



**STATE CAPITOL COMMITTEE  
Regular Meeting  
Legislative Building, Senate Rules Room  
Olympia, Washington 98504**

**July 11, 2019  
10:00 AM**

**Final Minutes- Approved by SCC on 09/19/19**

---

**SCC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Lieutenant Governor Cyrus Habib (*Chair*)  
Josh Wilund (for Commissioner of Public Lands Hilary Franz)  
Mark Neary (for Secretary of State Kim Wyman)  
Kelly Wicker, Governor's Designee

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Reuben Amamilo, Department of Labor & Industries  
Pete Anderson, Cornerstone Architectural Group  
Mark Beardemphl, KMB Architects  
Sharon Case, South Capitol NH Assn.  
Max DeJarnatt, City of Olympia  
Kevin Dragon, Department of Enterprise Services  
Bill Ecker, KMB Architects  
Bill Frare, Department of Enterprise Services  
Mark Fromme, Department of Enterprise Services  
Rory Godinez, Washington Patriot Construction  
Jeff Gonzales, Department of Enterprise Services  
Valerie Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services  
Linda Kent, Department of Enterprise Services

Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services  
Cora McClarty, Department of Enterprise Services  
Annette Meyer, Department of Enterprise Services  
Ruben Nuñez, KMB Architects  
Rachel Newmann, South Capitol NH Association  
Maurice Perigo, Department of Labor & Industries  
Jennifer Reynolds, Department of Enterprise Services  
Jairus Rice, Employment Security Department  
Shelly Sadie-Hill, Department of Enterprise Services  
Neil Shaw, Washington Patriot Construction  
Michael Van Gelder, Department of Enterprise Services  
Oliver Wu, Department of Enterprise Services

**Call Meeting to Order, General Announcements, and Approval of the Agenda - Action**

Lt. Governor/Chair Cyrus Habib called the State Capitol Committee (SCC) to order at 10:03 a.m., and acknowledged members in attendance.

**Approval of February 21, 2019 Minutes - Action**

**The minutes of February 21, 2019 were approved as published.**

**Employment Security Building – Predesign - Action**

Jairus Rice, Chief Information Officer, Employment Security Department (ESD), and Bill Ecker, Project Manager, KMB Architects, briefed the committee on the ESD Headquarters Building Renovation project. Mr. Ecker is serving as the project manager and is leading the project on behalf of ESD.

Mr. Rice reported the ESD Headquarters Building was constructed in 1961. No major renovations to the building have been completed since it was constructed other than upgrading building systems periodically to address failures. Major problems include all major building systems, inadequate or nonexistent building insulation, building envelope failures, leaking or cracked single-pane aluminum framed windows, inefficient or obsolete mechanical systems affecting the ability to maintain a comfortable environment for employees and customers, and the inability to meet current efficiency and performance requirements as required by Executive Order 18-01. Additionally, the building is experiencing significant functional and code deficiencies. The building is neither ADA compliant nor ADA accessible. Work spaces are not configured to current standards for the modern work environment. ESD also has unmet organizational and institutional client space needs.

Mr. Ecker reviewed the predesign options and preferred recommendation moving forward. To assist KMB Architects, the team received a copy of the Building Condition Assessment report completed in 2006. The thorough assessment was based on 2006 conditions, which continue to exist today. ESD also performed a self-funded energy audit in 2017 documenting functional and lifecycle costs of all existing systems. KMB Architects considered the information in addition to other directives guiding the predesign.

The recommended alternative is a major renovation of the entire building to include energy upgrades, interior and exterior cosmetic upgrades, and a seismic retrofit to meet current seismic standards.

Project goals (programmatic & functional) identified for the project include:

- Create a co-located, shared use efficient space including offices, conference spaces, and core building functions.
- Facility compliant with Governors Executive Order 18-01 “Net Zero Ready.”
- High efficiency LEED Silver Certification in accordance with Executive Order 05-01.
- Modern, accessible workplace in accordance with Executive Order 16-07 - *Building A Modern Work Environment*.
- Improve facilities to meet agency mission, goals, and RCW obligations.
- Maintain historic character of Capitol Campus architecture.
- Enhance safety and building longevity in the event of a major earthquake.

