

**CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
General Administration Building
210 – 11th Avenue SW, Room 324
Olympia, Washington
May 22, 2008
10:00 AM**

Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dennis Haskell
Barbara Swift
Representative Richard DeBolt
Senator Dale Brandland

OTHERS PRESENT

Anderson, Jim, WSP
Bremer, Linda, GA
Buker, Pat, GA
Burnham, Bob, Site Workshop
Colton, Joyce, Friends of the Waterfront
Doster, Marvin, M.A. Mortenson Company
Edens, Cindy, Wright Runstad & Company
Evans, Tom, GA
Forsythe, Dennis, SRG Partnership
Friddle, Steve, City of Olympia
Gooding, Barbara, Citizen
Gow, Valerie, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Gray, Donovan, DAHP/GA
Haferland, Lenna, Friends of the Waterfront

Hawkins, Jeannette, Triway Enterprises
Hensel, Grant, GA
Jennings, Marygrace, GA
Klein, Greg, Citizen
Koal, Penny, GA
Leisehring, Flora, Friends of the Waterfront
Mead, Art, FTE News Magazine
Robinson, Gary, DIS
Shosbree, Bob, SRG Partnership
Springer, Lillian, GA
Thomas, Jean Marie, Citizen
Valencia, Rachel, GA
Zieve, Rick, SRG Partnership

Chair King called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:16 a.m.

Announcements and Introductions

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 Hunt moved, seconded by Ron Tan, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes – April 3, 2008

Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Ron Tan, to approve the minutes of April 3, 2008 as presented. Motion carried.

Director's Report

Tom Evans provided an update on activities:

Wheeler Site Redevelopment - As reported at the CCDAC's April 3, 2008 meeting, GA issued a Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance for the project. On April 25, GA issued a modified Determination. The Determination includes 31 conditions applicable to the project. The South Capitol Neighborhood Association appealed the decision to the Director of GA as allowed by the rules of the State Environmental Policy Act. The State Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) will conduct the hearing. GA is working with OAH to establish a hearing date.

Chair King advised against further discussion on the matter because of the pending hearing.

Discovery of Additional Olmsted Documents – Artifacts Consulting, the campus conservator, discovered during its research on Olmsted's work for the state, 196 archived plans and over 1,000 pages of correspondence related to the Capitol Campus at the archives of the Fredrick Law Olmsted National Historic Site in Massachusetts and at the Library of Congress. The conservator was asked to catalog the new information and undertake an analysis of the material. A full report will be provided to the CCDAC at its September meeting. Some of the information discovered includes:

- The new research reveals a level of detail enabling the completion of the original master landscape plan for the west capitol grounds.
- Historical correspondence reveals negotiations, complications, and compromises shaping design decisions.
- Expanded understanding will lead to a greater sense of the historic value of the capitol grounds.
- Newly discovered documents confirm that the direction of the Landscape Rejuvenation Plan is basically correct.

Property Purchases - GA was given authority to purchase two properties adjacent to the Capitol Campus. The properties will prove to be of strategic value in the years ahead. The smaller of the two properties is under GA ownership and GA is working on the second parcel and hopes to have the purchase completed by mid-year. With the purchase of the two properties, the state will own the entire city block, which could be a strategic property for future planning.

Mr. Evans reported the Legislature authorized the purchase using a Certification of Participation, essentially borrowing money from the State Treasurer's Office.

Heritage Center/Executive Office Building – Progress Review

Penny Koal, Project Manager, provided an update on the project. Currently, the project is nearing the end of schematic design. Preliminary documents were provided to estimators for development of a budget review. Programming and space layout have been completed. All programming elements are able to be accommodated. Ms. Koal thanked stakeholders and users of the new building for their assistance in working through the programming.

The team is working on mechanical and electrical systems to ensure a sustainable building, which will incorporate flexibility and adaptability for the future.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) will be released in approximately two weeks for public review and comment.

The schematic design is scheduled for completion on June 9, 2008. On June 17, 2008 at 1:00 p.m., a presentation is scheduled for stakeholders on the design followed by an evening public presentation at 5:30 p.m. in GA's Auditorium.

Ms. Koal introduced Marvin Doster, Mortenson Construction. Mortenson Construction was selected as the General Contractor/Construction Manager (GC/CM) for the project.

Dennis Forsyth, SRG Partnership, reported the budget estimate is of great importance to the team. The team is happy to have Mortenson Construction on board. The CCDAC will receive a presentation on the project package. The team will then make any further refinements to the package based on comments by the CCDAC.

