
Sam Reed, Secretary of State

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Richard DeBolt
Representative Sam Hunt

OTHERS PRESENT

Benedict, Randy, NBBJ
Bremer, Linda, GA
Buker, Pat, GA
Donald, Craig, GA
Eaton, Cindy, WRC
Evans, Tom, GA
Forsythe, Dennis, SRG Partnership
Excell, Steve, OSOS
Gow, Valerie, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Gray, Donovan, DAHP/GA
Hensel, Grant, GA
Jacks, Liz, NBBJ

Johnson, Bill, WRS
Lavene, Mindy
McDonald, Patrick, OSOS
Pressley, Bob, NBBJ
Robinson, Gary, DIS
Rogers, Tina, Capitol Campus Child Care Center
Sanford, BM, NBBJ
Shosbree, Bob
Walsh, Jan, OSOS
Wheaton, Preston
Williams, Keith, GA
Wilson, Mary Sue, Capitol Campus Childcare Center
Zieve, Rick, SRG Partnership
Childs, Harvey, OFM

Chair King called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 8:03 a.m.

Announcements & Introductions

Chair King introduced members of the committee. The agenda was published in *The Olympia*. Public comments will be accepted following each agenda item.

Approval of Agenda

Secretary Reed moved, seconded by Dennis Haskell, to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes – January 10, 2008

Secretary Reed moved, seconded by Barbara Swift, to approve the minutes of the January 10, 2008 meeting. Motion carried.

Wheeler Site Development

Information Services Director Gary Robinson provided an update on the Wheeler site development project.

The House Budget included the Governor's request for funds for the child care center for the Perry Street location as well as for funds to purchase the site. The Governor recommended funds for an evaluation of the child care center located on the campus. The House Budget included funds for the purchase of the Pro Arts property.

The Wheeler site is located on the eastern portion of the Capitol Campus adjacent to the exit from I-5. Mr. Robinson displayed a progression of site plan illustrations for buildings on the site. The site includes an office building on the northern portion of the site to house the Washington State Patrol and other agencies, a building to the west portion of the site primarily for housing DIS with a consolidation of the data center facility on the lower part of the side adjacent to the power substation. Based on the feedback from the CCDAC as well as feedback from the community, another site plan is proposed with an orientation comparable to previous site plans. The two office buildings location on the north and west sides and the Data Center is in an L-shape configuration straddling around the power substation with cooling towers and generators facing the most eastern portion of the site.

Mr. Robinson reported the Wright-Runstad team will review the site layout and building skin options for the building on the north end of the site because most of the programming needs for the building have been identified.

Mr. Randy Benedict, NBBJ, Lead Designer, reviewed major changes since the last presentation. At the last meeting, there were concerns about the location of the Data Center and its placement with respect to the community as well as the quality of the open space between the two office buildings and Data Center. The new configuration of the data center as it wraps around the substation affords more open and wider spaces and minimize the exposure of the Data Center to the adjacent community while also creating a better community flow through the site. Those are the fundamental changes made to the site.

Mr. Bill Johnson, Urban Planner and Landscape, outlined through some illustrations a summary of the last meeting's discussion on the site's importance concerning:

- Capitol Campus Continuity
- Gateway Threshold & Green Edges
- Site Identity
- Campus Connectivity
- Site Accessibility
- Neighborhood 'Landing'
- Jefferson as a 'Green Street'
- Building Scale Transition
- Future Building Site

Some key landscape moves are beginning to form based on those principles. A fundamental one is a casual meadow-like woodland with open spaces as the area traverses toward the campus. As the casual campus atmosphere wraps around the corner, a view passageway is important from the intersection to the buildings and the future plaza. It's also important that the setback along Jefferson is recognized as a piece of campus which connects and embraces Jefferson on both sides of the roadway. The center block

between 14th and 16th can become a key identity point. This is the approach for the prime identity of the plaza for the project. The Maple Park extension will flow as green onto the project site.

