

CAPITOL SPACE STUDY
August 29, 1982

PRELIMINARY ALLOCATION OPTIONS:

OPTION 1:

- Capture portion of south ground floor corridor space for the following:
 - Senate journal and indexing (600 s.f.)
 - Fiscal bureau currently using loaned house space (off legislative dining) (240 s.f.)
 - Employment relations (680 s.f.)
 - 2 senator offices and secretary (180 s.f.)
- Absorb rules coordinator into Governor's space (1 secretary, 1 administrator) on ground floor
- Flip flop portion of Comptroller with vacated Employment Relations office to balance space needs
- Shift legislative dining to vacated senate journal and fiscal space
- Add 2 800 s.f. meeting rooms; one in vacated legislative dining, one in vacated Employment Relations
- Add 2 small meeting rooms (first floor); one in vacated senate indexing space, one in vacated office space
- Shift cafeteria seating to east corridor

PROS:

- No one moves out of Capitol building
- Gains 2 large, 2 small meeting rooms

CONS:

- Uses corridor space
- Further squeezes cafeteria seating
- Step backwards relative to restoration
- Does not fully address scope of problem

SUBOPTIONS:

OPTION 1A:

- Same as 1, except Treasurer and Auditor move to Lucas Building

PROS:

- Frees space for additional meeting rooms and offices on first floor

CONS:

- Violates 100 year tradition of presence of elected officials in Capitol
- Expense of vault relocation for treasurer ()
- Uses Lucas space needed for other purposes
- Compromises ties to Comptroller for Auditor and Treasurer, and ties to Governor for Auditor

OPTION 1B:

- Same as 1, except Fiscal and Service bureaus move to Lucas Building

PROS:

- Provides 4,200 s.f. for meeting rooms and offices on 2nd, 3rd and 3rd mezz.
- Unifies Fiscal with accounting division, Service with Code Editor

CONS:

- Fiscal and Service remote (9 vs. 3 minute walk)
- Uses Lucas space needed for other purposes
- Operational time, efficiency, and dollar impact on legislative functions

OPTION 1C:

- Combine options 1A and 1B

OPTION 1D:

- Same as 1A, 1B, 1C, except shift to historical building in lieu of Lucas

CONS:

- Poor link to Capitol; no tunnel presently
- Availability of space

OPTION 2:

- Move the following to Lucas Building:
 - Fiscal Bureau
 - Service Bureau
 - Senate Journal
 - Employment relations
 - Based on long range needs, requires approximately 10,000 s.f. (net)
- Shift part of legislative dining into vacated senate journal and Fiscal space on ground floor
- Shift part of Treasurer to vacated legislative dining space; provide dedicated stair link between first and Ground floor Treasurer spaces; add one 800 s.f. meeting room in vacated first floor space
- Shift Comptroller to vacated Employment Relations space and into captured ground floor corridor space; shift part of first floor Auditor space to vacated Comptroller space on ground floor; provide dedicated stair between first and ground floor Auditor spaces; add one 800 s.f. meeting room and 2 200 s.f. meeting rooms in vacated first floor space
- Use vacated fiscal space on Level Two for additional lobbyists space (212 s.f.), and additional conference space (1 @ 140, 1@ 400, 1@ 70) for joint use
- Use vacated service space on Level Three and Level Three mezzanine to relieve office overcrowding

PROS:

- Unifies Fiscal
- Unifies Service with Code
- Adds meeting rooms (2 large, 5 small)
- Adds office space, lobbyists space, relieves crowding

CONS:

- Fiscal and Service remote (9 minutes vs. 3 minutes)
- Lucas space needed for other
- Splits Treasurer and Auditor
- Journal and Indexing remote
- Employment Relations remote from Governor

- Does not meet long range needs
- Cost

SUBOPTIONS:

OPTION 2A:

- Same as 1, except Service bureau stays in Capitol building
- Eliminates potential space on Level Three and Level Three mezzanine to relieve office overcrowding
- Reduce Lucas space need to 6,525 s.f. (net) (still includes code editor)

PROS:

- Uses less Lucas space
- Service no longer remote from chambers
- Still gain meeting rooms

CONS:

- Does not relieve office crowding
- Service and Code Editor split

OPTION 2B:

- Same as 1A, except Fiscal also stays in Capitol building

PROS:

- Fiscal no longer remote from chambers
- Still gain first floor meeting rooms
- Reduces Lucas space need to 3,680 s.f. (net)

CONS:

- Fiscal split from accounting function
- Does not relieve office crowding

OPTION 2C:

- Same as 1, except Treasurer and Auditor move to Lucas also (entire functions)

PROS:

- Provide additional first floor space for meeting rooms and offices
- Would not be necessary to displace Comptroller

CONS:

- Violates 100 year tradition of presence of elected officials in Capitol building
- Expense of vault relocation for Treasurer
- Further use of Lucas space needed for other functions
- Compromises ties to Comptroller for Auditor and Treasurer, and ties to Governor for Auditor
- Does not really amount to significant improvement over present situation

OPTION 2D:

- Same as 1, except move occurs to historical building in lieu of Lucas Building

CONS:

- Poor link to Capitol; no tunnel presently
- Availability of space

OPTION 3:

- Build new underground space east of and adjacent to Capitol for the following:
 - Fiscal Bureau
 - Service Bureau (with Code Editor)
 - New additional meeting rooms (both chambers)
 - New committee chair offices and secretarial space
 - New space for legislator offices and secretaries
 - Support spaces (toilets, mech., etc.)
 - Based on long range needs, requires approximately 34,000 BGSF
- Vacate mezzanine spaces
- Provide elevator in northeast and southeast building corners immediately flanking east stairs; provides direct link between new underground level and existing ground, first, second and third levels

PROS:

- Unifies Fiscal Bureau
- Unifies Service with Code Editor
- Adds new meeting rooms
- Adds new office space
- Vacates mezzanines; steps towards restoring
- Avoids significant splits; good elevator connection
- Meets long term space needs
- Doesn't use needed Lucas space
- Good handicap/public access
- Initial step towards realization of mall project
- Preserves legislative staff flexibility, which is key to efficiency in small State government

CONS:

- Cost

OPTION 3A:

- Same as 3, except mezzanines are left in

PROS:

- Reduce amount of new construction by approximately 7,000 BGSF

CONS:

- Perpetuates present inadequate conditions
- Negates progress towards restoration of Capitol

OPTION 3B:

- Same as 3, except new elevators left out

PROS:

- Save on cost
- Save space otherwise occupied by elevators

CONS:

- Introduces more critical time and convenience factor for interaction between existing Capitol functions and new underground functions
- Compromises handicap/public accessibility

OPTION 3C:

- Same as 3, except build new underground cafeteria space also

PROS:

- Improves cafeteria facilities
- Step towards proper restoration of Capitol building

CONS:

- Additional cost

OPTION 3D:

- Same as 3A, except build new underground space for Fiscal, Service, and legislator's offices only; requires approximately 19,000 BGSF

PROS:

- Save on cost

CONS:

- Does not fully address needs, or resolve present deficiencies

OPTION 3E:

- Same as 3, except shift occurs to Lucas Building, instead of new space underground

PROS:

- Cost

CONS:

- Fiscal and Service remote (9 vs 3 minute walk)
- Uses Lucas space needed for other functions
- Split compromises legislative staff flexibility, which is key to efficiency in small State government