Bob Shrosbree, Landscape Architect, reported that during the schematic design process, it's important to ensure the building and the site coexists appropriately. Much of the building is below grade and the planning for the rationale of the landscape is important with respect to adherence to the Olmsted green concept. The landscape is planned around four primary areas to include the Heritage Plaza on the south side, the promenade and area to the west referred to as the Olympic Terrace, the parking area referred to as the north green because it incorporates landscaping and some stormwater facilities, and the Columbia side of the complex providing access to the complex from the city.

Mr. Shrosbree referred to the conservatory and the maintenance building. The buildings will be removed and the roadway will be reconstructed because of utility needs and to level the elevation of the roadway. The plaza area will include a bus drop-off area. While the area will include vehicular access, the area will incorporate a pedestrian focus through the use of landscaping, materials, and scale.

Mr. Shrosbree noted the Olympic Terrace is ADA accessible from the top of the terrace to the lower level to Heritage Park. Stairways and landings have been strategically linked to connect into the hillside trail to Heritage Park.

The north side of the building is at an elevation of 97 feet. The overall conceptual design intent is to have the building face be as important to the City side as it is to the campus side. It's important for it to have a pedestrian friendly atmosphere while also accommodating vehicular traffic as well as buses. The service drive will circle along the north edge and will traverse to a loading dock located at the 58-foot level. Screening and retaining walls will be included.

Mr. Shrosbree reported that with the reconfiguration of the roadway, more elements of the Olmsted character and spirit will be added with more flowering tree groves and pathways to connect to the rose garden as well as bringing the hillside up and over into the edge to ease the transition of the building within the hillside.

Funding for the relocation of the road is included in the project budget as well as removal of the conservatory. Senator Fraser asked about the disposition of the conservatory. Mr. Zieve said the disposition of the conservatory is still under discussion as to whether the materials will be retained and perhaps re-erected in another location. Ms. Koal said the handling of the conservatory is included as an element of the DEIS as part of the historical mitigation.

Mr. Tan inquired about the preservation of the large oak tree on campus. Mr. Shrosbree replied that the large oak and the large Washington Elm tree will be retained.

Mr. McDonald referred to the CCDAC's previous work on interpreting the Olmsted Plan for the current period. He asked if the team is working with staff on that element of the Olmsted Plan rejuvenation. Mr. Shrosbree said at this point, the team hasn't connected with staff but there is a good idea of what to accomplish within the framework. The next step is obtaining some of the Olmsted documents, which have been recently discovered. Marygrace Jennings confirmed staff has been reviewing the documents and will share the information with the team.

Representative Hunt asked about the alignment of the road after it has been repositioned. Mr. Shrosbree displayed a diagram of the proposed road configuration. For both cost and design reasons, the team is looking at various areas around the project in terms of materials, finishes, and elements that will integrate with a hierarchy that the cost estimators are considering from a budget aspect. Mr. Shrosbree outlined how the road will be realigned and straightened. He described vehicular movement through the pedestrian plaza. Mr. Forsyth reported the building has two distinct functions in the building for vehicular traffic. The first is the conference center located at the north side of the building and an auditorium, as well as visiting schoolchildren.

Mr. Shrosbree reviewed the proposed skylights included within the plaza. Mr. Zieve reported the goal is to maximize the amount of daylighting in the building to reduce energy consumption and achieve sustainability goals. Skylighting is one way to achieve that goal by capturing natural light. The skylights are seawall height off the plaza and will sit along an edge. The skylight will be low sloping and are not intended to convey much architectural presence. Mr. Zieve said the team visited the Visitor Center at the US Capitol in Washington, D.C. The reception area is below ground. A series of skylights were created to allow light within the space.

Mr. Zieve addressed questions from Chair King regarding the south entrance and how it wraps into the plaza. Mr. Zieve said the design of the building is important in terms of scale and that the building's axis with the Insurance Building is an important component of the design. The dimension of the building is segmented into elements to correlate with existing campus buildings. The terraces are aligned on axis with the capitol dome. The north side of the building flares out to the City of Olympia's grid for a smooth transition to Union Street.

Mr. Zieve reported that during the last several months of design there have been various options for the design of the lobby. Currently, the design incorporates a lobby presence that is part of the building rather than a separate appendage protruding from the building. Chair King questioned the height of the lobby. Mr. Zieve reported the lobby within the front of the building is approximately 20 feet tall and then under the second floor of the office building it expands up in height to approximately 55 feet. The goal is to create a prominent interior space in keeping with the spaces at the state capitol. The visitor will be able to look through the building from the plaza to the north entrance. The north entrance will be viewed as a main entrance as well to avoid a back door environment. Mr. Zieve said the goal of the design of the building and surroundings area is to accomplish the eventual overall plan of developing the entire block where the plaza can be extended.

Mr. Tan referred to the immense space within the lobby and commented on the possibility of considering hanging sculptures.