The team studied several alternative development scenarios. The first option considered renovation of the entire building without seismic bracing to provide an open office concept utilizing a semi-phased approach. The team discounted the scenario because extending the schedule would be too disruptive for ESD to provide service and the alternative would be much more costly. The second alternative was a major renovation including the seismic upgrades. The second alternative was selected as the preferred alternative because of the necessity of upgrading all building systems to extend the building’s life for another 50 years. The third scenario as required by the Office of Financial Management (OFM) was a no action scenario. Because of the current and ongoing deterioration of the building, the team believes the no action option would be unwise.

The project cost of the preferred alternative speaks to the importance of using the GC/CM alternative delivery method, which provides competitive bids and input from the contractor during the design process. ESD would vacate the building during the course of construction giving the contractor free access to the entire building and reducing the need to maintain building systems during construction. Not included in the project cost is the contract administration cost; however, risk contingency costs are included of 3% for the GC/CM, 13% for general conditions, and 5% for the contractor overhead and profit (O&P). Project cost is estimated to be \$28.5 million escalating to approximately \$31.4 in future costs.

The concept project schedule is based on the cycle of funding, programming, and commitment decisions. The current schedule is dependent upon a supplemental funding request for design extending through the middle of 2021 with the remaining funding received by the second biennium to establish a completion date by the end of 2023. The schedule is contingent on programmatic needs of the agency and legislative input and feedback.

Kevin Dragon, Program Manager/Acting Campus Architect, added that ESD and DES are working collaboratively on the schedule to line up with funding and agency goals and objectives.

Chair Habib inquired about the inclusion of security elements within the project. The factors and considerations for the project appear not to include security other than for seismic safety and environmental sustainability. He asked about the mechanism that DES employs to incorporate security within the predesign component. He suggested a smart way could entail obtaining input from experts on the front end of the design effort to ensure the addition of state-of-the-art security supported through the state’s policy choices for security on campus.

Assistant Director Frare advised that at this time, DES is incorporating safety and security components within DES processes, but not comprehensively. For example, the Newhouse pre-design included a security subconsultant for advice on security. DES also considered security during the pre-design efforts for the Child Care facility. During

the ESD pre-design, security experts were not included; however, security could definitely be included during the design process. As a state, one issue to resolve is whether the security aspect and the level of security should be included in a building's design. Because of the broad range of security elements, such as shatter resistant windows, metal detectors, or other security features, it would be important to establish standards for Capitol Campus security. It is definitely easier to incorporate security features into the early design process rather than adding security features later. DES is currently updating processes to include security features.

Chair Habib responded that although he does not wish to appear as an alarmist, it is not inconceivable that someone who perceives to be wronged by the state or received notice of a discontinued benefit or service could pose as a threat to the safety of state employees. Today, domestic conflicts often spill into the workplace. There are unique features to government, which is why it is difficult to enter a federal building in this country without going through a metal detector. It is not inconceivable a disgruntled individual might do something rash or try to intimidate. The Commissioner of ESD is a former United States Senate confirmed Ambassador who was subject to security protections while in federal service. There are different dynamics in each individual workplace on the campus. His concern at a process level is that it doesn't appear security is factored within pre-design efforts for projects or an assessment by law enforcement experts to review security risks and vulnerabilities of buildings. Experts could present a menu of options and costs for review and consideration by the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee and the State Capitol Committee or even OFM. That process should be included in the alternatives analysis.

Assistant Director Frare acknowledged the comments and emphasized how opportunities are available to complete an assessment to develop security options during the design process.

Manager Dragon added that the scope of the predesign did not include security; however, security professionals on campus were provided with a copy of the predesign. He anticipates that ongoing conversations with ESD will speak to the some of the agency's security initiatives and agency functions, such as whether additional hardening of the front entrance might affect how the agency interacts with clientele. Those discussions would occur during the initial design phase to ensure against the loss of opportunities to ensure overall security of the facility.

Chair Habib questioned why such considerations occur later in the process as those discussions should occur in concert during discussions on the scope of the project, seismic improvements, and environmental considerations. Manager Dragon advised that DES is evolving practices to include campus security, building maintenance, and ownership-related issues on property and encumbrances, which previously have been overlooked during predesign.

