

**CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING  
General Administration Building  
210 – 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW, Room 324  
Olympia, Washington  
April 3, 2008  
10:00 AM**

**Approved**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Fred King  
Representative Richard DeBolt  
Representative Sam Hunt  
Ron Tan  
Senator Karen Fraser  
Patrick McDonald (for Sam Reed), Secretary of State  
Senator Dale Brandland

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Dennis Haskell  
Barbara Swift

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Albert, Jim, DIS  
Alhadeff, Sally  
Anderson, Jim, WSP  
Bremer, Linda, GA  
Buker, Pat, GA  
Carlsberg, Steve, OIC  
Cockrell, Nick, GA  
Cox, Jennifer, DIS  
Donald, Craig, GA  
Emerson, Amy, DIS  
Edens, Cindy, WRC  
Evans, Tom, GA  
Forsythe, Dennis, SRG Partnership  
Friddle, Steve, City of Olympia  
Gow, Valerie, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Gray, Donovan, DAHP/GA  
Hensel, Grant, GA  
Jacks, Liz, NBBJ  
Jacobs, Bob, Citizen  
Johnson, Bill, WRS

Lavene, Mindy, NBBJ  
Maher, Carol, GA  
Manson, Jim TSG  
Perry, Diane, WSP  
Pretty, John, DIS  
Polzin, Roger, Citizen  
Rippert, Bob, GA  
Robbine, Connie, DIS  
Sanford, Bill, NBBJ  
Shrosbree, Bob, SRG Partnership  
Sims, Brian, Senate  
Springer, Lillian, GA  
Stepelton, Andy, Legislative Facilities  
Stevenson, Chris, GA  
Todd, Joanne, DIS  
Tousley, Amy, Puget Sound Energy  
Triggs, Sandi, OFM  
Valencia, Rachel, GA  
Weydemeyer, Jan, City of Olympia  
Wyrick, Lon, Thurston Regional Planning Council

Chair King called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) special meeting to order at 10:08 a.m.

**Announcements and Introductions**

Chair King recognized Senator Dale Brandland as a newly appointed member of the committee.

Chair King reported the notice of the meeting was published in *The Olympian*. Public comments will be accepted after completion of each agenda item. Other public comments will be accepted at the end of all agenda items.

**Approval of Agenda**

**Representative Richard DeBolt moved, seconded by Senator Dale Brandland, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried.**

**Approval of Minutes – February 25, 2008**

**Ron Tan moved, seconded by Representative Richard DeBolt, to approve the minutes of February 25, 2008 as presented. Motion carried.**

**Director's Report**

Linda Bremer, Director, Department of General Administration (GA), provided an update on recent projects and activities:

*Supplemental Budget* – The Governor signed the capital supplemental budget. Many projects approved will begin moving forward. Some projects require alternative funding sources, which GA will begin pursuing.

*Wheeler Site Development* – A Mitigated Determination of Non-significance (MDNS) was issued for the Wheeler site development for the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) report. GA and the Department of Information Services (DIS) are continuing to work on the mitigation process.

*Senator Fraser and Representative Hunt arrived at the meeting.*

**Building Height on Olympia 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Isthmus – Proposed Rezone of Urban Waterfront**

Jan Weydemeyer, Senior Planner, City of Olympia, reviewed the proposed rezone proposal received by the City of Olympia for a building height increase on Olympia's 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue isthmus.

The City's comprehensive plan provides a blueprint for making recommendations on development decisions. Ms. Weydemeyer displayed a map of the isthmus and the area of the proposal. The comprehensive plan emphasizes concentrating development within urban centers. She provided information on the amount of land necessary to accommodate 120 housing units for different densities in the downtown area of 1.4 acres to suburban areas, older residential areas, and urban areas, which can require up to 580 acres.

The proposal is one of several the City received from applicants to amend the City's comprehensive plan. The Growth Management Act allows the City to amend the comprehensive plan once annually. An annual cycle affords property owners with the opportunity to apply for a policy change or a rezone.

Ms. Weydemeyer displayed a view of the isthmus area with the proposed height limits. Currently, height limits along the isthmus is 35 feet. Under the proposal, the height is proposed to be 65 feet and 90 feet along different areas of the isthmus. The existing Capitol Center building is 120 feet tall, which includes the elevator shaft.

Ms. Weydemeyer reviewed the City's process to establish the comprehensive plan amendment docket each year. The City Council established the docket in January followed by a community workshop in March. In May, the City will issue a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) analysis considering all issues associated with the proposal. In June, the Olympia Planning Commission will hold a public hearing followed by a public hearing at the City Council in September. The proposal also requires an

*CCDAC Special Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
April 3, 2008 Page 3 of 17*

amendment to the Shoreline Master Program, which will involve a separate process of review by the Department of Ecology.

Staff will provide an analysis to the City Council that will consider all components, such as urban form, housing density, housing affordability, and how the project fits or doesn't fit within the downtown. A view analysis, a transportation study, and an economic feasibility study will be completed.

A rezone does not involve approval of a particular project or development and the City would have to review and approve a development proposal subject to a public process.

Ms. Weydemeyer reviewed a preliminary view analysis of the applicant's proposal involving the request for a height increase up to 65 and 90 feet.