Senator Fraser referred to the comments about the state's seal placed in the entryway of the building. She encouraged the team to consider other alternatives other than placing the seal on the floor. Within the Legislative Building, the seal is treated respectfully. She indicated it would be more respectful and more consistent with the Legislative Building, to put the seal in another location other than on the floor. Mr. Zieve acknowledged the importance of the issue and assured members that the placement of the seal is completed in a manner that is respectful.

Representative Hunt referred to a shopping center in Spokane, which features artwork on the floor of the entryway of the state map featuring the state's major rivers.

Mr. Zieve said the team worked hard to create a modern building that is respectful of Capitol Campus. There has been focus on the building's base, middle, and top. There is a building base with the middle section consisting of three stories of office space with vertical expressions of stone (Wilkerson stone), bronze colored metal, and glass. If cost becomes an issue, there has been discussion about placing Wilkerson stone at the lower levels of the buildings transitioning to precast stone at the top. However, the goal is to use Wilkerson stone if it can be achieved within the budget. The top level is pushed back to reduce the scale of the building, which will incorporate a continuous terrace. Windows will be deep set.

Ms. Bremer arrived at 11:03 a.m.

Mr. Zieve responded to questions regarding the upper level terrace. The intent of the design is enable access around the upper level of the building.

Mr. Zieve reviewed a model of the project and demonstrated how visitors can access different areas and features of the complex.

Representative Hunt asked whether the team is working on plans to afford availability of the cafeteria during nonbusiness hours. Mr. Zieve said the team is incorporating that option but that the main issue concerns the operator of the cafeteria. The building design will accommodate nonbusiness hour usage.

Mr. Tan expressed approval of the terrace design of the building. Mr. Zieve said the terraces help tie the building back down to grade and they mediate the two grids. The main building is brought onto the capitol grid because it needs to have a strong relationship to the main campus. The team is happy with the building's massing.

Ms. Bremer referred to recent incidents of vandalism and graffiti occurring on campus and reminded the team to consider security from a 24-hour perspective as well as operational issues associated with using the facility during nonbusiness hours.

Members discussed the disposition of the mosaic in the lobby of the GA Building. Mr. Zieve said the mosaic will be preserved, but that the re-location of the artwork has not been determined at this time. Ms. Koal said there has been discussion about forming a committee because there have been a number of people who have expressed interest in the artwork. There has been interest expressed by the Historical Society of Tacoma in moving the mosaic to Tacoma, but the preference is finding a location on campus. Currently, there are no plans to place the piece within the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building. Another option is to add weathering protection and place the piece outdoors in a park.

Mr. Zieve reviewed details of the internal building space. At level 97, the south-facing arrival plaza features the main entry of the building with a grand public concourse that parallels the plaza consisting of a hardscape area that could feature tents or other special events. The entry features visitor information, café, kitchen, Washington State Historical Learning Center, classrooms, gift shop, some offices, and the lobby area that steps down to the lower level to the north entrance. Elevators will traverse to the upper levels of the Executive Office Building. At the north side of the building at level 79, the entry will feature a front door with glass and concourse space with access to the auditorium and conference center. The lobby space accesses the entry to the State Library, which is located on the next level down as well as the reading room along the terrace. One more level down includes the loading dock and the large archives collection area and some office spaces as well as lunch space with glass and views. At the next level down, more library collections are featured with office space. The east floors are not open to the public and are considered secure space.

Mr. Zieve reviewed sustainability features of the project. The team is targeting LEED Gold certification as well as meeting the “2030 Challenge,” representing a 50% to 60% reduction in energy use by 2010 and eventually achieving a carbon neutral building by 2030. The building’s location is an east-west configuration for optimum sun control and maximum daylighting of the building to reduce electrical loads. The building will include high insulation values and efficient glass, window shading, natural ventilation, raised floors in office areas for chilling and warming the building, water harvesting by capturing rainwater runoff and storing for reuse, reduction of electrical loads, and a possible Puget Sound Energy (PSE) demonstration project. Ms. Koal added that PSE approached the Secretary of State’s Office about a possible project. Further discussions are planned.

Ms. Koal commented on environmental factors associated with refrigeration chillers. Currently, at the physical plant, three chillers are in operation. Two of the chillers are older and use an old refrigeration compound, which has since been banned. Staff is working with the physical plant on a plan to phase out the compounds, which will benefit the entire campus. The team is also working with the LOTT Alliance for using the project as an impetus for providing reclaimed water on campus.

Mr. McDonald commented that in discussions with mechanical staff, the new complex will be less expensive to operate than the existing GA Building. Ms. Bremer added that employees and maintenance personnel will need to be well versed in the use of sustainability methods and practices.

