

MINUTES

KANSAS CAPITOL RESTORATION COMMISSION

December 14, 2006
Room 519-S—Statehouse

Members Present

Representative Doug Mays, Chairperson
Senator Stephen Morris, Vice-Chairperson
Senator Jim Barone
Senator Greta Goodwin
Senator Derek Schmidt
Senator Dwayne Umbarger
Representative Clay Aurand
Representative Bill Feuerborn
Representative Joe Humerickhouse
Representative Dennis McKinney
Representative Ray Merrick
Representative Melvin Neufeld

Members Absent

Senator Anthony Hensley
Lynn Jenkins, State Treasurer
Duane Goossen, Secretary, Department of Administration

Staff Present

Alan Conroy, Kansas Legislative Research Department
J. G. Scott, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Raney Gilliland, Kansas Legislative Research Department

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Doug Mays. Representative Mays called upon Barry Greis, Statehouse Architect, who proceeded to give Commission members the annual update on the Capitol Restoration project. Mr. Greis introduced Mr. Mike Treanor and Vance Kelly of Treanor Architects, and Dirk Shafer of J.E. Dunn Construction.

Mr. Treanor was called upon to discuss the building design and Architecture Report (Attachment 1). Mr. Treanor then turned to Mr. Kelly who described the history of construction of the Kansas Statehouse. Mr. Kelly described the original architect who was hired to design the structure. He noted that lawmakers at the time decided that the State could not construct the building all at one time. Therefore, it was decided to construct the building in phases starting with the East Wing, which

would eventually become the Senate Chamber. However, initially it housed much of state government. He noted that the West Wing was constructed in 1870's, and that when the West Wing was completed it had been constructed exclusively for the House. Mr. Kelly stated that when the West Wing was completed, the East Wing was revamped to house the Senate. He noted with comparison that legislators were anxious to occupy the building and, even though it was not complete, they came back in and used it in an uncompleted state.

Mr. Kelly stated that by 1903, the exterior shell of the building was completed. However, even at that point, not all of the construction work was completely done. The members of the Commission learned that the Statehouse had a major renovation in 1917. This renovation is the one that the architects and construction personnel are using to be the model for the current restoration. Mr. Kelly then asked Mr. Treanor to continue the presentation and to discuss the design objectives:

These are found in Attachment 1:

- Site Issues
 - Parking
 - "Front Door"
 - Improve Site Utilities Infrastructure
- Building Issues
 - Add Usable Floor Area
 - Preserve and Restore Historic Features
 - Modernize Utilities
 - Phase Construction while Building is occupied

In addition, Mr. Treanor reviewed additional design objectives:

- Repair and Replace windows;
- Replace existing stone; and
- Update wiring and other major infrastructure.

Mr. Treanor indicated that the project construction plan is for the North Wing to be completed last and that the work would continue to proceed out the north through what would become the Visitor's Center. Members heard a review of how each of the four underground vaults are used and that a portion of each is dedicated for office space.

Members were shown some before and after photos of the East Wing, along with some of the decorative painting which has taken place. Pictures of the Senate Chamber were shown, including pictures of the light fixtures and other attributes. The Commission members were told that there was very little original hardware available, but it was possible to duplicate the pattern and new hardware was manufactured.

Mr. Treanor reviewed some renovation activities in the West Wing. He noted that there was much more decorative painting in the West Wing than in the East Wing. Mr. Treanor stated that much of the molding is being replaced and described the process being used to duplicate some of the more intricate designs. He also discussed the uncovering of the skylights and the use of various material and the replacement of certain flooring.

Mr. Treanor then referred the members back to Mr. Kelly who discussed the exterior masonry conditions. Mr. Kelly stated that there had been a great deal of time spent on documenting and

analyzing the condition of the exterior stone work. In the discussion of analyzing the stone, the members learned that the East Wing is constructed with Junction City limestone, while the remainder of the building is made of Cottonwood limestone. The members learned that they have started the process of quarrying some of the Junction City limestone. In addition, they have scanned all of the exterior limestone to determine whether or not it needs to be replaced. In this process each exterior stone has been numbered and has been evaluated individually.

Several video clips of the exterior evaluation were shown and indicated the types of failures which were being found. The report indicates that even some of the prior repair work is failing. Several pieces of stone from the exterior were shown to the members of the Commission. Completion of the exterior evaluation will take place in the Spring. Once the evaluation is complete, then the repair work could be placed out for bid.

Dick Shafer from J.E. Dunn then appeared before the Commission. Mr. Shafer discussed the reconstruction of both the East Wing and the West Wing. He also described the process of budgeting for the project and discussed the issue of inflation.

Mr. Shafer noted that they are wrapping up on a "punch list" for the East Wing and that infrastructure construction is continuing in the West Wing. Also mentioned was the issue of the sealer on the ground level stone which is not adhering. He stated they are still not sure what the cause had been, and therefore no decision has been made how to correct the situation.

Mr. Shafer then turned his attention to cost estimation. He noted that in the past they had used a company by the name of ENR to estimate costs, because the entity provided a Kansas City market analysis. Because of the estimate not being on target, J.E. Dunn decided to generate its own index. It was further noted that commodity prices continue to rise. The index does indicate that inflation will continue in the low double digit range (in the range of 11-12 percent) through 2007.

Barry Greis returned to speak to the Commission members. He indicated that the time line for completion of the project had been extended from April of 2011 until October of 2011.

Mr. Greis also reviewed the Capitol Restoration Quarterly Report which indicates the budget for the project. Mr. Greis indicated that the cost is at approximately \$172.5 million, excluding the final phase, the cost of which has yet to be determined. Mr. Greis proceeded to review the remainder of Attachment 1.

One of the Commission members asked about the amount of the fees for the architects and the contracting company. In response, Mr. Greis stated that the original agreement is that the architectural and engineering fees are a percentage of the construction cost. The member stated that the basis of his question was that if input costs increase over the period of the construction project, then so do the architectural and engineering fees. Mr. Greis confirmed that this was how the contract was negotiated.

Another question concerned the elevation of the floor in the House Chamber. Mr. Greis stated that the current plans have the design being flat with a raised podium which would be accessible to the disabled. In response, Mr. Greis stated that even though the floor of the Chamber was being designed as flat, it was possible to design the Chamber with some elevation. Commission discussion indicated that the more the floor elevation is increased, the more inaccessible it is by the disabled.

Senator Morris made a motion that the Capitol Restoration Commission recommend that the Governor's FY 2008 budget in the Department of Administration include \$55 million in additional bonding authority for capitol restoration and that the Capitol Restoration Commission accept, and

recommend to the Legislative Coordinating Council, the Capitol Restoration Commission presentation and report dated December 14, 2006 made to the Commission. Representative Aurand seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The meeting of the Capitol Restoration Commission was then adjourned.

Prepared by Raney Gilliland

Approved by Commission on:

December 29, 2006

(Date)