A computer-generated visual simulation was displayed showing buildings 35, 65, and 90 feet in height. Under existing zoning, the isthmus is zoned for 35-foot building heights. Ms. Weydemeyer displayed a visual simulation of the applicant's proposal as well as a hybrid scenario the consultant developed.

Chair King asked about the prior agreement between the state and the City regarding Heritage Park and assurances that the City would devote the entire "fountain block" as [a component of] Heritage Park. Patrick McDonald affirmed that there was an agreement. Chair King asked why the City is considering a rezone of the area. Ms. Weydemeyer said the City is responding to a specific application. The depiction is of the applicant's proposal. She confirmed the City's plan for preserving the block for Heritage Park.

Representative DeBolt asked whether the state has any opportunity for providing input with respect to the future development of the abutting area. Ms. Weydemeyer outlined the public comment opportunities. In May, the City will issue the DEIS, which involves a public comment period between May and June. The state is welcome to send representatives to the public hearing as well as provide comments in writing. Additionally, in September a second public hearing is scheduled before the City Council. Comments can also be provided either in person or in writing. Representative DeBolt commented that he understood that there were some discussions about purchasing and demolishing the Capitol Center building. Mr. McDonald affirmed there were discussions, but the state did not pursue that block in its park planning for Heritage Park. Ms. Weydemeyer shared the location of City-owned land in the surrounding area and future sites the City wants to purchase.

Representative DeBolt asked about the state's role in the design review process. Ms. Weydemeyer said if the rezone is approved and a development application is submitted for a specific building, the City will re-notify all interested parties and undertake a public process to include the design review process, which includes a public meeting. Representative DeBolt asked whether it's possible for a member of the committee to serve on the City's Design Review Board. Ms. Weydemeyer advised that the Design Review Board is an advisory board established by the City Council. It's unlikely a member of the CCDAC would serve on the board unless a vacancy exists and an appointment process is undertaken.

Chair King asked about the purpose of the presentation. Ms. Bremer said that, historically, the CCDAC has provided input to the City's process involving projects impacting the campus. Ms. Bremer referred to additional information provided to the committee from previous GA Directors to the City on previous height increase proposals for the isthmus. The City is soliciting the state's comments, which has previously occurred through the CCDAC.

*CCDAC Special Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
April 3, 2008 Page 4 of 17*

Chair King said the design review process occurs after the approval of the rezone. He suggested the CCDAC should comment on the rezone, and if there is opposition or a determination by members to provide input on potential restrictions allowed in the rezone, the CCDAC will need to do so directly to the City.

Representative Hunt inquired about whether a list of the respective owners of the parcels is available. Discussion ensued about the old county health building and current ownership of the sites.

Senator Brandland inquired about the role of the CCDAC in terms of its responsibility outside the Capitol Campus. Chair King said many of the master planning activities for the Capitol Campus emphasizes view corridors, and in particular, the view from the campus to Budd Bay and the Olympic Mountains. The proposal has the potential for modifying some of those views in a radical way and therefore the CCDAC may want to make an official statement about its position in terms of the rezone proposal. Mr. Tan noted the proposal impacts views to and from the campus.

Ms. Weydemeyer displayed a series of different visual simulation photos. One visual was of existing conditions and an approved development for the City, which is currently not constructed. The building is 41 feet because a height variance was approved. Another illustration showed existing buildout under current zoning as well as the applicant's proposal. A visual simulation photo was displayed from Marathon Park for both buildout at the current allowed height and the applicant's proposed height.

Several members inquired about the need for visual simulation photos from 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue looking toward the Capitol. Ms. Weydemeyer reported the photos will be posted on the City's website.

Senator Brandland asked about the property owner's plans. Ms. Weydemeyer indicated the City has not received a [specific] development proposal, but that the proposed zoning requires residential development. There are approximately six property owners of the nine parcels. The application was a joint submittal by the property owners.

Chair King said the CCDAC should be very specific that it does not want the City to rezone any parcels within the fountain block that would allow or encourage development. There was a prior agreement between the state and the City that the entire block would be a component of Heritage Park. Representative Hunt added that the committee should convey the importance of the City remaining sensitive of the view corridor issue as well to the isthmus. Senator Fraser said she is also concerned about the maximum height proposal as well as the hybrid proposal. She said the view shed includes the campus to the water as well as from the inlet and bay to the campus.

Representative DeBolt commented that the CCDAC is working to ensure the demolition of the GA Building and its replacement is completed and created in a way that is harmonic to Capitol Campus and that there is much investment in the effort to ensure it occurs as envisioned. He said he hopes the City will also find it appropriate to undertake some of the same efforts with respect to the isthmus. There are plenty of other locations for downtown housing.

Mr. McDonald commented on the proposal and the need for the City to have an infusion of downtown housing. In order to provide for housing and provide parking, it's not possible to build down on the isthmus because [that area] is fill which will require a developer to build above-ground parking. He cautioned against buildings that will impact views. He said he supports the concept of preserving the

*CCDAC Special Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
April 3, 2008 Page 5 of 17*

fountain block because the agreement is approximately 18 years ago. The City should also be wary about tall buildings. He referred to the Capitol Center as an example.

Mr. Tan said that any time structures are placed on the landscape, it's an infringement. It's important to be sensitive about the choices.