Building Height on Olympia’s 5th Avenue Isthmus – Proposed Rezone of Urban Waterfront

Ms. Bremer updated the CCDAC on the results of the review of the proposal with the State Capitol Committee as well as seeking the CCDAC’s input for possible committee comment on the proposal. The proposal remains the same as previously presented to CCDAC. The State Capitol Committee requested a review of the timelines associated with the City’s process and to present the issue to the State Capitol Committee after the Planning Commission’s public hearing but before the City Council renders a decision on the proposal. It also appears the CCDAC wants to share its comments on the proposal prior to the Planning Commission’s public hearing.

Chair King said he recalled that the City had promised to provide additional graphics showing the nature of view blockage and that the CCDAC did not render a statement at the last meeting because the committee believed it needed more graphics to understand the impacts. The CCDAC also believed it was important for members to express their opinions to the Planning Commission as the first step in the City’s review process.

Mr. Evans referred members to additional graphic materials depicting potential view blockages from views looking north and views looking south. He noted the photos depict scenarios A, B, and C. Scenario A includes the existing 35-foot building height from the Capitol Campus view looking toward Puget Sound. Scenario B is the proposed 65-foot/90-foot building height as it is viewed from Capitol Campus looking toward Puget Sound. Scenario C is the hybrid option combining the heights of 35, 65, and 90 feet. The same scenarios are repeated with views from the downtown looking toward Capitol Campus. Additionally, the committee received a reprint of the newspaper article showing the developer's perspective of the buildings.

Chair King said he believes the committee expressed the importance of the City declaring its commitment to the agreement that was developed between the state and the City to preserve the entire fountain block as a park and not permit development of the block. However, the drawings reflect buildings located on the property. He asked whether the City is backing away from that commitment. Mr. Evans said he understands that the City is not backing away from its original agreement and that the City intends to purchase the property and include those areas as part of Heritage Park.

Steve Friddle, City of Olympia, said the City has not changed its commitment to preserve the block. The City has had some difficulty with its consultant in removing the depiction of the buildings on the graphics. Consequently, the photos show the buildings located on the block, but the photos do not reflect the City's position regarding that block.

Mr. McDonald said he was also assured by City Manager Steve Hall and Mayor Doug Mah that the City plans to purchase the entire block and is not planning on developing the block as depicted in the pictures.

Senator Fraser asked for clarification on the ownership of the various proposals. Mr. Friddle referred to the applicant's proposal, which is scenario B. For environmental review purposes, scenario C is an alternative in consultation with the consultants and staff.

Senator Fraser said she believes some of the information to be provided by the City is some schematics from a north to south view. There is an important view consideration of north to south from Percival Landing, Priest Point Park, near the Port Plaza, and along the westside of Olympia. At Percival Landing, the view is blocked of the Capitol Building. Senator Fraser said she believes there is a City ordinance prohibiting the view blockage of the Capitol Building. She asked that the City provide those view photos from the different views she noted because they reflect a closer view.

Ms. Bremer referred to a draft letter covering the CCDAC's previous concerns. She suggested discussing options for conveying the information to the City of Olympia. The developer's representative is also in attendance to address questions from members.

Chair King said the issue does not involve the developer but the zoning within that section of downtown Olympia and the impact it may have on very long-standing principles of planning for both the campus and the City. The core plan leading to the layout of the campus is the Wilder and White Plan, which incorporates views from the campus to Budd Inlet. The view pictures are taken from an unusual place and not from some of the main areas of campus where people who visit and work will be viewing. The issue is zoning, urban planning from the perspective of the City of Olympia, and the manner in which it impacts the campus, which could change the way planning is undertaken for the campus.

Mr. McDonald commented on the CCDAC's role as an advisory body and indicated there has never been an instance where the CCDAC responded directly to the City on an issue. Ms. Bremer suggested an option available to the committee is formalizing some comments to her as the Director of GA. Chair King acknowledged the committee's mission is to advise both GA and the State Capitol Committee. He suggested revealing the committee's position early in a public format. Ms. Bremer suggested the letter could convey the CCDAC's input and that the CCDAC will also be conveying the same information to the State Capitol Committee.

Ms. Bremer asked Mr. Friddle about the availability of the view photos as part of the public hearing process. Mr. Friddle acknowledged the interest in having more views from the north looking south and indicated he's unsure why the views were not included in the packet. One reason for the delay is that the consultant is no longer working for the City on the project. Ms. Bremer suggested GA and the City collaborate on providing the view photos. Senator Fraser stressed the importance of having views from Percival Landing because it is the site of many public festivals and is used frequently by the public.

Mr. Friddle noted the Planning Commission's public hearing is scheduled for June 24, 2008. There is also the opportunity to respond to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Members and staff reviewed the draft letter. Members agreed the letter should address the proposal as published and not of any proposals by developers. Members agreed the letter should address zoning and long-standing principles that both the campus and the City have employed that have lead to the existing layout of the campus as well as the Master Plan involving views from key points, and that the concerns involve zoning and urban planning because it could change the way the state undertakes its planning.