Mr. Johnson displayed a series of landscaping illustrations depicting the potential landscape of 14th, Jefferson, and Maple Park. He described potential landscaping elements and redistribution of plantings in those specific areas.

Bobby Pressley, Project Manager, reported the design team took some time and walked the campus during the morning and afternoon hours to view different conditions and light to assist the team in the Capitol Campus context analysis to form the basis for the design piece. A series of illustrations were presented of spatial sequence, building entry, component articulation, window detail and façade proportion, façade relief, and building material/color. The illustrations and the Capitol Campus Master Plan will form the basis for the design. When visiting the campus there is the idea of spatial sequence and ceremonial approach in terms of the visitor approaching something of significance and importance. Simple things like building entrances are importance in terms of entry portals representing something of significance or crossing an important threshold. West campus has the best examples with the stone surround and the depth of the façade. Another feature of importance is component articulation with defined base, middle, and top of building. On the west campus there are buildings with a base, middle, and top. Some of that tends to disappear in the east campus. The design team believes buildings with a base, middle, and top is something that should be incorporated into the buildings on the Wheeler site.

Mr. Pressley reviewed an illustration of window detail and façade proportion to capture:

- Detail with strong hierarchy in division of elements
- Reducing planes in large openings
- Dark frame in light wall creates depth and richness
- Verticality of openings typical
- Sense of monumentality created through repetition and derivation

An illustration introduced façade relief showing examples of articulation of material depth:

- Layers articulated from plane surface
- Façade depth expresses thickness of material which is associated with quality of construction
- Light and shadow create richness and rhythm

Mr. Pressley displayed a pallet illustration of material and color for evoking a sense of performance and quality, such as stone, glass, and bronze colored metals. Lighting should be integrated into the overall concept. Interior materials soften the experience and create human connection. The design team is in the early stages of exploring materials but agree the pallet as illustrated should be included on the east campus.

Ms. Mindy Lavene, Design Lead, unveiled a concept model of the project buildings. The concept model was developed to help the team understand the larger massing of buildings as well as how the relationships of the facades build between the Data Center, DIS Building, and the General Office Building.

Ms. Lavene described the relationships on the model. The first element includes gray material, which is carried around the base of the project. It's an important element as it is the base of the foundation of the

entire project. That element wraps the Data Center and carries itself through what the plaza will be created from with the buildings sitting on top.

Currently, the team is studying the skins of the larger buildings. The model also shows a light gray color, which is an element that is related in material and color and proportion and massing and how the buildings meet the ground. Internally, those elements facing the Data Center will have a strong relationship to the Data Center and the plaza. However, the current focus is on elements that are related to the campus and once the design team receives input from the CCDAC the design can start to understand how it will carry around the entire building.

Ms. Lavene presented illustrations of three building skin schemes and several alternates. All the schemes have a strong base, middle, and top relationship. She described Scheme A as a building with a stone base. The stone base carries up stone columns with vertical elements carried to the roof plane with a glass element for the top that is capped off with a roof plane. The roof plane compliments the west campus by creating a top but in a more modern design. Within the larger structure there is metal framing that adds layering and detail to the façade.

Scheme B includes a strong base, middle, and top. The base is stone with a potential metal and glass middle portion. Within the 32 bay structures there is a large metal frame that helps articulate the bay and within that creating another stronger vertical element with either metal, stone, or glass. The difference between Scheme A and Scheme B is removing the glass element and carrying the metal frame to the roof.

Scheme C is potentially an all-stone scheme with a strong stone base with larger vertical bay pieces.

An alternate Scheme C removes the vertical elements.

Ms. Lavene invited questions and comments from members.

Mr. Benedict described the composition of the programmatic elements and the relationship to the three buildings and plaza.

At the request of Chair King, Ms. Levine described in detail Schemes A, B, C.

Chair King commented that the design team is seeking a clear consensus from the committee on which scheme suits the project and whether the current handling of exterior spaces is appropriate.