Senator Fraser commented on the likelihood of Olympia having an ordinance prohibiting the interference of views to the Capitol because of its prominence and feature within the area. There should be some scenarios that look to the Capitol from other areas of the City, such as Priest Point Park and West Bay Marina looking from north to south.

Ms. Bremer requested clarification regarding the committee's opinion of the proposed rezone. Chair King said members have conveyed their concerns that any development will jeopardize important views to and from the Capitol Campus. He suggested there will be a point prior to the City making a decision on the rezone when the committee will be in a better position to make a specific recommendation. The proposal is serious and the committee doesn't want to appear to inhibit residential development or damage the aesthetics of the City and Capitol Campus.

Mr. McDonald suggested it may be appropriate for the committee to convey its concerns about not developing the fountain block. Representative Hunt said in addition, the committee should express concerns about the density of buildings to ensure view corridors and space is maintained. Chair King said all of the parking will be street parking, which will not afford a pedestrian environment. The intent of Heritage Park is to promote pedestrian activity. The City should find a way to deal with the urban design issues associated with density development.

Ms. Bremer said based on the committee's comments, she will draft a letter to the State Capitol Committee (SCC) for review by the CCDAC. Chair King asked that GA present the topic at a time when it can still provide meaningful input to the City.

Chair King invited public comments.

**Bob Jacobs** said he's been a resident of Olympia for many years and has come to appreciate the Capitol Campus as a state treasure and a wonderful asset as well as being one of the most beautiful state campuses in the U.S. He said he feels a special obligation to pay attention to issues surrounding the campus. The rezone is an extremely important issue. Starting with the Wilder and White Plan in 1911, the physical, as well as the visual connection to Puget Sound was central to the plan. Somehow, the Capitol Center building was permitted in the 1960s, and since then, everyone has wanted to demolish the building. State and local governments have expended efforts to obtain ownership to demolish the building. The rezone proposal will only make things worse. He said he hopes the state obtains ownership of the Capitol Center building and demolishes it to maintain the 35-foot building height along the isthmus. As far as the need for housing in downtown Olympia, the question is where. Ninety percent of the downtown area is zoned for eight-story buildings. There is room for thousands of housing units in the downtown and the City should not be giving up the amenity that is so important to the local area as well as the Capitol Campus to obtain housing units. He recommended retaining the existing zoning and turning the isthmus into park land.

**Carol Maher** commented about downtown housing in Bellingham and how tall buildings are reducing light in the downtown area.

Mr. Tan said the City of Spokane is working on similar issues in trying to preserve the river, the falls, and view corridors.

Chair King said the CCDAC will reconsider the matter in time to provide comments to the Olympia Planning Commission.

**Wheeler Site Development – Architectural Concept Review**

Jim Albert, Deputy Director for Operations, Department of Information Services (DIS), reported Director Gary Robinson was unable to attend the meeting because of a death in his family.

Mr. Albert reported DIS and the project team is working with affected agencies to include Washington State Patrol (WSP), Office of Financial Management (OFM), GA, and other interested parties on traffic mitigation. A community meeting was held on March 26, 2008, which was well attended. DIS is working with agencies moving off the Wheeler lot and providing them with relocation services as well as current tenants of the GA Building. DIS and the project team are working closely with the Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation. Work has begun on the Child Care Center in west Olympia and occupancy is anticipated to occur in the first weekend in July.

DIS is posting information on the project on its website.

Mr. Albert said the team is seeking comments and direction from the CCDAC and an endorsement and support of the design as the effort advances to the SCC on April 24, 2008.

Mr. Albert introduced Cindy Edens, Wright-Runstad. Ms. Edens thanked the CCDAC for agreeing to meet to adhere to the schedule's needs. The team has moved forward on the financial documents and is beginning mitigation efforts on asbestos in the existing building beginning in April. Bonds are scheduled to close at the end of May. A tremendous amount of work has been accomplished by the team.

Ms. Ednes introduced Bill Johnson, Urban Planner & Landscape Architect, who provided an update on the landscaping plan. Mr. Johnson referred members to an aerial illustration of the site, several sketches, and a representation of a detailed site landscaping plan.

Mr. Johnson reported landscaping principles developed at the beginning of the project are beginning to take shape. Mr. Johnson reviewed and described in detail specific landscaping principles following the Olmsted Plan for the Wheeler site and surrounding area.

Representative DeBolt questioned whether visitor parking of 20 spaces is sufficient for the site. Mr. Albert reported 20 spaces are within the courtyard area as well as [38] additional spaces located in a parking lot across the street. Representative DeBolt suggested 20 parking spaces are too limited for the size of the facility. Ms. Bremer advised parking needs have been assessed for all projects underway. The Legislature approved funding a study to look at how to move people on and off campus in different modes because it's not possible to accommodate all parking on campus. Representative DeBolt suggested visitor parking is the most important as people visit the campus to utilize government services. Ms. Bremer offered that it may be employee parking that is affected. The amount of visitors to the DIS site was considered in the parking calculation. Mr. Johnson affirmed staff parking is included in the plan.

*CCDAC Special Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
April 3, 2008 Page 7 of 17*

Mr. Johnson reviewed the layout of the plaza, parking area, pedestrian zones, desired tree plantings, and types of shrubs and vegetation.

