

MINUTES OF THE CAPITOL RESTORATION COMMISSION

JUN 9 2000

The joint meeting of the Capitol Restoration Commission and the Joint Committee on State Building Construction, was called to order by Senator Bond, at 4:45 PM on March 11, 1999 in Room 220-S of the Capitol.

All members were present.

Commission staff present:

Bill Wolff, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Rae Anne Davis, Kansas Legislative Research Department

Advisory Staff Present:

Bill Groth, Statehouse Architect
Jim Reardon, Division of Facilities Management
Ramon Powers, Kansas State Historical Society
Courtney Swan, Kansas State Historical Society
Jeff Russell, Legislative Administrative Services

Chairman Bond said that the Department of Administration (DOA) will review how the Capitol restoration project should be approached.

Chairman Kline said that the request for this meeting arose during last week's Building Committee meeting during the reviewing of the Department of Administration's capital improvement budget, as the Committee does not know the priorities for the work that is necessary in the Capitol Building.

Jim Reardon, Director of Facilities Management, DOA, presented to the Commission a Capitol restoration and rehabilitation status report (Attachment 1). Mr. Reardon asked the Commission if they want the project to be a renovation or remodeling. Two sets of questionnaires - programming issues and scope issues (Attachments 2 and 3) were handed out in order to obtain feed back from members.

The Department of Administration has never been involved with such a restoration of a major structure like the Capitol building. Restoration and rehabilitation of the Capitol Building is one of the State's most challenging undertakings. Mr. Reardon noted that the 1967 the current mechanical system was installed in a manner that destroyed portions of the Statehouse and did not integrate into the structure. The architect and representatives of Facilities Management visited Iowa, Minnesota and most recently Wisconsin to tour those restored capitols. They have been consulting with the architect and the contractor who worked on Wisconsin's capitol.

They reported learning by visiting other state capitols that major restorations begin with careful planning. Capitol restoration plans are complex, multi-phased and require years of focus, dedication and commitment. Experienced preservation architects and engineers must develop a historical structures report consisting of four major elements 1) historical building documentation, 2) existing building

condition analysis, 3) master preservation plan, and 4) master space needs analysis and development program.

Project scope should be large enough to achieve maximum impact, minimum disruption and economy of scale. A wing is the logical unit size due to the need for vertical access to the infrastructure. A multi-year commitment of planning and development money should be held in trust for the Capitol Restoration Commission to utilize in implementing the master plan for the on-going development. Temporary relocation of personnel outside the building may be necessary to achieve maximum project efficiency.

Bill Groth, Statehouse architect noted that an historical structures report will give the Commission a master guide, determine what should be preserved, replicated or enhanced. The report will define projects that could be done in a logical order, funding to be done in a logical order, and give costs of each of the projects. The study will also determine the technological needs of the building occupants and identify the scope, phases and cost estimates of the work. It will also determine what personnel will be temporarily relocated outside the Capitol while the restoration is done. This report should be done within the next eight months.

Mr. Groth anticipated total length of time would be eight years and total cost estimated at \$80 million (\$200 per square foot) for total restoration and rehabilitation of the Statehouse. Other states have allowed 10 years and those years are sometimes extended.

The Commission directed Bill Groth to proceed with the historical structures report.

The meeting adjourned.

Approved May 24, 2000

Joint Committee on Building & Construction
Thursday March 11, 1999

Jim Reardon, Director
Bill Groth, Statehouse Architect

Department of Administration
Division of Facilities Management

Status Report: Capitol Restoration & Rehabilitation

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: Thank You for the opportunity to provide this perspective on Capitol Restoration and Rehabilitation.

The Kansas Statehouse is a wonderful unity of architecture and art. Restoration and Rehabilitation of our Capitol Building is one of the State's most challenging undertakings. After years of "remodeling" many spaces within the building have entirely lost their historic reference. Dropped ceilings, fluorescent lighting, exposed communication lines and numerous coats of paint have redefined the building and obliterated the original character and beauty. In 1967 the current mechanical system was installed in a manner that destroyed portions of the Statehouse and did not integrate into the structure.

Several years ago, a light fixture was removed from the ceiling of the House Chamber revealing a small panel of artwork lying just beneath the ceiling paint. Last year's decision by the legislature to fund historical paint analysis resulted in the partial restoration of the stunningly beautiful House Chamber. Moreover, it provided an exciting glimpse of forgotten beauty and artistic treasures lying beneath decades of plaster and paint throughout the building.

Restoration and Rehabilitation of the Statehouse

On March 2, 1999, the House Budget Committee recommended funding for "intensive restoration" of the Statehouse. Noting many years of neglect, the Budget Committee recommended restoring its "original grandeur". "As responsible stewards of the Statehouse", the committee wrote, "it is the Legislature's obligation to maintain the Capitol Building for future generations."

Given the amazing transformation of the House Chamber at the conclusion of the 1998 legislative session, it is tempting to seek further "instant" successes. The Legislature has discussed similar transformations of meeting rooms and other strategic spaces. As stewards of the Statehouse however, it is incumbent upon us to recognize the *entire structure* is essentially "functionally obsolete".