Chair King advised against addressing issues associated with traffic congestion and parking unless those issues can be linked with how Capitol Campus or Heritage Park functions. He suggested the issue of density of buildings except for the height issue does not have any particular impact on the campus. The letter could include that the committee's secondary concern is that great density of both people and cars on the peninsula may impact statewide public use of Heritage Park.

Senator Fraser suggested adding two new bullets with the first bullet addressing the central concept of the historic plan for the location and design of Capitol Campus, which is the visual link between the campus and Puget Sound. Respect for this concept has been reflected over time in policy and in investments decisions by both the state and the City. Another bullet could refer to the EIS process and a suggestion that the City should provide visual data on the view from Percival Landing present and future so that people viewing the EIS can take that into account. The letter should conclude by asking the GA Director to convey the concerns to the EIS process and the Planning Commission process.

Chair King invited comments from the public.

Jeanette Hawkins, Triway Enterprises, reported she is the project manager for Larida Passage. She said she is disappointed that the City's presentation to CCDAC did not include all the materials that have been submitted, especially concerning the view analysis. There has been an extensive view analysis undertaken from 17 locations that the City identified. The view analysis is available in a PowerPoint presentation on the company's website as well as graphically presented in a bound booklet. The information includes detailed view analysis of each photograph and the locations around the lake, the western residential area of Olympia overlooking Budd Inlet, Capitol Lake, and views from east downtown. She expressed regret that the committee was not able to view the photos. The photos were

displayed at the open house, which the committee was invited to attend. There is much information available and she conveyed regret that she and the City were not able to provide the information to the committee in order for the committee to base its comments on having all the information available. She acknowledged the questions and concerns by the committee. She said she has been working over the last three years in preparation of answers to all questions. She offered to provide the information as well as meet and address any questions and concerns. The website address is www.triwayenterprises.com. She encouraged the committee to review the documents along with market studies and updates. She encouraged the committee to read the DEIS and base comments on the document.

Barbara Gooding said she was the chair of the Planning Commission in the 1980s when the plan for downtown housing was developed. She said Chair King's remarks addressed Ms. Hawkins's comments as Chair King advised that the issue is not the developer, but a broader issue of zoning.

Chair King advocated against conveying any opposition for downtown housing, because that is not the issue. CCDAC is not opposed to downtown housing or dense housing on the peninsula but is concerned about any heights above 65 feet, which would be damaging to the views. He cited his belief that there should be no development occurring on the park block and no development in the planning area over 65 feet.

Discussion ensued on the accuracy of a photo taken along Olympia's westside looking toward the Capitol. Ms. Hawkins assured members of the integrity and reputation of the firm producing the visuals as well as the cost for each view analysis.

Members reviewed the revised letter to GA Director Bremer on the proposed rezone of waterfront property by the City of Olympia. After several minor adjustments, members agreed with the content of the letter.

Senator Fraser moved, seconded by Representative Hunt, to approve and finalize the draft letter from the CCDAC signed by Chair King to Director Bremer as amended. Motion carried.

Lunch Break

Chair King recessed the meeting from 12:12 p.m. to 12:32 p.m. for lunch.

Heritage Center/Executive Office Building – Progress Review – Continued

Mr. Zieve reviewed elevations of the project. He quoted from the Capitol Campus Master Plan citing principles for new construction. The team is satisfied in how the design breaks up the mass of the building in terms of lengths, sizes, and pieces and how they come together. The model provides a good sense of the building's mass. However, the elevations are still in process with the design team still studying desirable features. The south side of the building has a clear base, middle, and top with the top terrace level set back. The upper level features mostly glass. There are three levels of office that are grouped within the middle portion of the building and the team believes it's important to incorporate a vertical impression within the middle portion of the building. He cited the Temple of Justice as an example with columns on one side and pilasters on the other side with a play back and forth with freestanding columns and pilasters for proportion.

The south side of the building faces the campus and incorporates the most stone. The frame is on axis with the Insurance Building. On the north side of the building, the amount of stone has been reduced by

approximately 50% within the pilaster. The goal is to maximize the amount of daylighting from the north side to achieve the most efficiency within the interior of the building.

Mr. Zieve displayed some early sketches that led to some design elements. The pilasters have been thinned from four feet to three feet wide to increase the size of the glazing with more glass introduced in the main entry space.

On the east and west elevations, the west side of the building includes glass, but there is consideration to incorporate sunshades to protect the glass as well as active skin shading to include external blinds or louvers encased in glass limiting the amount of direct sun. The east side of the building may incorporate more stone based on feedback from user groups and stakeholders because it faces the City. The team believes the building can be enhanced by contrasting the east and west ends of the building from the north and south sides of the building.