Senator Brandland acknowledged the importance of the Olmsted Plan and questioned whether the landscape plan could be modified to accommodate more visitor parking. Ms. Edens said when the analysis was completed, 20 visitor spaces was identified as adequate for [day-to-day visitors to] the three buildings because there is parking located under the building. When events are held at the conference center visitors will have access to the parking garage and would be monitored by WSP. Senator Brandland noted many of the buildings will have conference rooms capable of holding larger meetings, which will require parking for attendees. Twenty visitor parking spaces do not appear to be sufficient. Ms. Edens advised that there will be 950 parking spaces under the building.

Discussion followed on the adequacy of 20 visitor parking spaces, types of visitors to the complex, and the availability of the parking garage and the parking lot across the street for visitor parking.

Mr. McDonald referred to the grand stair design [in the plaza] and asked how ADA accessibility will be afforded. Mr. Albert reported there are efforts underway with the City to rezone along 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue some special parking spaces near the entry into the plaza between the DIS Building and the Data Center for access from the plaza to any of the buildings. Ms. Maher noted access would only be afforded Monday through Friday and not on weekends. If special events were held on the plaza, there wouldn't be ADA accessibility. She asked Mr. Johnson to consider specific ADA accessibility in some areas of the site.

Mr. Johnson reviewed an illustration of a basic organization of the upper court and 16<sup>th</sup> Street edge and described details for tree and shrub plantings, an arching walkway, event and gathering place, arrival plaza, and the lower court.

Detailed landscaping plans are underway. However, landscaping elements for Jefferson are on hold depending on the outcome of the traffic resolution that may involve a traffic roundabout. More information will be provided at the committee's next meeting.

Senator Fraser referred to the stairs between the two buildings and asked whether the design will incorporate elements for persons with mobility challenges, such as including a curved walkway or platforms at varying elevations to provide universal access. Additionally, many people in the neighborhood are concerned about walking, biking, and accessing the downtown. She asked about the possibility of including walking/biking routes within the east campus area as well as including traffic calming devices within the neighborhood to discourage motorists from using neighborhood streets as a shortcut route.

Senator Fraser referred to the intersection of 14<sup>th</sup> and Jefferson and asked whether it's necessary to include a series of bulkheads. She suggested replacing it with a sloped hillside that is less formal. Mr. Johnson acknowledged it could be a possibility and provided information on how it could be accomplished.

Representative Hunt said his first reaction of the site plan and disability access was an image of sending the disabled community to the back door. He acknowledged that it's likely not the intent but that it appears to reflect that and that the design should incorporate equal access for all.

*CCDAC Special Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
April 3, 2008 Page 8 of 17*

Ms. Edens reported one of the conditions of SEPA is construction of a sidewalk on the westside of Jefferson. The project team is exploring that requirement. Because of [its design as] an arc, the east sidewalk becomes ADA accessible. Ms. Bremer advised that as part of the project, the project team committed to providing recommendations for the east campus within the project area for improving accessibility that could be pursued in the future.

Sally Alhadeff, DIS, added that one of GA's positions for the MDNS is consideration of a landing point near the plaza for a future pedestrian connection that could be a bridge over Jefferson from the east campus. She noted GA staff provided a copy of the MDNS to the committee earlier in the day, which includes all the traffic implications for the project.

Senator Brandland asked about the main traffic entrance into the building complex. Ms. Edens said the main entrance has changed since the last meeting through the work with the neighborhood.

Mindy Lavene, Design Lead for NBBJ, referred to the model of the complex and pointed out the location of entries into the parking garage and service access locations.

Representative Hunt referred to the substation and asked about fencing. He was advised the substation is already fenced. Mr. Albert reported Puget Sound Energy (PSE) plans to upgrade the substation and has requested an expansion of 20 feet east as it slopes down. Some activity will be occurring in that area. The project will provide dirt to enable the expansion and as part of that effort, some improvements to the area surrounding the substation is anticipated.

Amy Tousley, PSE, Local Municipal Manger, reported she has been working with DIS and the project team and appreciates the cooperation. The impact of the project will require an expansion of the substation. PSE is looking at the eastern edge of the property. PSE appreciates having access along the western edge for ongoing maintenance of the substation. She asked for assurances that the vegetation plan doesn't conflict with transmission lines.

Mr. McDonald noted one challenge with underground parking in other buildings in the area have problems with the roof leaking. He asked about the confidence level associated with the plantings placed on top of the parking garage that will not lead to leaks within the parking garage. Mr. Johnson assured the committee that there shouldn't be any problems associated with the vegetation. Ms. Edens added that Wright-Runstad has designed garage plazas older than 25 years that have never leaked. The issue is ensuring the garages are properly constructed at the onset to avoid problems later.

Chair King referred to the Data Center Building and the area of the Link and the roof deck and asked if they are of the same elevation. Ms. Lavene described the heights of the building and the various entryways into the buildings and the conference center. Chair King asked about accessibility for disabled individuals from the lower plaza to the higher levels. Mr. Albert said the project is still undergoing design and those issues can be considered within the design.

Senator Brandland questioned the viability of providing only 20 visitor parking spaces to accommodate the size of the conference space. Ms. Edens explained the conference center is designed to accommodate the tenants of both buildings. For more efficiency in the floor plan, conference rooms are sized smaller for each floor. There are multiple conference rooms. The largest capacity is for WSP's monthly meeting requirement involving approximately 200 individuals.