Heating, ventilation, air conditioning, electrical, plumbing and communications systems have lived out their useful lives. Roof leakage and water damage threaten the integrity of the structure and the air quality within the building. Hazardous materials such as asbestos and lead paint need to be removed. ADA, fire safety, and other long ignored building codes need to be complied with. Security enhancements need to be incorporated into the structure. Archival sources need to be visited and consultants obtained. Much planning lies ahead if we are to update the infrastructure and "restore the Statehouse to its original grandeur."

*Capitol Restoration Commission
March 11, 1999
Attachment 1*

Restoration and Rehabilitation Planning Steps

Capitol Restoration Committee members learned by visiting other State Capitols that major restorations begin with careful planning. Capitol Restoration plans are complex, multi-phased and require years of focus, dedication and commitment. Experienced preservation architects and engineers must develop a *Historical Structures Report* consisting of 4 major elements:

1. Historical Building Documentation

- Studies the original construction and subsequent alterations
- Identifies and assesses the remaining historic fabric (condition analysis)
- Assesses the structural stability of key building components

2. Existing Building Condition Analysis

- Identifies and assesses the condition of all existing building components

3. Master Preservation Plan

- Develops preservation philosophy
- Defines levels of preservation
- Determines elements to be restored, replicated, or enhanced
- Identifies and selects appropriate historic features to be preserved in public, semi-public, and private areas

4. Master Space Needs Analysis and Development Program

- Will describe spatial relationships and technology needs of the occupants
- Identifies project scope, phases, cost estimates and schedules
- Determines temporary and permanent relocation assignments

Planning Assumptions and Goals

Every effort should be made to save, incorporate and preserve historic building elements and fabric, particularly in the public areas. Significant historic features should also be retained or replicated in meeting rooms and offices. Modern technology and safety and security enhancements should be incorporated when practical. Offices and committee rooms should be expanded to meet present and future space needs.

Project scope should be large enough to achieve maximum impact, minimum disruption and economy of scale. A wing is the maximum logical unit size due to the need for vertical access to the infrastructure. A multi-year commitment of planning and development money should be held in trust for the CRC to utilize in implementing the Master Plan. Temporary relocation of personnel outside the capitol may be necessary to achieve maximum project efficiency.

1-2

Proposed FY 2000 Building Projects (Can be completed before Master Plan is developed).

- *Copper dome restoration and repair*
- *HVAC, plumbing, electrical, telecommunications existing conditions report*
- Basic Fire detection system backbone
- Additional 1st floor women's toilet facilities*
- Development of Historic Structures Report
- Exterior Stone repair
- Senate column restoration*
- Senate chamber wall & ceiling restoration*

Summary

Since the first cornerstone was laid October 17, 1866 the Capitol Building was intended to be a symbol of our tenacity, pride, vision and courage. In this competitive world, the image of our State and the symbols of our Statehouse continue to be as important as our reputation for friendliness and the outstanding work ethic of our people.

The Capitol Building was built stone by stone, year by year, wing by wing, phase by phase. Restoration and Renovation can occur in the same manner. Economically and historically speaking, the time has never been better. As we journey into the next Millennium, it is our responsibility as "trustees" of this 100 year old monumental structure to rededicate ourselves to preserving and restoring its proud heritage and character for generations to come. At the same time, we must undertake the task of making it technologically compatible for current Information Age users.

* Funding not requested in DFM budget

SCOPE ISSUES

Planning Questionnaire

1. Will this be a comprehensive Restoration and Rehabilitation of private and support space?
2. Will this project include the exterior as well as the interior?
3. Will work on the Capitol Park be included as a separate package?
4. In general, will building automation systems be repaired, upgraded or replaced?
5. In general, will security systems be implemented?
6. Will interior lighting systems be repaired, upgraded or replaced?
7. Will exterior lighting systems be repaired, upgraded or replaced?
8. Will fire detection & alarm systems be included?
9. Will there be a café space, library or museum space within the building?

SCOPE ISSUES

10. Will historic replica carpets, drapes, clocks, and hardware be utilized throughout the private spaces?
11. Will original windows, woodwork and ceilings be preserved?
12. Will all artwork and scagliola be conserved?
13. Will original skylights be reopened?
14. Will comprehensive wayfinding and signage be included?
15. What are furniture needs?
16. Are present elevators adequate?

PROGRAMMING ISSUES

Planning Questionnaire

1. Has a comprehensive space and equipment needs program been developed for the present/future Capitol occupants?

2. Has a relocation plan been developed for present occupants who may permanently move out of the Capitol?

3. Has a relocation plan been developed for present occupants who may temporarily move out of the Capitol?

4. What will be the preferred project timeline for the Restoration & Rehabilitation of the Capitol?

5. Has a survey of existing utility capacities been conducted for the Capitol?
(Electrical capacity, steam and chilled water capacity, storm and sanitary sewer capacity, telecommunication capacity, building automation capacity.)

6. Does a comprehensive site survey exist?
(Utilities, landscape features, drives/walks/parking, tunnels and monuments.)

7. What are the historic milestones and key events for the next 5 years?

PROGRAMMING ISSUES

8. How does the Capitol Restoration Commission interface with the project team?
9. Is it practical to break the project up into several phases, such as one wing at a time?
10. Will a management plan be developed for the long term care of the Capitol when the project is completed?
11. What are the initial thoughts on code compliance related to enclosed stairs, egress distances, fire suppression, areas of rescue assistance and full/partial ADA compliance?