Mr. Zieve referred to the model and pointed out how the north elevation reveals how the terraces mesh with the building that is integrated within the site. Level 97 terrace wraps around to the café with the other terraces cascading down the hillside.

Mr. Zieve reported external materials will include Wilkenson stone, bronze, and glass. He invited comments from members.

Mr. McDonald referred to the museum space, which will provide an opportunity for different types of artwork, such as a Native American carving. He said he has some issues with the east side. One of the principles of the master plan is the massiveness of the buildings and honoring the structure and massiveness of existing campus buildings. The eastside along Columbia appears to resemble fake walls. There are no buildings on campus that have glass walls on the main part of campus. He suggested the team needs to continue the massiveness of the building along the east end of the building.

Mr. McDonald asked how the south entrance will be emphasized so that it doesn't overtake the building while at the same time, not confusing visitors on the location of the front entrance. Mr. Zieve said a great entry to a public building ought to signal an entry on many different scales. The entire site and landscaping projects prominence and entry into the building. The frame on the building currently projects approximately seven to eight feet. The team has been moving that projection back and forth to determine the right proportion. He acknowledged the challenge of designing a building on the campus because everyone wants a building of modern time while also conveying a cohesiveness and grandeur with existing campus buildings. The team is still developing proportions and details. The next stage of design development will include presenting more details. The success or failure of the building will be in the details.

Mr. McDonald asked what prompted the change in the south elevation. Mr. Zieve said the model is an example of the study that has been undertaken. It is still in process and ideas are still under exploration.

Representative Hunt referred to the block across the street and previous discussions on whether the buildings should be joined or connected. If a future decision is rendered to join the buildings, Representative Hunt asked whether the design can accommodate that connection. Mr. Zieve said when the block develops there has been an expressed desire to tie the buildings together.

Mr. McDonald said the glass on the east end detrimentally reduces the massiveness of the stone. He suggested some wrapping of stone and pointed to the CCDAC's recommendation on the Wheeler project to modify two of the building's glass walls because of a move away of that kind of 60s and 70s architecture. He said that is his only concern. Mr. Zieve acknowledged the design hasn't been solved, as many people who are located at the corner of a building want to have a view. One option shows wide 20-foot stonewalls anchoring the building. However, it's also important to ensure that there is sufficient glass in the corner to make a great corner office. That's the balance that the team needs to work through.

Chair King echoed similar comments of Mr. McDonald as it makes him uncomfortable to see a sandwiched stone and framed curtain wall within the building design. He encouraged the team to refer to some earlier solutions that includes stone on the end walls. He said he would like to see it as a stone box with lights rather than as a glass and steel box with some stone applied. It should apply to both the east and west walls.

Chair King said another concern he shares with Mr. McDonald is the entrance, which he believes is not working at this point. It needs to be grander, formal, and more visible so when a visitor arrives at the plaza they are clear where the entrance to the building is located.

Chair King said the difference in scale between the center and the two end pieces is troubling. He acknowledged what the team is trying to accomplish but noted there is a radical difference in the scale of the components that is somewhat troubling. Mr. Zieve acknowledged the comments and noted the building is 300 feet long, which requires some modulation of the façade, which includes a 180-foot dimension that relates to the other dimensions on campus. There are many ways to articulate that. Mr. Zieve said the team has tried in some drawings to continue the same vertical stone and glass but changing the proportion slightly to create emphasis. Another drawing emphasizes a prominent entry and how that section of the building should be different. The team will continue to explore and work on the facades.

Mr. Tan acknowledged that the team is still at the schematic stage and more design is to come. He complimented the team on the terracing effect. He said his first impression of the model and elevations "feels" like a state capitol structure. Perhaps there is too much rigidity right now, which is reflected in some of the comments. However, the main entry should reflect some of the artwork that will be inside the building. He suggested using that as a design element and reflecting that externally. He said he looks forward to the next stage of design development.

Senator Fraser commented on the need for a night lighting plan to ensure the building's geometry is emphasized at night. Mr. Zieve said the budget includes some allowances for lighting. The interior of the building will include the same quality of materials as externally, which will be visible during the evening.

Chair King asked if the committee will receive another presentation on the final schematic design. Mr. Zieve said June 17 is the scheduled date for final schematic design. The design is also dependent on the estimator's budget outcome, which may require some significant adjustments to accommodate costs.

Mr. Forsyth said the intent is bringing the costs inline with the schematic design. The team will work from there as the design is developed further. Currently, it's timing and a coordination process issue.

Representative Hunt asked whether the cost estimation will be reflective of increased fuel costs that will have an impact on construction costs. Mr. Forsyth said the cost estimators are tracking the issue closely.