Ms. Lavene referred to the black and white illustration of the site plan. She described the building skins and three schemes provided at the last meeting and recent modifications to the external and internal skin scheme of the buildings. Based on the committee's comments, Scheme B was the preferred option, which is based on more stone at the base as depicted in Scheme A. The preferred scheme is a merger of the three schemes to some degree. She presented the revised scheme representing a strong base delineation with metal and stone to retain a strong presence of the building skin with vertical metal bands incorporating a stronger vertical element along with a top piece with a cap. Each bay is 32 feet wide and within each bay is a strong vertical piece indented within the stone that helps to weave the base, middle, and top together and carries the top piece.

Ms. Lavene referred to a model of a shadowbox showing building materials, scale, and depth. She described the type of glass, stone, and metal components. Selection of the stone will be based on the type of stone complementing the west campus. Natural stone is being considered. Ms. Edens said it's important to use natural stone for longevity and for maintenance. Concrete products tend to etch glass and require more maintenance.

Ms. Lavene displayed a sample of stones in comparison to stone on some of the west campus buildings.

Ms. Lavene referred to the model and described the massing of the buildings beginning with the General Office Building. The goal is to bring some strength to the building corners and provide some relationship between the buildings rather than having the buildings mirror one another.

Ms. Lavene addressed questions about the entryway into the buildings and the inside skin of the building, which consists of a stone base, metal panels, and glass elements.

Mr. McDonald expressed concerns that the building should not resemble the IBM building, which consists of a traditional curtain wall of glass and steel columns.

Mr. Tan said based on the model, it represents a strong façade, which he is comfortable with. He suggested the building will not reflect the architecture of an IBM style building.

**The meeting was recessed from 12:08 p.m. to 12:13 p.m. for members to pick up their lunches.**

Ms. Lavene described the building elements of the Data Center.

Ms. Bremer commented on need for distinctive signage identifying the buildings as state offices. She noted with the recent increase in fuel prices more mass transit will be utilized in the near future and that it's likely more buses will need access to state buildings as transportation modes change.

Representative DeBolt asked about the opportunity to discuss the feasibility of the roundabout.

Tom Evans referred to the conceptual drawing of the roundabout as information for the committee as well as a discussion point if the committee decides to pursue a discussion on the option.

Ms. Alhadeff reported as part of the SEPA process and as part of the threshold determination from GA, DIS engaged in a traffic impact analysis and determined that there will be dramatic impacts to the intersection of Jefferson and 14th. There are two solutions involving an intersection with additional lanes or a roundabout. DIS met with the Washington State Department of Transportation, City of Olympia, and

the neighborhood and reviewed the options. The number of lanes across 14<sup>th</sup> is intimidating to pedestrians and bicyclists. There was a universal response by the entities for a roundabout option. The roundabout provides options for motorists exiting from the freeway. Another benefit is a refuge in the middle for pedestrians. Mr. Albert advised there will be pedestrian signals included. The roundabout option provides more flexibility in lane widths especially for buses and trucks. Mr. Albert noted the design has not been completed and that the illustrations are preliminary while exploration of the two options is undertaken.

Mr. McDonald asked DIS representatives to meet with Dave Moyer at the Legislature Building because of impacts to the campus from decisions made for the east campus.

Ms. Alhadeff reported another opportunity with the roundabout option is the ability to landscape within the roundabout. One of the conditions included in the MDNS is to use the opportunity within the middle of the roundabout to establish a more appropriate entryway to Capitol Campus. That will require input from the CCDAC and the public as well.

Senator Fraser agreed with Ms. Bremer's comments about future transportation modes. Lanes will need to be wider for trucks and bus within the roundabout to ensure they don't veer in other lanes of travel.

Chair King recognized more design is underway but questioned the status of the steep wooded bank on the southwest corner of the current intersection and whether the roundabout will remove the wooded area. Mr. Albert advised that a portion of the area will be removed. Chair King asked if the area will be replaced with a retaining wall. Ms. Edens said options haven't been studied, but that there will be some impact to the area. Ms. Alhadeff added because of requirements by Intercity Transit, its important for buses to move through the roundabout as well as correct placement of the bus shelter. There are also requirements for bike lanes and because of the width of Jefferson; it is likely the west side of Jefferson will be impacted from the corner along the entire roadway.

Mr. Johnson agreed the entire corner is of significance to the future of Capitol Campus and should be considered as a whole rather than situation-by-situation.

Ms. Bremer said the intersection solution emphasizes the partnership and relationship of the community and the Capitol. The neighborhood has asked for consideration of how the project encroaches on the neighborhood and how the neighborhood will be impacted from traffic flows. It is part of the give and take as the project moves forward. However, there will be some tradeoffs. Mr. Albert said in the neighborhood meeting held on March 26, the two traffic options were presented to the community. The neighborhood was overwhelming supportive of the roundabout.

Senator Fraser suggested some thought should be given to improving the attractiveness to the tunnel through the use of plantings or other materials.

