520/05 CAP

# CAPITOL COMMISSION MEETING

APRIL 20, 1987

# MAY 13 1987 DIV. OF FACILITIES MANAGEMENT Dept. of Finance & Administration

# MINUTES

Capitol Commission Members Attending: Treasurer Steve Adams, Representative John Bragg, Secretary of State Gentry Crowell, Chairman Amon Evans, Charles Harrison for Comptroller William Snodgrass, Senator Douglas Henry, Commissioner Hov Stephenson.

Chairman Amon Evans read the minutes from the last Commission meeting. Minutes Approved.

Agenda Item No. 1: Use of the State Capitol.

Jerry Daniels reported that the Capitol Commission's policy for non-governmental use of the State Capitol building and grounds was in place and functioning very well. Mr. Daniels raised the question of whether "use of the Capitol" included flying flags from the cupola flagpole other than the State or National flag. If flag flying does constitute "use of the Capitol," it would come under the jurisdiction of the Capitol Commission to determine which flags should be allowed to be raised there.

Representative Bragg suggested that flags other than the State or National flag should not be flown over our State Capitol without special prior approval from the Capitol Commission and that provision be made for other such flags to be flown somewhere over the Legislative Plaza on appropriate occasions. Senator Henry made a motion that it should be the Capitol Commission's position that the use of a flag on the Capitol building is a matter within the scope of the Commission's assignment. Commissioner Stephenson seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED.

Agenda Item No. 2: Presentation of Design Scheme: Phase Two Capitol Restoration

Mike Fitts reported that the State Building Commission has approved the scope of the work that the Commission approved and design schemes are being pursued. The design has been approved by the Building Commission with the exception of the second floor work which they basically have approved contingent upon approval by the two Speakers.

The architects, Charles Warterfield and Marion Fowlkes, presented the plan for the Phase Two Restoration for the purpose of updating the Commission with regard to plans and design.

Mr. Warterfield reported that work to be done on the ground floor includes providing handicapped toilets, asbestos removal and the installation of a fire suppression system. Installation of new carpet, painting, etc. will occur in the ground floor offices as well. The first floor is where the majority of work will occur during this phase of the restoration. The corridors will be restored, new chandeliers will be installed, the ceilings will be repainted. The Supreme Court will be restored back to its documented period with new lighting fixtures,

carpet, drapes, etc. The Governor's suite will also have new carpet, drapes, new painting, etc. The Constitutional offices and their support staff will also have the new carpet, drapes, etc. A new toilet is to be installed behind the stairs. Work on the second floor will include cleaning the walls and floor as well as the chandeliers. There is also a proposed concessions kiosk about which the Commission will need to give some direction.

Senator Henry asked whether there was any feasibility to putting a men's washstand and toilet area more immediatly convenient to the chambers. Mr. Warterfield stated that he did not know of a way to do that without compromising the building; that perhaps when the House and Senate chambers themselves are restored, that more convenient toilets might be addressed.

The design scheme for the kiosk was presented by the architects. explained that the current design is that of a square permanent structure with telephone booths on each corner and counter space on three sides. is roughly compatible with the vestibules on the first floor corridors. wood structure with glass panels. The open parts can be closed and secured. Senator Henry asked that an alternative might be considered for making the kiosk disconnectable, so that when the legislature is not in session, the Representative Bragg suggested that having a structure can be moved. self-serve food service might cut down on congestion. Mr. Mesick stated that in locating the kiosk, the Commission would be faced with the difficulty of conforming to exit code requirements; that in trying to come up with a design solution, the architects had to consider how to remove congestion from the only Mesick stated that he believed that having a kiosk located on the side walls would clutter the grandeur of the space. Representative Bragg requested that Blind Services should be consulted before a final decision is The Commission decided to request further presentations for the design of the kiosk before making any recommendation to the Building Commission.