Chair King said he is somewhat troubled that the team is pursuing completion of schematic design with some degree of discomfort with the status of the design at this point by the committee and no clear understanding of what modifications might erase the discomfort. He said he has confidence in the architectural team, but is concerned that June 17 will arrive with some responses by the committee.

Ms. Bremer said the concerns appear to be on the ends of the building. Part of the concern appears to be that the committee has provided feedback but it is unknown what the response to the feedback will be, and that the committee doesn't want it to be too late in terms of process and cost estimating.

Mr. Forsyth noted there is another year of the design process, but the problem is determining at some point where the design is in some totality while also having plans and elevations that match the cost estimates. The team can commit to showing many options to address the committee's concerns. That's not the issue. The issue is what the team is able to package comprehensively for determining the project's cost.

Mr. McDonald said he doesn't anticipate any dramatic changes on the overall layout of the building, hillside, and structural issues, but does see some revisiting on the two ends and the entrance issue.

Mr. Zieve said the team could present some elevations on June 17 to address the committee's concerns that will include a presentation on the drawings and cost estimates and additional studies for concurrence.

Mr. Forsyth acknowledged that none of the feedback from the committee will increase the costs of the exterior as glass is more expensive than stone. However, long-term energy efficiencies may be reduced.

Mr. Zieve said the team will continue to meet and work. The elevations will continue to change. He expressed appreciation for the committee's comments.

Wheeler Site Development – Architectural Concept Review

Gary Robinson, Director, Department of Information Services, referred to a written summary on the status of the project and several slides from prior briefings. The team is continuing to work on design and administrative preparations based on input from the CCDAC and from community meetings. The project is under review by the GA as part of the SEPA process and some of the conditions included in the SEPA review were conditions recommended by the CCDAC as well as suggestions from the community meetings. Some of the suggestions include a roundabout at the corner of 14th and Jefferson, an extension of the bike path from I-5 to 14th and Jefferson, changes to the architectural character of the Data Center on the south portion of the building, placing conditions on access points, limitations on visitor parking, and augmentation of traffic studies to address various traffic levels adjacent to the project site. A SEPA Determination was issued by GA with an appeal filed of the determination on May 5, 2008. GA is undertaking the Administrative Hearings process for the appeal. The team also reviewed the plans with GA Facilities staff in terms of accessibility. Included in the plan is the inclusion of an elevator lift from the ground level to the upper plaza level. Work on the child care center on Perry Street is progressing. The existing child care center will be moved from its existing Wheeler site location to the Perry Street site at the end of June or first part of July.

Earlier in the day, a State Finance Committee meeting was held. However, consideration of the Wheeler site project was delayed because of the SEPA appeal.

Chair King referred to the refinements of the elevations of the Data Center and indicated his approval of the changes.

Representative Hunt inquired about the schedule to maintain the groundbreaking timeline. Mr. Robinson said the intent was to begin work on the project in June. However, the SEPA appeal has delayed work commencing as well as appearing before the State Finance Committee for the financing decision. Mr. Robinson said he is unsure of the timeline associated with the appeal process.

Representative Hunt noted any substantial delays will impact the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building project.

Chair King advised the committee against discussing any issues associated with the appeal.

Chair King invited public comments.

Greg Klein, South Capitol Neighborhood Association, asked about the garage entrance/exit onto 14th Street. He said he assumes that it will only be exit-only access. He asked if there is a possibility to remove the exit-only access as well. Ms. Cindy Edens replied that the access is both an entrance and an exit off 14th. The goal is to ensure it works for both. When it was further down, there were concerns about its location, which resulted in the access relocated.

Jean Marie Thomas, South Capitol Neighborhood Association, said that the information is helpful. She suggested having more discussion around the issue because it has been one of the association's primary concerns pertaining to ingress and egress points. There was uncertainty of the implications to the neighborhood each time the access location changed. She stressed the importance of the entry to the neighborhood and suggested having more discussion. Another issue that is of concern is the design of the building facing the neighborhood on 16th Avenue. The materials provided during the meeting are unclear as to the building's design from the viewpoint from 16th, which is a residential neighborhood. The association doesn't believe it can adequately comment until there is a design to review. There are also concerns about the quality of the materials on that side of the building. Other buildings facing Maple Park are gracious and face the neighborhood very well. The drawings for the Wheeler site do not look like they have been fully planned and designed. It appears to be the back of the building. However, based on the status of the design it is unknown whether that's true. She suggested the design should be carefully planned based on the historic residential neighborhood.

Mr. Robinson said the design of the building is one of the issues within the appeal. He declined making a response.

Ms. Edens noted the glass has been carried along the entire Data Center to improve the appearance of the building. Below that, there is a thick concrete wall because of noise considerations. The concrete will match the imprint of the stone that is on the street side.