Senator Fraser said she likes the new proposed site layout as it offers an improved use of the site and is more neighborhood-friendly. She expressed a preference for Scheme C. She requested the team consider accessibility in terms of stair design for the disabled, elderly, pedestrians, and bicyclists. She complimented the team on their progress.

Secretary Reed agreed with her comments. The tie-in to the main campus by having stone exteriors is the way to provide that continuity.

Ms. Linda Bremer agreed with the stone aspect of the design. However, some of the vertical elements appear to resemble bars. Ms. Lavene pointed out that within all the schemes, the material can be exchanged. Senator Fraser said she still prefers Scheme C because it is simpler and somewhat bold.

Ms. Bremer inquired about energy efficiency in terms of materials. Ms. Cindy Eaton, Wright-Runstad, confirmed all the building skins will be energy efficient using the highest quality glass.

Mr. Haskell expressed a preference for Scheme B with an exchange of some of the material components and adding more stone. Scheme B is livelier than Scheme C, which has the stone component that everyone seems to prefer.

Mr. Tan commented that it is often said, "less is more." Sometimes it appears on the campus that has been carried to the extreme with the General Administration Building. The building is cold and not part of the family. He said he was encouraged by the presentation's focus on continuity of materials to keep the campus flow intact. It is of utmost importance to the design of the buildings. He said he's encouraged by the schemes the team developed. A combination of Schemes A and B would likely be a good outcome. He said he likes the design elements and there is definitely a relationship to the classical buildings, and he is anxious to see further development of the design.

Senator Fraser departed.

Ms. Eaton asked Mr. Tan to identify the elements he likes in Scheme A. Mr. Tan said most of the elements have been carried through to Scheme B.

Ms. Swift cautioned against using an "x" amount of stone resulting in the loss of materials that provide weight and stature. She expressed concerns about Scheme C because of the massive stone and the sense that the stone weighs the building down. She commented on the model and the way the corners are handled, which is another important extension in the mix of materials. The bottom windows on Scheme C versus Scheme A carries through the continuity, which is important.

Chair King referred to the illustration of the buildings and the plaza in Scheme B and commented on the significant flight of steps. It appears the plaza wraps around and ties to the back face of the building. Ms. Lavene confirmed it wraps around. There is an entry to the conference center and it wraps and ties into the General Office Building essentially providing a plaza on each side of the buildings. Chair King said he prefers Scheme B with the stone, but agrees the base articulation of Scheme A is more attractive than the base of Scheme B. The overall concept still remains somewhat boxy. He commented that the team may want to consider providing some form either through recesses in the upper level with a balcony as it appears to lack the articulation found on west campus. Ms. Lavene referred to the model and described how the inside face facing the Data Center includes some breaks within the massing as well as roof decks within the internal side. The intent was to maintain cohesion with the campus side and while including some articulation towards the Data Center side and the neighborhood. Chair King said he was unsure of the articulation form and couldn't provide a suggestion.

Ms. Swift referred to the images for placemaking and noted there was no discussion pertaining to the freeway side of the site. As the site is significant to the campus, there is an obligation for the project to treat the space as a whole and as a placemaking opportunity. Ms. Eaton pointed out the difference in elevation of the area, which is substantially lower than the main site. Ms. Swift offered that it could be a forested edge that defines a strong entry into the campus.

Mr. Pressley acknowledged Ms. Swift's concerns about the freeway side.

Secretary Reed inquired about what the team envisions for the plaza. Mr. Pressley said the plaza will be a combination of hard surface and trees – a partial green and a partial plaza with bays for activities.

Discussion followed between members and the team about the campus and the importance of the campus skirt in terms of elevation changes within the campus at the Wheeler site as well as along the lake and other areas. Ms. Swift commented on the importance of the view of the capitol through the trees and how they set the tone. Too much fiddling with the campus “skirt” begins to lead to the decay of the campus. Mr. Johnson affirmed the importance of basic landscape moves.

Mr. Pressley reviewed site access.