Chair King said he's not necessarily grasping the entire concept of the roundabout scenario. It appears the entire westside of [Jefferson Street] will be reconstructed with part of it consisting of a high retaining wall or the large wooded area will disappear. Ms. Eaton and Mr. Albert affirmed a portion of the wooded area will be removed. Chair King asked about the status of the roundabout decision. Mr. Albert said the traffic solution is considered part of the project mitigation to address traffic impacts. The project will fund its fair share of the improvements. Further discussions are underway.

Chair King said as he understands, the project is going to the SCC for some official approval on April 24. He asked if that approval will entail final approval of the design. Mr. Albert said the goal is to provide the SCC with the preliminary design discussed with the CCDAC. The project is positioning for state funding. All of the design elements and mitigation will need to be a part of that consideration. Whatever the CCDAC and the SCC approves, that will go forward for determining maximum allowable construction costs.

Ms. Edens described the SEPA mitigation approval process. If the approval does not include street mitigation, it will result in the loss of green space resulting in a more urban building located close to the sidewalk. It would also mean that Jefferson would be more offset and more difficult to transverse. The configuration involves approximately 30 feet to accommodate travel lanes, bike lanes, and sidewalks. Ms. Eaton reported [street] parking will not be included on either side of the roadway to enable the turning lane and bike lane.

Chair King asked for input on what the committee is asked to approve. He said he's not comfortable with the entryway into building as represented in the drawings and would like a better opportunity for the project team to demonstrate that the design is an elegant, contemporary piece of work. Secondly, he said he wants to avoid a half job along the west side of Jefferson and wants to see the landscaping design for that area to restore and reestablish the wooded area. If the triangle land located on the north side of [14<sup>th</sup> Avenue] is impacted, Chair King said he also wants to know what's envisioned for the area as well as receiving assurances the project sponsor will complete the work.

**Ron Tan moved, seconded by Patrick McDonald, to endorse and support the building designs as well as the preliminary landscape designs presented by the Wheeler Lot Development Project Team of Wright Runstad and the architectural team of NBBJ.**

Senator Fraser asked about the status of Chair King's questions and the committee's questions.

Ms. Edens said the project team needs to establish a guaranteed maximum price. The project team has only recently learned about the roundabout option and new conditions within the last several weeks. The cost and design options at this point are unknown. She said she will recommend carrying an allowance in the budget and work with DIS and return to the CCDAC with the designs for those areas and to ensure the costs are covered. She acknowledged Chair King's concerns about the design involving the entryway wall. She assured the committee the project team will return and assure it's addressed to the committee's satisfaction. Signage is also an issue that will be addressed.

Ms. Bremer commented about the guaranteed maximum price and said the dollar question involves what the state can afford and how to manage the costs as work continues through the committee.

Representative Hunt asked whether Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Standards will be achieved. Ms. Edens affirmed the project is required to meet LEED Silver standards. The goal is to exceed LEED Silver standards.

Mr. McDonald inquired about meeting the project timeline if the motion is adopted and whether the design team is considering ADA issues as well. Ms. Edens affirmed ADA issues will be considered. Mr. Albert reported the project is on target and progress is occurring as anticipated.

*CCDAC Special Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
April 3, 2008 Page 12 of 17*

Ms. Edens said some of the demolition work will begin on May 16, 2008 as well as utility work, which must be undergrounded.

Ms. Alhadeff referred to ADA access and noted the stair [in the plaza area] is almost two stories tall. There is the expectation that the stair will not be the primary access point for 99% of the people who visit the complex. The reason for the stair was because the neighborhood asked that the project not trap them and to provide them with an access to the site. The team could look at not including a stair. The project team believes universal access is the elevator from the General Office Building and the DIS Building. There will be excellent elevator connectivity to each level from the parking to the cafeteria. The stair was a conceptual design to satisfy the community's concerns for access to the area.

Chair King referred to the impending vote on the motion and requested the project team provide some assurance to the CCDAC that there is an opportunity for the CCDAC to make design adjustments because he said he doesn't believe members have seen sufficient detail in the building design to provide final approval.

Mr. Albert said the DIS and the project team will seek further guidance as the design proceeds. Ms. Bremer asked whether a special meeting could be scheduled if required. Mr. Albert affirmed a meeting could be scheduled.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

*Representative DeBolt left the meeting.*

**Master Plan Amendment – Proposed Clarification Regarding Building Height on West Campus**

Mr. Evans reviewed the existing provision on heights and measurements from grade contained in the 2006 Master Plan. The provisions state:

*General – All new buildings must recognize the Legislative Building as the Capitol complex's predominant feature. No new building should attempt to compete with the grandeur of this central symbol of state government.*

*Scale – The Legislative Building should not be rivaled in size. The height of the O'Brien and Cherberg buildings should the maximum height above grade of all new West Campus construction.*

During the committee's discussions on the new Heritage Center/Executive Office Building over the last several months, an issues has been addressed asking whether "height above grade" means that new buildings cannot be taller than the Cherberg and O'Brien Buildings are above their respective grades, or whether "height above grade" means the datum line for the top of any new building must not exceed the datum lines of the tops of Cherberg or O'Brien Buildings.

The concept design height of the new Executive Office Building ranges from 79 feet to 93 feet (not counting penthouses) above its surrounding and sloping grade, but 11 feet below the datum elevation at the tops of the O'Brien and Cherberg Buildings.