Plans for the exterior sitework were presented by the architects. Warterfield stated that they had made great efforts to make the new pathway system (stroll garden) as historically correct as possible. Although under the current grading conditions, the paths cannot be exactly as they were, the routing is nonetheless the same. The paths will be of compacted limestone aggregate. Mr. Evans raised the question of whether or not we will be doing something (by creating the path system) that we will have to redo at a later Mr. Fitts and Mr. Mesick responed to Mr. Evans' question. Mr. Fitts stated that we are consistent with the Historic Structure Report in doing the path system with the exception of two things: (1) the HSR recommends that we have a bus turn around (an inexpensive change) and (2) the proposed revision of the south entrance. Mr. Mesick stated that the paths are very important. That they offer something on a much more intimate scale than the building itself for visitors to enjoy, and it allows for access to the statues on the grounds. Mr. Mesick stated that he sees no problem with future work upsetting the path system.

Warterfield/Ehrenkrantz gave an account of their process of acquiring the proper lighting fixtures for the Capitol. The fixtures that we require are no longer made. W/E is in the process of trying to acquire one such chandelier in order to have copies made (bid out the reproduction). The chandeliers will eventually go in the Supreme Court Chamber, the Constitutional offices and the corridor.

Senator Henry stated that he thought the Capitol Commission ought to consider the advisibility of maintaining as a central feature in the Legislative Library the portrait of William G. Brownlow, especially in light of the great number of tourists and school children who will visit the room. He stated that he didn't think we ought to have William G. Brownlow as a central feature in the Legislative Library to present to our visitors.

Mr. Evans stated that Brownlow's portrait provided us with the pattern of the original carpet in the Capitol, but that the Commission, until it has a full-time curator, can make recommendations about what is placed in the building.

Senator Henry stated that he would like to move that some other arrangement be made to display a portrait of Governor Brownlow in some area other than its present central place in the Library.

Dr. Jim Kelly of the Tennessee State Museum explained why Brownlow had been chosen to hang in the Library; that it was a recommendation from the Furnishings and Decoration Subcommittee as it is the only painting known that depicts the interior of the Capitol at the period - 1866. It depicts the furniture and the carpet, etc...

Mr. Evans stated that at some time in the future, there will be a reorganization of the pictures and recommendations from this Commission on the use of all the Governors' and the Speakers' portraits in the Capitol.

Mr. Bragg suggested that the Brownlow portrait could be moved to the Museum and tour guides might mention that the carpet depicted in the portrait can be seen in the Legislative Library of the State Capitol.

Mr. Evans stated that another place for the portrait would be found.

Meeting Adjourned.

# FURNISHINGS AND DECORATION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

# APRIL 20, 1987

## CARPET:

Mike Fitts reported that the F&D Committee has approved patterns, without colors, for the first floor offices. The issue about the carpet is whether or not to request a sole source procurement procedure for carpet from Henry A. Dornsife and Sons for the Governor's office and for the Supreme Court. Carpet for the Constitutional offices can be competitively bid.

The issue of whether or not the Governor's office ought to have carpet that has not been competitively bid was raised. Mr. Mesick pointed out that Mr. Dornsife is a truly unique resource; that he owns the historic point papers. He also added that the carpet is not being bought for the man currently holding the office of Governor, rather it is being bought for the office of Governor, itself. Therefore, the best that is available ought to be used.

The committee voted to approve the Dornsife design and color scheme for the Supreme Court and to recommend sole source procedure for same. They also decided to consult the Governor's office before recommending sole source procedure form Dornsife for that office's carpet.

### CHANDELIER:

Jim Thompson from Waterfield/Ehrenkrantz reported that an eight arm chandelier like we would like to have is extremely difficult to find. He reported that he has contacted a man from Wisconsin who owns a chandelier that we would like to purchase. The man is a craftsman and artist and does reproductions of parts of chandeliers. He has thus far refused to sell us his original, but says he will make reproductions for us at a cost of \$17,500 each - if we buy at least three of them.

It was generally concluded that this was an extremely high price and that W/E would continue to negotiate with him in hopes that he will eventually agree to sell the original.