

## MINUTES

### KANSAS CAPITOL RESTORATION COMMISSION

December 5, 2007  
Room 519-S—Statehouse

#### Members Present

Senator Stephen Morris, Chairperson  
Representative Melvin Neufeld, Vice-Chairperson  
Senator Anthony Hensley  
Senator Laura Kelly  
Representative Don Dahl  
Representative Bill Feuerborn  
Representative Joe Humerickhouse  
Representative Dennis McKinney  
Carol Foreman, Department of Administration  
(representing Secretary of Administration Duane Goossen)  
Steve Porter, McPherson  
David Fritchen, Manhattan  
Ron Chandler, Salina

#### Members Absent

Senator Derek Schmidt  
Senator Greta Goodwin  
Senator Dwayne Umbarger  
Representative Ray Merrick  
Representative Sharon Schwartz  
Lynn Jenkins, State Treasurer

#### Staff Present

Alan Conroy, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
J. G. Scott, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Raney Gilliland, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Mary Galligan, Kansas Legislative Research Department  
Mary Torrence, Revisor of Statutes Office

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Steve Morris. Senator Morris called upon Barry Greis, Statehouse Architect, who proceeded to introduce the conferees of the meeting to members of the Commission. A copy of the annual Statehouse Renovation Report was made available to the Commission members (Attachment 1). The report contained a CD which was used to aid the testimony of most of the conferees.

The first conferee was Mr. Mel Chastain of Mel Chastain Consulting, who described for Commission members the documentation of the Statehouse renovation project through the use of video technology. The video recording which Mr. Chastain showed demonstrated some of the issues which the architects and construction people encountered when conducting renovation work. The video chronicled issues both inside and outside of the Statehouse. He told the Commission that through the use of technology it was possible to record events, as well as to consider all of the potential options for resolving issues encountered during the renovation. He noted that the recording of events will allow those in the future to view the issues encountered and understand how those issues were addressed. A member asked whether it was possible to get this particular video distributed across the state so that citizens would understand what was occurring with respect to the Statehouse renovation project. The Chairperson encouraged Mr. Chastain to proceed with distribution of the video.

The next conferee was Vance Kelly with Treanor Architects, who is the Project Manager for the Statehouse renovation project. Mr. Kelly reviewed the construction of the Kansas Statehouse and told the Commission that the Senate wing of the Capitol was initiated in 1869 and completed in 1870. He noted that the main objective of the renovation project was to make the building a modern office building. Mr. Kelly proceeded to review both site and building issues. He noted that the first step when Statehouse renovation was initially considered was development of a master plan.

Mr. Kelly continued by discussing the phases of reconstruction. He spoke specifically about the exterior masonry restoration and reviewed the time line for the repair. He described how each stone on the Statehouse exterior was numbered and how an evaluation was made of each and every stone. A part of the video shown to the Commission illustrated patches made in previous exterior stone repair projects. He noted the dates of exterior repair projects over the last 40 years and indicated that some of them were of questionable quality. A portion of the video illustrated some of the stone failures on the exterior of the Statehouse. During the stone evaluation process, loose stones were removed for safety purposes. He concluded by indicating that there was a significant need for exterior stone repair and that the repair package was intended to last from 40 to 50 years.

Mr. Kelly then reviewed for the Commission the next phase of the Statehouse renovation project, which is the South Wing restoration package.

The next conferee was Jim Miller, Executive Vice-President of JE Dunn Company. Mr. Miller indicated that the work on the West Wing renovation should be completed by the end of the year. He also discussed that the next phase would be the South Wing and said that the plan for that phase of the project is being prepared. He stated that this phase is to include renovation of some legislative offices, the rotunda, and the cage elevator. He noted that the south stairs from the fifth floor to the fourth floor would be reopened. He also stated the skylights would be uncovered.

Mr. Bill Spillar, Assistant Vice-President of JE Dunn Company, discussed the selection process undertaken to determine which company would be awarded the contract for the exterior masonry project. Mr. Spillar stated that the project would take four years to complete. He described which portions of the Statehouse would be addressed first and how the scaffolding would be constructed.