Josh Wilund asked whether current and future space needs were factored, as well as whether an analysis was completed of building new versus renovation of the building. Mr. Rice responded that all factors were considered and continue to be assessed in conjunction with new agency programmatic needs that emerged from the last legislative session. The Executive Leadership Team of ESD has scheduled a discussion on how the project will relate to future space needs. The option of a new building was considered but because the ESD Building was funded with federal dollars in 1961, any demolition or sale of the building would require a payback to the federal government.

Manager Dragon pointed out that from a design perspective the ESD Building is a twin to the Highway Licensing Building. The master plan for East Campus identifies both buildings as flanking East Plaza both to the north and to the south. Similar architectural elements are featured on both buildings.

Assistant Director Frare advised that the next step is submitting the predesign to OFM for approval and then forwarding the package to the Legislature. The requested action before the committee is to approve the findings.

Chair Habib said he would prefer, within available means, to include some formal involvement by campus security/Washington State Patrol (WSP) to analyze security defects in the existing building and identify a menu of options for consideration. The lack of security in the findings speaks to incomplete findings. While he appreciates evaluation of security elements would occur during the design process, a predesign is completed for a reason, as it provides the Legislature with information on total design costs, especially if there are costs associated with security features.

Assistant Director Frare inquired about the expiration of the predesign appropriation. Mr. Rice advised that the appropriation expired on June 1, 2019. Assistant Director Frare asked whether other sources of funds would be available for security investigation. Mr. Rice replied that he is confident ESD would partner with DES, Capitol Campus Security, and WSP to complete a study and identify some recommendations as part of the project.

Assistant Director Frare questioned how the committee's meeting schedule might affect the timing of the budget submittal. Kelly Wicker advised that all budget submittals are due to the Governor's Office in early October. Chair Habib suggested rescheduling the committee meeting during the second week in September to enable ESD to meet its deadline.

Chair Habib noted that action on the proposal would be deferred until the September meeting. He thanked DES and ESD for identifying resources to address security elements.

**L&I/WSDA Safety & Health Lab and Training Center – Predesign – Action**

Chair Habib recognized Bill Frare, Assistant Director, DES; Oliver Wu, DES Project Manager; and Dr. Reuben Amamilo, Capital Projects Director, Department of Labor and Industries (L&I).

Manager Dragon reported DES has been working with L&I to complete a predesign for a new facility located in the Tumwater area to meet L&I's operational needs for both safety and lab programs.

Dr. Amamilo briefed the committee on the purpose of the project. Both L&I and the Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) operate various labs. Existing labs are located in leased and inefficient buildings. WSDA currently has four labs and L&I operates the Industrial Hygiene Lab at a leased building located off Plum Street in Olympia. The building was originally designed to house office employees and was adapted to accommodate the lab. The location presents a series of issues with vibration and settling. During construction, fill was added to the site, which contributes to ongoing settling of the building and cracks to the building's foundation.

WSDA's Food and Safety Lab is located in an older building with no elevator. The building houses three labs and the lack of functionality in existing lab spaces threaten the agency's ability to respond.

The proposal provides an opportunity for the state to combine the five labs in one building creating efficiency for both agencies and providing one-stop shopping for lab customers, while also reducing costs. The agencies would partner on the project and create value for the state. Another feature of the project is creating a zero net energy building and achieving Platinum LEED certification.

Dr. Amamilo introduced Mark Beardemphl with KMB Architects, and Maurice Perigo, Facilities Program Director, L&I.

Mr. Beardemphl briefed the committee on predesign efforts. He worked closely with all project stakeholders with L&I and WSDA on the L&I/WSDA Safety & Health Lab and Training Center project. Within the predesign, critical and important work was highlighted by both agencies. The work completed by L&I and the Department of Safety and Health is to prevent worker injury, illness, and potential death. That work is completed in offices, laboratories, and at a training center. All those activities have been completed in leased facilities over the last 20 years. The facilities are inadequate in both performance and size. The training center is nearly non-existent with training tasks completed from spec office spaces that do not meet needs. The work completed by WSDA is important to protect the state's food supply and to prevent disease outbreak and pest infestation. The agency is located in inadequate and inefficient leased facilities.

Within the predesign, the recommended alternative is a new shared facility for both L&I-DOSH and WSDA meeting 100% of all program needs. The proposal includes a DOSH-focused training center. The building would be approximately 53,000 square feet in size.