Mr. Evans said he spoke with the original authors of the Master Plan and they said the intent was that "height above grade" was intended to reference the grade at each building's own site, not a campus datum

elevation. Extensive design review of the new Executive Office Building suggests that “height above grade” may be an unnecessarily restrictive measure.

Staff recommends a proposed amendment to the Master Plan to clarify the issue. The proposed amendment would be on page 5-11 under the section, “Design Guidelines for West Campus”. The paragraph on “Scale” shall be rewritten as follows:

*“Scale – to ensure that the Legislative Building shall not be rivaled in grandeur or size, the top-most point of all new West Campus buildings, including equipment penthouses, shall not be higher than the datum elevation of the top-most point of the equipment penthouse on the Cherberg Building.”*

Mr. Evans said this change will provide the necessary clarification and will not affect the current Executive Office Building design which, through the process of several committee and public reviews, has been deemed to conform to the greater principle of not competing with the grandeur of the Legislative Building.

Discussion followed on the proposed amendment and its impact.

**Representative Sam Hunt moved, seconded by Patrick McDonald, to amend the Master Plan on page 5-11 under section “Design Guidelines for West Campus” within the paragraph on “Scale” to be rewritten as follows:**

*“Scale – to ensure that the Legislative Building shall not be rivaled in grandeur or size, the top-most point of all new West Campus buildings, including equipment penthouses, shall not be higher than the datum elevation of the top-most point of the equipment penthouse on the Cherberg Building.”*

Senator Brandland expressed uneasiness for voting on the proposal and asked to be provided with visual information for a better understanding of the proposal.

Chair King noted that two committee members are absent and one is a landscape architect and the other is an urban designer. Their input would be important. He asked about the urgency for approving the motion. Ms. Bremer replied that the amendment was presented based on the previous request of the committee.

**Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Senator Brandland, to table the motion until the next meeting. Motion carried (4-2).**

#### **Heritage Center/Executive Office Building – Progress Review**

Craig Donald, Project Director, provided an update on the project. The Legislature passed a revised budget that includes the plazas, utilities, and infrastructure, which had been included in a separate Governor’s plan. The project now includes an all-inclusive budget. Mr. Donald thanked Senator Fraser and Senator Brandland for their efforts.

GA has advertised for a General Contractor/Construction Manager (GC/CM) based on the Legislative proviso. The GC/CM is scheduled to be hired by May 19, 2008.

The City of Olympia received a presentation on the project.

*CCDAC Special Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
April 3, 2008 Page 14 of 17*

GA is scheduling a steering committee meeting soon. The Legislature modified the governance structure, which requires some revision to the charter. Two members of the CCDAC are member of the steering committee.

The design team, SRG Partnership, has been working on revising and developing more specificity regarding the building program and building structure. Work is continuing on landscape and plazas as well as developing some changes to the exterior.

Mr. McDonald noted the Olympia City Council was very positive in its comments concerning the Executive Office Building/Heritage Center proposal.

Dennis Forsyth, SRG Partnership, provided an update on the level of development in the building design and floor planning. Using a series of display boards, he reviewed with the committee the site plan, building design, and internal uses.

To maintain proportion and scale of the buildings with existing buildings on the west campus, the building layout was overlaid on existing buildings. Additional work was expended to adjust the axis of the building to better center the building. Additionally, there has been exploration of making the two-story space as part of the lobby entry as well as pulling a lobby entry element back into the building instead of protruding from the building.

He referred to some preliminary sketches of the elevation of the building. He asked for comments on the illustrations.

Bob Shrosbree, Landscape Architect, referred to the axis of the building and how it fits within the campus. The goal is for the building to become a component of the campus in terms of proportion and scale. It was important to adjust the axis by several degrees to bring the terraces in line with the Legislative dome, which provided an additional 20 feet on the road. He explained how the terraces will affect the road and the roadway curve. There is a future opportunity for removal of the conservatory to restore the Olmsted green.

Mr. Donald reported the realignment of the roadway is not included in the budget. An alternative plan is under development to show the roadway not realigned. Senator Fraser suggested the importance of conveying that the design is a budgeted versus a future scenario to be achieved in the long-term.

Mr. Shrosbree reviewed Heritage Center terraces, building grade, roadway configuration, and Heritage Center plazas. There will be no vehicular access on the plaza. Another program element is for the plaza to hold special events. He outlined the building elevation beginning at the top of the plaza and extending to Heritage Park at the lower street level.

Mr. Tan asked about the building height with respect to the height of the current GA Building. Mr. Forsyth indicated the building is approximately two feet below the penthouse of the GA Building.

Mr. Forsyth referred to a path that intersects with a stair path to enable ADA access. The team met with Carol Maher and she supports the design to accommodate ADA access from the building to Heritage Park.

*CCDAC Special Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
April 3, 2008 Page 15 of 17*

Mr. Forsyth said the design team is considering an entry to the building at the 30 level as well as the 44 level. Currently, the plan only includes the 44 level. Taking the elevator down one more level will provide another entry. The 30 level is a more convenient location to access the building. The problem with the 30 level is that it causes consumption of space to another floor, which is a cost implication.

Mr. Forsyth referred to the recommendation for not allowing vehicles to access the plaza as it enables more lawn in the front of the building for events. Buses and cars can unload passengers 40 to 50 feet away at the drop-off point along the roadway. The roadway will remain open.