Mr. Spillar stated that there is only a small number of companies in either Canada or the United States that are capable of successfully completing a project the size of the Kansas Statehouse exterior masonry project. He noted that a pre-qualification survey questionnaire was sent to 12 companies in the United States and Canada. Only five companies replied. He noted that the other seven companies did not have the ability to complete the Kansas project. He stated that of the remaining five respondents, two companies withdrew their interest in the project. He also stated that each of the remaining three companies had significant experience in the area of exterior masonry renovation similar to the Kansas Statehouse. He noted that one company had completed work on Union Station and the Liberty Memorial in Kansas City; another had completed work on the Montana Statehouse; and the third had done work on buildings along Michigan Avenue in Chicago, as well as completing work on the Nebraska Statehouse. All three companies submitted bids and all presented different approaches to the exterior work. He told the Commission that representatives of all three companies came to Topeka and were interviewed. The company selected for the project is Marketing Qualified Stone Restoration Company. It also was the lowest cost bid received.

As a part of the discussion, Mr. Spillar explained the potential for renovation of the copper on the dome. He noted that one of the requirements for such a restoration was construction of scaffolding which would be in place for the exterior stone renovation project. He stated that if the renovation of the dome takes place in the year 2010, the scaffolding will be in place. No decision on dome renovation has been made.

Mr. Miller returned to the podium to discuss building costs and reviewed pie charts in Attachment 1 which illustrate eastern Kansas building cost indices. He noted that metals such as steel and copper had increased in price significantly since the Statehouse renovation project began.

Mr. Greis returned to the podium and reviewed for the Commission the phases of the project, comparing the amount of time estimated with the amount of time actually taken to complete different phases of the project. He noted that the West Wing phase is approximately five weeks behind schedule. Mr. Greis also reviewed other time lines contained in Attachment 1, tab E.

Mr. Greis stated that the exterior masonry repair project cost estimate is \$38,780,152. He also stated that the total cost for the project to date is approximately \$211 million, including the masonry repair. He also noted that the new projected total cost for the project is \$285 million. Mr. Greis noted for the Commission some of the elements of the current plan which were not a part of the original plan for the Statehouse renovation project, including the garage, visitors center, and extensive exterior repairs. One member asked about the extent of energy efficiency improvements with the new heating and cooling systems. Mr. Greis replied that the total utility bill would be about the same even after the addition of some 118,000 square feet of space to the Statehouse. This savings is a result of greater efficiency of the new systems.

Another member asked Mr. Greis about the cost of the exterior stone work and wondered if the bid amount was more than what was originally anticipated. Mr. Greis replied that the stone work was approximately \$28 million more than originally projected. He also stated that the next lowest bid was \$10 million more than the accepted bid, and that the third bid was \$15 million more than the accepted bid.

One member asked about the potential of sealing the exterior stone work once the renovation was completed. The member was told that the sun deteriorates the sealer and that with such a large building, constant re-application of sealant would be required. Another member asked whether the bid provided for the exterior was a guaranteed price. Mr. Greis replied that it was. Another member asked whether materials were purchased in advance in order to avoid the ever-increasing costs of building materials. Mr. Greis responded that the project material cost was a function of the price at the time of purchase. Another member asked whether the bid for the stone work included the cost

of stone facing for the new area on the north side, both interior and exterior. Mr. Greis replied that this bid amount does not cover that cost, but that it does include reinstalling the exterior steps on the north. Finally, a member asked whether the plaster difficulties encountered in the West Wing caused a portion of the delay of that phase of the renovation. Mr. Greis replied that the plaster issue was part of the reason for this portion being delayed.

*Representative Neufeld made a motion to approve the presentation to the Commission and to recommend that authority be given to issue bonds sufficient to cover the \$38.8 million stone restoration costs and related bond expenses through K DFA. The motion was seconded by Representative Humerickhouse. The motion passed.*

The meeting of the Capitol Restoration Commission was adjourned.

Prepared by Raney Gilliland

Approved by Commission on:

January 11, 2008

(Date)