Goals for the project include:

- Create a co-located, shared use space including offices, conference spaces, and core building functions.
- Facility compliant with Governors Executive Order 18-014 "Net Zero Ready."

- High efficiency LEED Silver Certification (at a minimum) in accordance with Executive Order 05-01.
- Modern, accessible workplace in accordance with Executive Order 16-07 – *Building A Modern Work Environment*.
- Adequate facilities meeting agency mission, goals, and RCW obligations.
- Modern laboratories for reliable, expeditious results to better serve stakeholders.
- Increase in availability of critical training programs for workplace safety - the facility would provide the adequate space designed to handle the equipment and the exercises necessary for critical training.

Several alternative development scenarios were studied. The first alternative was a larger facility accommodating all program needs for L&I and WSDA, as well as, a large agency-wide training center to total a 64,000 square-foot building. The preferred alternative (Option 2) would be a smaller building of approximately 53,000 square feet, which also includes a DOSH-L&I training center. Option 3 included a 48,000 square-foot building with no training center. Option 4 included a reduced program of 30,000 square feet, which would not meet programming requirements of both agencies. Option 5 employed a phased approach over time. The option was not preferred because of the increase in costs because of project phasing over multiple biennia. Option 6 was the no action alternative as required by OFM. The team discussed the consequences of no action.

Chair Habib asked whether the primary purpose of the facility is for training or for testing and other lab processes. Mr. Beardemphl said the primary function of the facility would revolve around the laboratory; however, training is an important element. The training component involves training of clients, such as contractors and business owners on industry-specific safety procedures. Recent news of accidents at construction sites speak to the importance of training. The current training site includes mock-up scenarios to teach contractors how to use fall protection properly on a construction site. Currently, training is conducted within spec office space without the actual facilities or sufficient ceiling height, as well as outdoor space to house larger equipment. Critical safety training is being conducted by the agency without the benefit of adequate training facilities.

Chair Habib asked whether training is provided to contractors working on private projects. Dr. Amamilo explained that L&I provides state-wide safety training for different construction trades, which speaks to the need to use similar equipment utilized in the industry. Chair Habib asked whether training provides a revenue source for L&I. Dr. Amamilo said training is offered as part of the DOSH program, which is mandated by the state to reduce workplace injuries and death. A death of a worker becomes a state liability.

Mr. Beardemphl reviewed the recommended facility site. The preferred site is the Edna Goodrich site located adjacent to the existing L&I Headquarters Building and west of the existing Department of Corrections Headquarters Building in Tumwater. The site was recommended because of its close proximity to L&I and to Interstate 5. Other development factors included no latecomer fees, frontage improvements, and parking.

Manager Dragon noted that the Secretary of State's new building proposal is on the opposite side of Linderson Way. The Edna Goodrich site is part of the Tumwater Satellite Campus, which is administered as part of the State Capitol Campus.

Mr. Beardemphl said the team also examined additional state-owned properties. Those alternative sites included a site off 88<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Olympia and a site off Desmond Drive in Lacey. Both sites were considered but had more drawbacks than the Tumwater site. The preferred Tumwater site is undeveloped.

Manager Dragon said the site is located on the Edna Goodrich Building parcel housing both the Department of Corrections and Department of Transportation. The undeveloped site is located in the rear of the parcel with access provided by the road serving the L&I Building.

Mr. Beardemphl reported the project budget developed during the predesign assumes a GC/CM project delivery method with site work specific to the preferred site. The estimated cost of the project is \$53 million with a total of \$33 million as the maximum allowable construction cost (MACC).

Mr. Wilund asked whether the budget estimate reflects legislatively mandated LEED Silver or LEED Platinum. Mr. Beardemphl said the estimate is based on achieving LEED Platinum. During the predesign process, lifecycle cost analysis was completed with assumptions included for a code-compliant building, LEED silver, or a LEED

Platinum net zero energy building to meet the Governor's Executive Order. The analysis considered those costs and projected them over a 50-year lifespan. Although the results were close, the results pointed to pursuing the net-zero energy ready LEED Platinum building option.

Manager Dragon added that at the time the law was adopted, DES required LEED Silver, which is a different certification than today's Silver certification. LEED Platinum includes different criteria with higher performance and efficiencies.