Mr. Haskell inquired about whether square foot costs have been tracked through the development of the different schemes. Mr. Robinson said estimates are being developed as the team moves through the process. Final numbers are not available at this time.

Chair King asked for input from members on his comments for adding more articulation to the gross form rather than flat surfaces on the outside faces. Mr. Haskell agreed and offered suggestions on some of the opportunities within with the schemes. Mr. Tan and Secretary Reed also agreed with the suggestion.

Chair King said it appears that most members preferred Scheme B with the possible exception of Senator Fraser, with stone through the upper levels but not to the roof. Secretary Reed referred to Ms. Swift’s concerns about the windows in Scheme A. He said he and Senator Fraser favor the stone.

Mr. Tan conveyed that he is anxious to see the next level of development.

Mr. Robinson explained that the plan is to obtain feedback from the committee. A community meeting is planned for more input. The team will bring the options to the committee in the next several weeks. Ms. Eaton advised the team wanted input from the committee and plans to pull the information together and return in the next several weeks to review changes with the committee, which might be the last visit before closing the bonds, but keeping the committee informed.

Chair King asked the team to advise the committee of any information from the neighborhood that may differ radically than the committee’s comments to assist the team in working through any compromises. Mr. Robinson acknowledged the request and said he will work with GA to receive a summary of the community’s feedback and provide it to the committee.

Chair King summarized the committee’s direction. The committee likes the direction of the site plan but is still somewhat confused about the grade changes that occur within the plaza area. The committee prefers Scheme B with some modifications with the base of A rather than the base of B, as well as looking at ways to include greater articulation on exterior surfaces of the west and north faces of the buildings.

Ms. Bremer requested the committee articulate what should occur to the site edge because once the project is completed; improvements to the edge are unlikely and will take time. There will be a substantial amount of dirt that can be used to fill and create forms around the edge of the site. That work should be included as part of the project. Ms. Eaton affirmed that there will be opportunities to move dirt for GA to pursue landscaping. Ms. Swift said her issue was somewhat different in that there are designated sites in the Master Plan. The project is using one of those sites. She said she believes the use

of the site entails the entire site and not just a piece. It's important to make the site "whole." Ms. Bremer said the project is also struggling with maintaining a certain cost boundary as well as meeting other requirements. She asked that the committee articulate the direction so that it is understood what the trade-offs are and what possibly might not be accomplished. Ms. Eaton said one of the issues cited by the neighborhood is the lack of a walkway across the street, which is not part of the project. Those are the sorts of things the team is contending with even though they are not part of the project. There will be a "To Do List" that articulates clearly what is needed.

Secretary Reed thanked the team for moving the project along because the Executive Office/Heritage Center project and the demolition of the GA Building are contingent on the project remaining on track.

Chair King asked whether it is appropriate for the committee to make a statement that the expectation is that this project will address the entire site that has been designated for potential development. Mr. Robinson said it appears the request that the entire Wheeler site is addressed with the development including the property toward the east near the freeway. He said he will work with the team to see what can be done and to ensure it is within the parameters of the Legislative authorization for the project.

Chair King asked whether it's appropriate for the committee to render recommendations to GA and subsequently to the Legislature to find companion funding to allow the matching development on the opposite sides of the streets to complete this section of the campus appropriately.

Ms. Bremer said it's a reasonable recommendation and could be factored into the capital plan. She suggested waiting on a motion until more details become available from the team.

Dennis Haskell moved, seconded by Ron Tan, to recommend that funding be appropriated for improvements to the north side of 14th for complementary development of the Wheeler site in terms of landscaping as well as the west side for the walkway. Motion carried.

The meeting was recessed for a break from 9:25 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.

Heritage Center/Executive Office Building – Progress Review

Mr. Craig Donald reported the Legislature authorized the construction of the Heritage Center and Executive Office Building on the north campus site currently occupied by the GA Building. Over the past six months, GA conducted a number of studies that were requested by the Legislature including a Soils Study and a Best Study as previously reported to the committee. The Soils Study indicated construction is feasible. The Best Study provided some cost-saving strategies and approaches, some of which have been incorporated into the design.