Ms. Bremer commented on the amount of exhaust into the GA Building from the parking lot.

Senator Brandland asked about the building height in comparison to the GA Building. Mr. Forsyth said the top of the GA Building is several feet higher than the Executive Office Building. Additionally, the building has been stepped to reduce the impact of the elevation on the north side. He noted how the GA Building appears to sink down, which is important to ensure the Executive Office Building maintains its plane.

*Senator Brandland departed from the meeting.*

Chair King asked whether views will be maintained from the plazas as long as the conservatory remains. Mr. Forsyth said there will be views from the lower plaza because it's located beyond the conservatory.

Chair King expressed approval for the proposed design and no vehicle access on the plaza. He said he hopes GA will be able to prevent buses from parking and idling along the drop-off point. He said he is very concerned the roadway will not be realigned and can't think of any incentive for the Legislature to add it later. It would be beneficial to complete the roadway alignment and preserve the view from the plaza to the Capitol. He asked whether supplemental funding has been requested. Ms. Bremer said the alignment was included in the BEST Study recommendations to save some budget costs. She noted there is a maintenance facility that is located at the site as well. She said she was not involved in the final conversations concerning the roadway and the conservatory.

Mr. Donald said the demolition of the conservatory and the maintenance facility is included in the budget. The roadway alignment was cut from the budget. However, there could be some misunderstanding associated with the issue, which is why the team is retaining the option. The team needs to revisit the entire issue. Realigning the roadway will mean removal of the conservatory, which also removes the maintenance facility, which is not budgeted. Staff and the project team are continuing to work on the issue, as it would be beneficial to accomplish the work at once.

Chair King said it's important to recognize that projects occur because there are departmental programs that drive the project and the relocation of the greenhouse and the maintenance facility do not stack up to some of the other priorities that the government faces on a regular basis. It's reasonable to assume that if the greenhouse is not removed as part of the project, it will not be removed for many years and will block the views that the design is based on.

Mr. McDonald said he understands funds have been budgeted to remove the conservatory. The greenhouse is slipping down the hillside. It's a major priority of the Secretary of State's Office to have the facility removed. Alignment of the street will hopefully occur in time. However, to build the balconies, it's important to continue. The department is working with those that can approve the funds.

*CCDAC Special Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting  
April 3, 2008 Page 16 of 17*

Ms. Bremer said she understands the concerns but that the maintenance facility is a necessity to the function of the campus in terms of maintenance. However, there is no more funding and GA has to live within the budget prescription and as a steward of the state and to taxpayers, she has to consider the options.

Senator Fraser said there are many people who attach historical significance to the conservatory. She said earlier, there was a suggestion that part of it could be recreated on the site. Mr. Forsyth indicated the site that was previously designated to house the conservatory is still available. The conservatory is larger than the site, but an element could be restored. Mr. Buker advised that there is also a practical element to consider, the fragility of the conservatory.

Mr. Forsyth commented on the entry element protruding from the building. The project team has pushed it in several feet to be more in scale with other Capitol Campus building porches. The extension of the element appeared odd and it precluded the plaza from extending across the entire plaza area. Mr. Tan said he prefers pushing the element into the building. Ms. Bremer said pushing the element creates an illusion of the building as a box. Protrusion of the element gives it a design element. Mr. Forsyth said the design team agrees it should protrude, but the issue is how far it should protrude.

Ms. Bremer observed that the previous discussions centered on the building entrance as the focal point and that anyone visiting the building would have no question that the building was distinctive, unique, and of a presence. Mr. Forsyth said the face of the building satisfies that vision because it includes the open two-story space inside. The vision is carried throughout the building.

Mr. McDonald expressed appreciation for the work of the project team. The department is somewhat concerned about the reduction of the lobby when there could be hundreds of school children converging in the area. Mr. Forsyth referred to the lobby and described the space and how the internal core was moved to avoid conflicts between building tenants and visitors.

Mr. McDonald agreed with the decision to move the core.

Discussion followed on the future use of the building by visitors and employees.

Ms. Maher complimented the project team for their willingness to involve her in some of the design decisions for accessibility. She commented on the dangerous situation of the crosswalk next to the GA Building off Columbia Street. In the last several weeks, 12 people have almost been hit with one being hit and taken to the hospital. She suggested taking some preventive measures to ensure motorists drive more carefully in the area.

Members offered positive comments on the proposed design.

Donovan Gray asked about progress in terms of building materials. Mr. Forsyth said the team is looking at sandstone at the Wilkinson Quarry. A check was initially made with the quarry but no follow-up with the quarry has occurred since the initial contact. The team is scheduled in the next three weeks to begin discussions on building materials.



**Public Comments**

**Steve Carlsberg** commented positively on the work of SRG Partnership and their flexibility.

**Bob Jacobs** commented that he likes the design of the buildings but is concerned about the height issue. The dominance of the Capitol dome and the older buildings is very important and said he's not sure he is entirely comfortable with a 90-foot height. The building will be massive. He cautioned the team about how it will impact the campus.

**Adjournment**

**With there being no further business, Chair King adjourned the meeting at 2:00 p.m.**

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary  
Puget Sound Meeting Services