Mr. Beardemphl reported the project schedule reflects the design process beginning in September and concluding in August 2020. Major construction is scheduled to begin in September 2020 through October 2021 with a projected move-in sometime in January 2022. The schedule is somewhat aggressive. The GC/CM delivery method supports the aggressive schedule and includes an early work package to take advantage of the GC/CM's involvement by working closely with the design team during schematic design. That enables the team to develop the early site work package for clearing, utility, and land development beginning in June 2020. The building construction package would follow in September 2020.

Manager Dragon reported the project was submitted in the budget package for 2021 and received an appropriation of \$52.3 million. Efforts are underway to secure the allocation necessary to begin the procurement of the architectural and engineering (A/E) groups, as well as the GC/CM to begin work as quickly as possible.

Dr. Amamilo said the document accompanying the predesign would include the package of solicitations for the RFP/RFQ for the A/E teams and the GC/CM. Project requirements were developed with a focus on safety and security. Although each lab is unique, safety requirement standards are required to meet state and federal requirements. Additionally, general security of the exterior building site was considered and how it fits within the existing south campus area.

Chair Habib asked whether the selection of the preferred alternative and corresponding cost were determined after the appropriation. Manager Dragon said the preferred alternative and project cost was determined and included within the proposed appropriation for the project. Chair Habib asked whether the proposal was presented to the Capital Budget Committee. Mr. Dragon said the budget request was included in the agency's request as part of its capital budget proposal.

Chair Habib asked how the timing of the committee's review and preferred action fits within the overall schedule of the appropriation decision. Manager Dragon said that unfortunately, the committee's review was not within that timeline as DES scheduled the review to the committee to present information on the preferred alternative, as well as the alternatives that were considered. The predesign should have been presented to the CCDAC and the SCC prior to the selection of the preferred alternative; however, because of the aggressive timeline for approval of the capital budget during the last biennial cycle and the work required to arrive at this point, it conflicted with the timing of the committee's review.

Chair Habib pointed out the committee has met previously during the earlier part of the year. He questioned the reason for not presenting the proposal to the committee during those earlier meetings. Mr. Dragon replied that he did not have a good response, other than the proposal should have been presented to the committee. The process of predesign, elements of a predesign, and timeline of a predesign are being comprehensively re-evaluated by the DES Planning and Project Delivery team to avoid those types of situations.

Chair Habib offered that it is likely legislators would be disappointed to learn about the lack of a review as legislators operate under the assumption that an iterative process was completed. The Governor and OFM have a role to play in presenting proposals to the Legislature; however, the Legislature also refers to the committee and CCDAC for a public process to consider a proposal and any issues, such as security issues as mentioned during the previous project review. It would likely be disappointing to legislators to learn that the process, whether good or bad, was not followed. Some discussions should be scheduled to clarify the review process by the committee, as it appears the process has been ignored. Funding decisions are being rendered that are zero sum at the end of the day without the benefit of an appropriate process. Legislators lack the time to examine the different alternatives and ask questions the committee typically would have had the opportunity to ask. The process has become disappointing and warrants scheduling a conversation followed by a discussion by the committee on the

requirements of the law, potential changes to the statute if necessary, or a change in practice. It appears that action on the proposal is moot. He questioned whether that stance would be fair.

Director Liu acknowledged the points and the comments as factual.

Chair Habib recommended scheduling a conversation between him and DES before the next meeting. Director Liu confirmed the request.

**East Plaza Water Infiltration Repairs (5B) – Informational**

Chair Habib recognized Jeff Gonzales, DES Project Manager.

Manager Gonzales introduced project team members Jennifer Reynolds, Communications Manager, DES; Shelly Sadie-Hill, Property Manager, DES; and Mark Fromme, Site Representative, DES. Pete Anderson is with Cornerstone Architectural Group and Neil Shaw, Project Manager, and Rory Godinez, Superintendent, are with Washington Patriot Construction.

The project was scheduled to respond to failures in the existing waterproof membrane with water infiltrating into the Plaza Garage and compromising structural integrity. East Plaza forms the open space bordered by the Department of Transportation (DOT) on the east and the ESD Building on the south. Construction on the project began in May 2019 and will continue through December 2019. The project is on schedule.

Other repairs to the Plaza Garage began in 1996 using a phased approach with repairs beginning near OB2 and the DOT Building. Phase 4 was completed in 2005 through 2007 and included seismic improvements and roof replacements on the north half of East Plaza.