The project submitted the studies to the Legislative and staff is waiting for Legislative approval to advertise for a General Contractor Construction Manager (GCCM).

Mr. Donald referred to the Project Charter, which recognizes a number of entities involved in the project. The project charter establishes a structure that brings all the entities into a partnership to participate in the development of the design and construction of the project.

Mr. Donald reviewed the Project Charter's governance and organization. The structure of the project will be governed by three levels of committees. Overall direction will be provided by an Executive Steering Committee comprised of the Secretary of State, Insurance Commissioner, and GA Director. A Steering Committee will be comprised of seven members to include an appointed GA representative, two appointed representatives from the Office of Secretary of State, Office of the State Auditor, two CCDAC members, and a representative from the City of Olympia. Two members from CCDAC previously identified as Steering Committee members are Fred King and Barbara Swift. The Steering Committee meets every six weeks with more meetings initially on an as-needed basis.

Mr. Donald requested the committee's confirmation of the membership by CCDAC. Members concurred with the request.

The Steering Committee's role is to address issues and review issues of concern related to exterior design, transportation planning, parking, plazas, and landscaping.

The role of the Executive Steering Committee is to resolve any major issues not resolved by the Steering Committee or at the project team level. Day-to-day issues and guidance will be handled by various project teams. There are three project teams. One is for the Executive Office Building, one is for the Heritage Center, and the third is the GA project team of technical experts. The three teams will work together to resolve day-to-day issues. The Executive Steering Committee will provide overall guidance to the project and will step in to resolve issues not solvable at the other levels.

Chair King said he's unclear about the role of the Steering Committee in terms of design issues. He questioned those instances where there is a difference of opinion between the CCDAC and the Steering Committee. He asked how the CCDAC's opinions and/recommendations are modified in the event the Steering Committee doesn't endorse them. Mr. Donald said the two CCDAC members of the Steering Committee will be asked to articulate and to be active participants in the development of any exterior design issues related to the buildings. Chair King said although it's unlikely to occur, CCDAC members may represent their individual opinions about an issue. He asked how those circumstances will be handled. Mr. Donald reported the CCDAC will have several opportunities to meet during design development. During the interim period, many issues will be addressed. There is the Design Opportunities Recommendation as well as previous guidance from CCDAC. During the interim period, GA will rely on the Steering Committee to provide specific guidance.

Director Bremer provided additional clarification. The three main elements of the project include the scope, budget, and timing. The Executive Steering Committee will look at the large issues that may impact those three elements. The intent is to move forward in a manner for everyone to be stewards of the process. There will be times when the owners will have to make a final decision based on criteria. In terms of the advisory role, the intent is to work through the process with as much input from CCDAC as possible.

Secretary Reed and Assistant Director Steve Excell provided additional information on the committees' roles and CCDAC's role. In the end, CCDAC will have to make a formal recommendation on the final design to the State Capitol Committee. At that point, the steering committee is irrelevant. By having two CCDAC members, the process should flow smoothly.

Mr. Donald reported the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building Design Opportunities Recommendations were developed in the context of an initial north campus design. The Legislature

requested an analysis of a number of programmatic needs for Capitol Campus and address them in the context of the north campus, which included the site of the GA Garage and the 1063 Building, defined as north campus. A predesign addressed those programmatic needs and included a General Office Building and a 512 parking garage that were not funded. GA was asked to conduct another phase of predesign that included a design for the GA Building site. Subsequently, CCDAC asked GA to ensure the building could be developed along with developing some conceptual information for the 1063 site. The design team used the previous Design Opportunities Recommendation for guidance as well as additional information from the Soils and Best Studies resulting in additional design changes.

The process is ready to embark on a four-month schematic design phase providing the opportunity to revisit and reverify the DOR assumptions with context. The team is seeking more information from the CCDAC on the site layout, especially the above grade portion of the HC/EOB, building massing, building height, and exterior appearance.