Chair King noted there is also a heavy planting of trees along the south wall, which continues Maple Park. Ms. Edens said the plantings will be heavier toward the Data Center to help mitigate noise.

Chair King said the CCDAC is aware of the appearance of the south wall from the neighborhood and there were no concerns expressed by the committee. Ms. Bremer added that the CCDAC did express a need for emphasizing a gracious flow to the neighborhood through supporting the extension of the park.

*CCDAC Regular Meeting
Minutes of Meeting
May 22, 2008 Page 14 of 15*

The CCDAC did look at the various design pieces and framing with the park. There were no issues carried forward after that review. Chair King added that the committee undertook extensive conversations about the building facing the neighborhood as well as discussions with the designer's landscape architect, Bill Johnson, who emphasized the design.

Ms. Thomas said that at the most recent meetings, the association asked for schematic designs for the site. The association was told they did not exist. She suggested there might be some confusion about what is available and not available. Mr. Robinson said the design documents are posted on the agency's website.

Mr. McDonald said he's sensitive to the neighborhood's issues. The committee has had many meetings and there are several members of the Legislature on the committee. The committee always holds open meetings. He said he hopes residents are comfortable with addressing issues at the committee level instead of pursuing a legal process. Delaying the project can cost millions of dollars as well as impacting the timeline associated with the Heritage Center/Executive Office Building project.

Representative Hunt referred to the Olympia isthmus issue and the various illustrations with some conveying a sense of distortion. Ms. Edens said Bill Johnson is a landscape artist and that the drawing was not meant to represent the final design of the building. Senator Fraser said it's difficult when viewing the illustration whether the building is of concrete squares or glass. She said she understands from the discussion that it is a glass wall of square panels. Ms. Edens said the illustration representing the landscape plan is not reflective of the building. The actual building design is reflected on the model.

Chair King asked whether the south wall of the Data Center closely matches the west wall. Ms. Edens said on the interior of the building, the stone was changed to metal. The scale was also changed slightly because the building appears shorter. There is a change of material, but it looks similar. The heavy material on the model is a combination of stone and metal and the ratio of the stone and metal on the building's face is more stone to metal. Both sides are proportionately similar. There is stone on all faces of the buildings.

Ms. Thomas asked whether the Data Center is stamped concrete. Ms. Edens said the Data Center is concrete that has been treated at the base followed by a glazing system above matching the wall systems of the building that has metal and glass. Above the landscaping, mostly the glass will be visible with lesser views of the concrete because of landscaping.

Ms. Tan shared the neighborhood's concerns about the massiveness of the structures and asked that the architects continue emphasis on a design that is friendly to the neighborhood.

Ms. Thomas said she appreciates mature landscaping but wouldn't want to see landscaping camouflage poor design or poor materials. She's concerned about using concrete on the side facing the historic neighborhood rather than the elegant architecture that is on the other faces. It's a reduction in materials and design that is facing the neighborhood. She asked to view the schematics to help understand the differences in material. She cautioned that for a 100-year building, including landscaping that camouflages a building is not building a beautiful legacy as part of the Capitol Campus.

Chair King said characterizing landscaping as camouflage is an inappropriate intent of the landscape plan, which is to carry some of the wooded areas along Maple Lane north to the site to create a bond between various parts of the campus.

Ms. Bremer said she is concerned about some of the characterization as well because she felt the committee spent quite a bit of time working to understand the environment first. There was emphasis to ensure that there is meaning in terms of how the neighborhood met with the edge of the complex and how the park extended. The committee had many conversations regarding that aspect of the project. The project sponsors responded by shifting the orientation of the Data Center so that the smaller face would front the neighborhood rather than the longer wall as well as responding to concerns about equipment and sound mitigation. There were many conversations concerning how to make the project neighborhood friendly. It is a bit of a concern, as it was the emphasis the CCDAC undertook. The conversations have been ongoing over the last eight months and the team has been very responsive to the issues raised about the neighborhood transition and enhanced neighborhood places regarding the campus in the area of the Department of Transportation and other areas. The committee worked hard on the issues. The team has been very responsive. The goal at this point is to discuss refinements.

Ms. Thomas expressed appreciation for the comments. The association has participated in many discussions over the months. She said she will retract her statements concerning camouflage if the design invites the public to view the building versus putting up landscape to hide the building.

Mr. Robinson advised that the team will continue working on the project and will return with a status report.

Master Plan Amendment – Clarification Regarding Building Height on West Campus

Mr. Evans presented the proposed amendment to the State's Master Plan.

Representative Hunt moved, seconded by Patrick McDonald, to approve the Master Plan Amendment clarifying building height on West Campus on page 5-11. In section, "Design Guidelines for West Campus, the paragraph on "Scale" should be revised to state, "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." Motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair King adjourned the meeting at 1:40 p.m.