The current phase of the project was developed in 2006 and was assigned as Phase 5 to implement a master plan approved by the State Capitol Committee in 1997. No work was funded or performed between 2008 and 2014 because of funding constraints. Subsequently, Phase 5 was re-examined and divided into six manageable sub-phases (A-F).

Project Phase 5A was completed between 2015 and 2017 on repairs to Stair Towers #1 and #8.

Mr. Gonzales displayed an aerial view of the project area. The view depicts how the project site is situated with respect to the location of the DOT Building and the ESD Building. The construction laydown area for the project is located on the Maple Park Annex Lot.

Mr. Anderson reviewed design components of the project. The design of the Plaza began by examining existing infrastructure of the Plaza Garage. The project encompasses a footprint of 40,000 square feet comprised of a multi-story underground parking garage with a large roof deck with planted trees, shrubs, gardens, ramps, pathways, and concrete walls, etc. The garage was designed in 1969 and constructed in 1970.

The design function is to create a waterproof roof over the garage. The project scope entails removing all trees, shrubs, grass, pavers, soil, planter walls, and other structures down to the concrete roof deck and installing new waterproofing at the deck level with a drainage layer and drains. The scope also includes installation of new walls with capstones, soil, trees, shrubs, grass, irrigation, walkways, and light fixtures to re-recreate a functioning plaza designed to unite several areas of East Campus.

Mr. Gonzales reported that as part of the design process, the team reviewed the work began in 1997 with the master planning effort. He identified some of the stakeholders and agencies involved in the planning effort for the Phase 5 area. The master plan was prepared by EDAW, Inc.

Mr. Anderson said the design is consistent with the master plan created in the late 1990s. Based on the original design, the team is maintaining the three main walkways in the east/west direction. The north walkway will include additional landscaping, the center walkway serves as an extension from the main door of the DOT Building and provides a westerly pathway, and the south pathway will remain located at the edge of the garage roof. As part

of the construction, an oval walkway will be started that will ultimately surround the fountain feature during the next phase of work.

An additional scope included in the project is repairing some cracks developing in the garage. At this time, the cracks are minor but are of the type that left unattended could lead to serious structural issues. The work involves an epoxy crack repair system to extend the garage life for another 50 years. Some additional electrical work is necessary in the garage involving some electrical panels and major electrical aspects of the garage, which was included in the budget.

Mr. Gonzales shared an aerial photograph of the entrance to the Plaza Garage from Maple Park. Construction has begun and the ability to access parking has been affected. However, impact has been minor and only to the extent necessary to perform specific tasks on the garage roof, such as drain work. ESD and DOT employees have been encouraged to use other parking areas on campus. The main entrance to the Plaza Garage is not ADA accessible; however, reasonable accommodations can be accommodated.

Manager Dragon advised that DES has not received many complaints about the lack of accessibility to and from the garage. The project has required several temporary closures to the garage.

Mr. Gonzales reviewed staging sequences of the project. A portion of the Maple Park Annex Lot will be occupied for construction staging. The site includes seven reserved parking stalls and two ADA parking stalls, which will remain open during construction. A lower laydown area is located near the Maple Park entrance to the garage requiring relocation of an existing smoking shelter and connex. Currently, the area is occupied by construction equipment with some problems encountered with delivering materials to the area of the project because of some weight restrictions. Much of the work will be completed at the lower level with materials lifted to the plaza deck.

Construction activities have generated noise and vibration; however, much of that work has been completed with the project generating less noise. Most of the vibration and noise was generated by the demolition work and some core drilling of the concrete deck. Construction is limited to the hours of 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. Washington Patriot Construction is monitoring for compliance.

Because of the importance of safety during construction, the entire project site was fenced to eliminate access. During the extensive efforts involving the pouring of concrete, spotters were assigned as equipment moved back and forth. Safety screens were installed and signage with detour maps posted for pedestrians.

Mr. Anderson displayed another aerial photograph of the project site and the laydown areas, as well as a larger aerial image relative to the entire campus. The project website is maintained by Manager Reynolds. The website publishes current stages of work and future work.

Chair Habib asked whether DES has received any complaints about the lack of ADA accessibility. Mr. Gonzales reported no complaints have been received.