Rick Zieve, SRG Partnership, briefed the committee on the current status of the project.

The HC/EOB is a legacy project for the State of Washington and a once in a lifetime project. The goal is to have the project live up to its potential. It will be the first new building on the west campus in over 50 years. Mr. Zieve displayed a photo collage of 100 years of building evolution on the west campus and the critical importance of the HC/EOB to the whole composition. The building will be of the highest quality, highly sustainable, and LEED silver at a minimum. Mr. Zieve described the public component of the building as a major new structure on campus involving the public. The ground floor will be open to the public.

Bob Shosbree, Landscape Architect, reviewed the landscaping elements of the project.

Mr. Zieve referred to the axis of the building and how the terraces are aligned with the capitol dome. An important element of the building is the entry lobby that is on axis with the Insurance Building. Additionally, the building should also relate to the City's grid. Mr. Shosbree added an objective emphasized to the design group is the seamless importance of the project in terms of the embankment and building. The terraces are extensions of the building floors and with the geotechnical issues present on site, there is an opportunity to reconstruct that end of the building by tying back of the site into the building and allowing for circulation and integration with the adjacent site. The objective is for the building and site becoming one as well as addressing the grade change and ADA access by including a graceful transition to the existing path system to the lake.

Mr. Donald advised that the redirection of Cherry Lane and the construction of a new maintenance facility are not in the budget at the present time.

Mr. Shosbree displayed an illustration of aerial view of the building site and the continuity of the Heritage Plaza carrying across to the future building site along the urban edge.

Ms. Bremer reported when the project was originally approved it included a specific square footage and cost. At the last legislative session, many of the infrastructure elements were not included in the budget, such as sewage and water lines to the street. GA is wrestling with putting things back into the original box with additional components. If the box is bigger, GA hasn't received approval for the bigger box and whatever the final number is, she said she is unsure whether it includes this element.

Ms. Swift asked whether the presentation includes Best Study recommendations. Mr. Zieve said illustrations represent the current status of the predesign. Ms. Bremer said there were some suggestions and recommendations in the Best Study to save costs. Mr. Donald indicated the Best Study recommended against redirecting Cherry Lane and building the maintenance facility. That recommendation was incorporated into the funding at this stage and is not incorporated in the design. There are other aspects of the Best Study such as using the existing GA foundation or lower portion of the building that have been incorporated into the design.

Chair King inquired about the study's recommendation pertaining to the demolition of the greenhouse. Mr. Donald indicated it would be retained in order to keep the maintenance facility. Chair King said the plan that has been developed over the last several years is meaningless if the greenhouse and road relocation are not accomplished. He asked whether the illustration is inaccurate. Mr. Donald said in accordance with the Best Study recommendations and the Legislature's funding formula, the illustration is inaccurate.

Ms. Swift asked if there is a process to evaluate the shifting occurring within the "box" priorities and dollars and how it will be resolved. Ms. Bremer advised GA has been advised of a specific dollar amount, which is still under adjustment. Within that dollar amount, GA has been told to "make things work." Consequently, the [project] budget folks are looking at where adjustments can occur to obtain most of what has been desired. Mr. Donald noted that the intent is to come back and subsequently redirect the road and the greenhouse, but it wouldn't necessarily be during this phase.

Secretary Reed described his understanding of the financing for the building, which did not include the parking garage, Cherry Lane, the greenhouse, and the 1063 Building. Essentially, those elements were delayed to a future biennium. This created some issues and adjustments but in the end the outcome did not resolve what will happen in the future. The pressure is on the Legislature to deal with the issues.

Mr. Excell said the project tenants met with GA and SRG and reviewed all Best Study recommendations. Responses were developed to either accept or reject the recommendations. The street alignment was basically rejected and preserved for the future design plan for the street. The Senate Ways and Means and the House and Capital Committee received information on costs to do the projects. It is unknown if the Senate Budget addressed the issue. However, from a design perspective there was concurrence that the street realignment was a desirable element to retain and those costs were conveyed, but the decision makers and the Legislature must decide to provide those funds. From a design perspective everyone is in agreement.

Mr. Haskell said that with the road and the conservatory issue, there is no current guarantee that it will ever change. He asked how the designers will be directed in terms of designing for the current situation or to design for the hope that something may occur in the future, which may never occur. He said he's unsure how to proceed at this point.

Chair King agreed and indicated the project is not what the CCDAC believes it is if a big component is left out.

Mr. Zieve pointed out the legislative discussion is changing by the hour.

Mr. Zieve referred to an illustration and reported the design's intent is based on the premise that Columbia Street will at some point in the future, close.

Mr. Zieve reviewed the building design and how the EOB sits above the Heritage Center. The height of 96 feet is basically even with the Olmsted model. The overall height of the building places the building lower than the Cherberg and Insurance Buildings. He outlined the elements of the building.

Mr. Zieve reviewed the floor plan for the plaza level of the building and public spaces. The building has no "back door." He reviewed a floor plan of the office levels. The building takes advantage of natural lighting to reduce energy consumption.

The team is beginning to consider building character. A detailed analysis will be undertaken of the main buildings on the campus in terms of proportion, base, middle, and top, materials, and depth of facades. The building will be modern but extremely respectful of the existing complex. Mr. Zieve described the building pallet, which is reflective of existing buildings.

Mr. Zieve invited comments by the committee.

Ms. Bremer emphasized how hard the budget team is working and how committed everyone is to the success of the project. The challenge is looking at the all the components for the whole site in relationship to the complex itself.

Chair King referred to Mr. Haskell's previous comments said the proposal doesn't reflect the reality of the project at this particular time and that the project will never fulfill the potential as long as the road and the greenhouse are not addressed. The committee will need to have continued discussions. During the last agenda item, the committee recommended [additional] landscaping on the Wheeler site, which can be termed frivolous in comparison to the importance of the realignment of the road for the HC/EOB project.

Ms. Swift requested clarification of the location of the existing road within the illustrations. Mr. Zieve pointed out the location, which is on access to the entry of the building.

Mr. Haskell asked the design team about their thoughts. Mr. Zieve said the team is hopeful funding can be obtained. Mr. Haskell questioned the probability of the design concept without a guarantee that the roadway is realigned. Mr. Zieve replied that the team has not discussed at this point, what will occur if it does become reality that the roadway is not realigned.

Ms. Swift said it appears there are some principles that are valid regardless of what occurs in the future. It is worth pursuing and that the dome axis edge the building's terrace with the notion of connectivity is a core objective embedded in the master plan. If it moves forward, CCDAC needs to take a strong stand in support of the long-term implementation of that piece.

Ms. Swift shared thoughts on the hillside terrace and the building edge. Rather than the building creating the edge, the building is sticking out through the edge, which is the forest.

Mr. Tan recommended the team continue working on the terraced edge.

Mr. Patrick McDonald offered comments on the drop in elevation and building design.

Ms. Swift urged the team to take time and look at the area and at the proportion and mass of the skirt around the campus reflected as the forested condition.

Chair King commented that it's the second time the committee has had to address landscaping. It appears that both project teams should have some guidelines from the owners about what they expect in terms of the rehabilitation of the slopes that they are responsible for, which suggests the hiring of a landscape architect to develop some ideas on what to remove and add. Ms. Swift agreed.

Secretary Reed agreed with the analysis of the road. He expressed concerns about not having a parking garage for a complex that will have a major conference center, museum, and public space. The issue is where all the visitors will park. He said he would like the committee continue to pursue future plans for the [site of the] 1063 Building and that section of the campus.

Mr. Zieve reported a transportation study is underway that might provide some information about the parking situation. Mr. Donald indicated the study is only analyzing the differences between current parking availability and project needs. Mr. Tom Evans reported data is being gathered to provide the project teams with information so that they can develop parking solutions. The study is not intended to recommend solutions.