Mr. Dragon noted the lack of complaints speaks to efforts to publicize project activities and alternative ways to access the garage and other parking areas.

Chair Habib thanked the team for the update.

**Capitol Campus Eastern Washington Butte – Informational**

Chair Habib recognized Michael Van Gelder, Property Manager, DES.

Manager Van Gelder introduced Ruben Nuñez from KMB Architects who is serving as the consultant on the project.

Manager Van Gelder explained that Heritage Park was envisioned by Wilder and White with the concept further developed by the Olmsted Brothers. Most of the work occurred in 2004 during master planning efforts. At that time, a number of features were considered for future development. One feature was the Arc of Statehood, symbolizing the State of Washington. Future park development was to be cognizant of the Wilder and White

campus axis. The park was planned to provide open space for public gatherings. Development of the Arc of Statehood features began near the western Washington inlet at the south end of Capitol Lake. Another undeveloped feature supporting the Arc of Statehood is the Eastern Washington Butte located at the north end of the lake near the dam. During the 17-19 biennium, DES received some funds through the Department of Commerce's Grain Program to complete conceptual design work for the Eastern Washington Butte. He emphasized that the design was only conceptual with the goal to use elements associated with eastern Washington to create a conceptual representation of eastern Washington in the area known as the Eastern Washington Butte.

Mr. Nuñez provided an overview of the design concept for the Eastern Washington Butte. Some of the stakeholders included DES and the North Heritage Park Development Association. Factors considered during the design included sightlines lines with the capitol, sea level rise and the sea level work completed by the City of Olympia, and three concepts of wheat, apples, and the basalt topography of eastern Washington. The design concept replicates the three elements within the project, which was part of the original idea within the master plan. Because of the difficulty of growing wheat in western Washington, the idea for wheat was represented in a sculptural form. The design considered accessibility to the butte by pedestrians and vehicles, as well as the views from Capital Campus looking down to the butte. The butte plaza is positioned in the orientation of the campus axis.

Mr. Nunez shared a series of graphic illustrations depicting the conceptual design.

The basalt area was based on the landscape of the Palouse and eastern Washington. Another idea explored opportunities for incorporating wind generation within the design to provide power for lights and illuminate the sculpture within the butte. The team researched acrylic based products and considered the maintenance aspect of the wheat sculpture within the plaza.

Chair Habib inquired about outreach efforts to help define some of the features that should be represented for eastern Washington. Mr. Nuñez replied that outreach occurred during the initial meetings with the North Heritage Park Development Association. Some members live in eastern Washington. Additionally the team shared concepts with some legislators from eastern Washington. Some of the concepts are also included in the original master plan.

Mr. Van Gelder reported the master plan effort was completed in 2004. The plan included some broad concepts for the butte representing eastern Washington. In addition to basalt, other elements were mentioned. A landscape architect who had worked in eastern Washington was also involved in the early efforts. Presentations were provided to the Eastern Legislative Caucus. Members of the caucus offered comments and feedback.

Manager Dragon added that a large part of the effort has involved collecting conceptual design elements for further consideration should the project move into the design phase. The elements representing eastern Washington are design concepts for discussion and additional stakeholder input. Additional stakeholder discussions will include the North Heritage Park Development Association and constituent representatives from eastern Washington.

The plaza feature of the Butte will include two accessible ramps that will also serve as the sea level barrier. The site includes an existing berm along the east side with the goal of expanding the berm along the west side as well.

Chair Habib inquired about the possibility of deconstructing the dichotomy to the extent that the landscape architecture tells a story without complicating the division of the state into east and west. He asked about the possibility of such a concept to help convey a "One Washington" message. Mr. Nuñez replied that symbolically, a way to convey that message is incorporating unity within the feature for this particular project through a human connection.

Manager Dragon pointed out that the Arc of Statehood is intended to represent the entire state beginning with the estuary/lake at one point followed by a pathway along the frontage of the lake with each county represented from western Washington to the area of the undeveloped butte. Currently, the area includes an unadorned mound representing the butte. The purpose of undertaking a conceptual-level plan for the Eastern Washington Butte was to develop information from stakeholders on elements that represent eastern Washington within the Arc of

Statehood as a whole. The project is centric to eastern Washington because at this time, eastern Washington is not well represented.

Chair Habib commented that it would be important to ensure there is a focus on highlighting eastern Washington while integrating some connectivity with the western Washington elements to help tell the story that the state is one connected state.