Chair King addressed the work presented by SRG and indicated the building seem to work well. There were concerns expressed about blocking campus views from the downtown, which doesn't appear to be the situation. Since there is an existing parking structure, Chair King said he doesn't have any major concerns. He expressed approval of the direction for the building appearance but acknowledged the how not addressing the realignment of the road and the greenhouse will impact the overall design. He inquired about the mechanism available to the committee to reiterate the seriousness of the issue.

Dennis Haskell moved, seconded by Barbara Swift, to express support of the excellent work completed to date and that the committee believes it is compromised by the exclusion of the realignment of the road and removal of the conservatory.

Ms. Bremer suggested the motion should be referred to the SCC.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chair King asked that GA submit the motions to the SCC for its next meeting and additionally, send the motions on to the finance committees in the Legislature immediately.

Secretary Reed suggested hand delivering the motions to Senator Fraser and explain the importance of the issues as she is taking the lead of the project in the Legislature.

Committee members discussed the importance of not comprising the design and the importance of the building on the campus.

Mr. Donald provided information on the state of the bills in the Senate and House and the financing issues undertaken with the State Treasurer and suggested the motion may be unsettling to the entire process given its current status. He said he understood the Legislature will revisit the road and conservatory. Secretary agreed it likely will be pursued during the 2009 session.

Chair King asked Ms. Bremer to interpret the two motions adopted by the committee as guidance to GA to include the elements in the agency's 2009/2011 capital budget request.

Members and staff discussed how to proceed with the motions and the issues associated with the design because of the funding level.

Ms. Swift suggested the committee could convey that the master plan in identifying the moving of the road and the release of maintenance space for public access are essential components of the master plan, needs to be implemented, and needs to be part of the design. Chair King agreed. Secretary Reed suggested designing the project for the future and putting pressure on the Legislature.

Secretary Reed moved, seconded by Ron Tan, to approve the work of SRG Partnership as presented to the committee recognizing that there are components of the Master Plan for the project that are not being met at this time, but which need to be met as soon as funding permits.

Motion carried.

Mr. Donald referred to the building height and the importance for the committee to recognize the proposal's recommendation on the height of the building.

Members and staff discussed the height and acknowledged the building height is still below the critical point discussed in the master plan.

Mr. Evans reported he discussed building height with the writers of the master plan in terms of the intent of the provision that there would be no building on west campus taller from grade than the existing Cherberg and O'Brien buildings. The proposal is quite a bit taller above its grade than the Cherberg, O'Brien, and Insurance Buildings are about their grades. Another section in the master plan speaks to any new building in west campus should not in any way detract from or overpower the Legislative Building. Authors of the master plan were asked to review the two provisions in the master plan and try to resolve the issue. Currently, the idea is that no building would be taller than the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings, however if they are bigger and taller without violating the fundamental principle of the overpowering the Legislative Building, then perhaps some flexibility could be allowed in the maximum height above grade issue.

Chair King asked why the focus in on the O'Brien and Cherberg Building when the focus is the Legislative Building. Mr. Evans the two buildings were selected as examples of height about grade that also honored the Legislative Building as a premier structure on the campus.

Members and staff discussed the discrepancy and possible action to eliminate the conflict without violating the principle

The committee requested Mr. Evans provide new text for the master plan based on the concerns and the committee's discussion.

Secretary Reed reported on the public/private finance efforts for the museum, conference center, and learning center. An advisory committee has been established with former Governor Dan Evans and former Washington State University President Sam Smith as co-chairs. The goal is to raise approximately \$30 million. A company was hired to conduct interviews on the feasibility of the fundraising goal. The House Capital Budget suggested dropping the figure to \$3 million.

Adjournment

Ron Tan moved, seconded by Dennis Haskell, to adjourn the meeting at 11:09 a.m. Motion carried.

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary
Puget Sound Meeting Services