Mr. Nuñez noted that the wheat sculpture would be illuminated at night. One design feature that might be possible in the future is incorporating some type of light feature within the western Washington elements as a way to reflect how the light connection represents the symbol of a united arc.

Manager Dragon added that as part of the project design, elements revisiting the park's concept of the Arc of Statehood could be pursued as part of the next budget request to ensure the design reflects a "One Washington" message by working with other stakeholders, the Legislature, and other community members.

Chair Habib agreed the effort would be worthwhile because there are many talented architects who could create a united message. Manager Dragon responded that the concepts were intended to prompt discussions on an appropriate design and elements that should be included. The feedback has been important to ensure the design delivers an outcome that meets all expectations.

Chair Habib suggested the process would benefit from participation from the Governor, Secretary of State Wyman, and Commissioner Franz as representatives of the entire state. The Governor is a gifted artist who often provides foreign dignitaries with a drawing as a gift. The Governor's drawings are very reflective of the state's overall culture.

Manager Dragon and Mr. Nuñez affirmed the Chair's request and agreed to pursue the suggestion during the next cycle of design.

#### **Update on 19021 Capital Budget – Informational**

Chair Habib invited Assistant Director Frare to provide a status report on the capital budget.

Assistant Director Frare updated members on seven projects within the capital budget:

- ***East Plaza Infiltration & Elevator Repairs (Phase 5B)*** – The project is in progress, on schedule, and within budget. The Legislature approved another \$2.4 million for the project to repair underground electrical issues consisting of corroded conductors and water infiltrating some electrical vault rooms. Maintaining the project schedule is important for the Child Care Center project because the construction laydown area occupies the site of the new Child Care Center.
- ***Child Care Center*** – DES has pursued selection of the Design-Build team to complete the project. Initial screening identified three candidates and interviews have been scheduled. Following completion of the East Plaza project in December 2019, the Design-Build team will take possession of the construction laydown area.
- ***Cherberg and Insurance Buildings*** – Both buildings are scheduled for new roofs. The projects were advertized and contracts were awarded. DES has issued a notice to proceed on the projects. Both projects will be completed before the end of this year's construction season.
- ***Building Envelope Repair*** – The project involves repairs to the exterior sandstone on the Capital Courthouse Building located at the intersection of Capital Way and 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The sandstone constructed building requires some repairs in areas where sandstone has cracked. Some of the sandstone areas will be removed, cleaned, and replaced to preserve the envelope of the building.
- ***Newhouse Predesigns*** – An alternatives analysis was completed for the Newhouse Building with three alternatives identified and developed to a predesign stage. The typical process for predesign entails the owner selecting the alternative to move forward. For this particular project, the owner of the building is the Legislature. DES is seeking more guidance to select the preferred alternative to move forward. Meetings were scheduled with the administration of both the House and the Senate to ascertain which alternative to move forward.

- **Department of Transportation Building** – Predesign is currently underway to identify project alternatives. The committee is scheduled to receive a briefing at its next meeting. The DOT Building is similar to the ESD Building in that it was constructed in the 1960s and has not been seismically retrofitted.
- **Office of Insurance Commissioner** – DES is initiating work on the predesign of a new building for the Office of the Insurance Commissioner, who wants to be located on Capitol Campus. DES contacted other agencies to identify another potential anchor tenant. DES is evaluating different sites on the campus to include the GA site, ProArts site, and other sites identified in the budget proviso. Currently, the Insurance Commissioner has an office in the Insurance Building with most of the administration located in Tumwater in a leased building.

Chair Habib requested consideration of scheduling a briefing or an executive session (if necessary) on the results of the campus security study at the next meeting. Director Liu replied that although the security presentation has not been finalized at this time, it should be finalized in time to include it on the committee's agenda for the next meeting.

**Public Comments and Closing Remarks - Informational**

There were no public comments.

Chair Habib reported the next meeting of the SCC would be rescheduled and posted.

**Adjournment**

**With there being no further business, Chair Habib adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.**

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President,  
Puget Sound Meeting Services, [psmsoly@earthlink.net](mailto:psmsoly@earthlink.net)

*Approved by SCC at the September 19, 2019 Meeting without modifications.*

This page intentionally left blank.