

AGENDA
INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
June 20, 2012
5:30 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

- 1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA** **1 min.**

- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT** **10 min.**
Public Comment Note: This is the place on the agenda where the public is invited to address the Authority on any issue. The person speaking is requested to sign-in on the General Public Comment Form for submittal to the Clerk of the Board. When your name is called, step up to the podium and give your name and address for the audio record. If you are unable to utilize the podium, you will be provided a microphone at your seat. Citizens testifying are asked to limit testimony to three minutes.

- 3. CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT** *(Faith Hagenhofer)* **3 min.**

- 4. CONSENT AGENDA** **3 min.**
 - A. Purchase of Software Licenses:** Authorize the General Manager to issue a purchase order for \$58,632.98, including tax, to the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services for the software upgrades and licenses shown in the attachment to this item. *(Marilyn Hemmann)*

 - B. Transportation Improvement Program Adoption:** Adopt the 2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Federal Transit Administration funding. *(Bob Holman)*

 - C. Schedule a Public Hearing on the Transit Development Plan:** Schedule a public hearing for July 18, 2012, 5:30 p.m. for the purpose of receiving and considering public comments on the annual Transit Development Plan: 2011 Summary and the 2012 - 2017 Plan. *(Dennis Bloom)*

 - D. Special Meeting:** Cancel the July 4, 2012, Intercity Transit Authority regular meeting due to the holiday, and schedule a special meeting for July 18, 2012, to conduct the regular business of the Transit Authority. *(Rhodetta Seward).*

5. **2012 BICYCLE COMMUTER CONTEST UPDATE** (*Duncan Green*) **15 min.**
6. **UPDATE ON FEDERAL ACTIVITY** (*Mike Harbour/Dale Learn/ Travis Lumpkin*) **20 min.**
7. **VANPOOL FARES - COST RECOVERY** (*Ben Foreman/Carolyn Newsome*) **20 min.**
8. **CITY OF OLYMPIA DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE** (*Dennis Bloom*) **20 min.**
9. **CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS** (*Karen Messmer*) **5 min.**
10. **BUS STOP PAD CONSTRUCTION** (*Marilyn Hemmann*) **10 min.**
11. **OLYMPIA TRANSIT CENTER EXPANSION UPDATE** (*Ann Freeman-Manzanares*) **25 min.**
12. **AUTHORITY ISSUES**

ADJOURNMENT

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM NO. 4-A
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2012**

FOR: Intercity Transit Authority
FROM: Marilyn Hemmann, 705-5833
SUBJECT: Purchase of Software Licenses

1) **The Issue:** Consideration of upgrading software and purchasing software licenses to ensure the software in use by the agency is licensed correctly for version, purpose and number of users.

2) **Recommended Action:** Authorize the General Manager to issue a purchase order for \$58,632.98, including tax, to the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services for the software upgrades and licenses shown in the attachment to this item.

3) **Policy Analysis:** The procurement policy states the Authority must approve any contract over \$25,000.

4) **Background:** The Information Services (IS) staff periodically reviews the agency's current and pending use of Microsoft software products to ensure the agency is compliant with licensing agreements.

Our agency is moving to a newer version of SQL Server in order to stay current with the system needs of our business software such as Fleetnet and Routematch. This move requires the purchase of 25 SQL Client Access Licenses to ensure all work stations are correctly licensed.

Two new servers will soon support our fuel management system. Our agency needs to purchase 10 Windows Server Standard Edition licenses to license these two before they are in service and to update the existing server licenses.

The Intercity Transit web site runs on SharePoint 2007 software. The software has not been upgraded since it was installed. The 2012 budget includes funds for a web site enhancement project, and IS recommends upgrading the site to SharePoint 2010 enterprise software. Public use of our web site has steadily increased. Moving to the capabilities of the 2010 enterprise version will allow staff to more fully meet user's expectations for features and functionality. The agency will also benefit from improvements in SharePoint's document

management tools. Upgrading to SharePoint 2010 requires the additional purchase of a SharePoint 2010 Server License.

Upgrading software and the purchase of software licenses is included in the 2012 IS budget. IS staff evaluated options for obtaining the software and licenses and found the best value for the agency is to purchase them under the competitively bid Washington State Department of Enterprise Services master contract with Microsoft. The attachment to this item shows the details of the recommended purchases.

5) **Alternatives:**

- A. Authorize the General Manager to issue a purchase order for \$58,632.98, including tax, to the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services for the software upgrades and licenses shown in the attachment to this item.
- B. Defer action. If action is deferred, the servers could not be utilized due to noncompliance until the licenses were purchased; this also means some of the hardware could not be used as well.

6) **Budget Notes:** The 2012 IS budget item for software and licenses is \$56,135. This purchase added to the amount already spent under this budget item will exceed the budget by \$7,193. IS staff projects the overage in this budget item will be offset by a lower than projected total expenditure in the 2012 IS supplies budget.

7) **Goal Reference:** Goal #5: *“Align best practices and support agency sustainable technologies and activities.”*

8) **References:** Summary of costs.

**SUMMARY OF COSTS
SOFTWARE AND LICENSES
2012**

Microsoft Products From DES Master Contract	Cost Each	Number	Total
SQL Server Client Access Licenses	199.89	25	4,997.25
Windows Server Standard Licenses	463.16	10	4,631.60
SharePoint 2010 Enterprise	39,598.57	1	39,598.57
SharePoint Server License	4,712.76	1	4,712.76
		subtotal	53,940.18
		tax	4,692.80
		Total	58,632.98

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM NO. 4-B
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2012**

FOR: Intercity Transit Authority
FROM: Bob Holman, 705-5885
SUBJECT: Transportation Improvement Program Adoption

-
- 1) **The Issue:** Whether to adopt the 2013 draft transportation improvement program (TIP) for Federal Transit Administration funding.
-
- 2) **Recommended Action:** Adopt the 2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Federal Transit Administration funding.
-
- 3) **Policy Analysis:** Grant guidelines require this program be adopted by the governing body.
-
- 4) **Background:** The draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Federal Transit Administration funding reflects the programming of projects consistent with Intercity Transit's 2011-2016 Transportation Development Plan (TDP). A public hearing was held on June 06, 2012. There were no comments received prior to the hearing or during the hearing. No comments were received since the hearing.

Project elements in the draft 2013 TIP are:

- Capital Preventive Maintenance for 2013, 2014 and 2015. This is for planning purposes pending adoption of the federal budget for federal fiscal years 2013 through 2015.
- Four replacement buses - for planning purposes, anticipating funds from one or more FTA grant applications to replace the balance of 1998 coaches still in service.
- Final Engineering & Construction for transit maintenance and operations facility expansion in 2013-2015. This project is for planning purposes in the event a funding request from one or more FTA grant applications is successful.
- Smart Corridor Project as a placeholder for yet to be identified Intercity Transit participation in a multijurisdictional intelligent signaling project on major corridors for 2013 through 2015.

Following the Authority's adoption, the Thurston Regional Planning Council will move Intercity Transit's proposed, federally funded projects through their annual process for updating the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The STIP then gets approved by the state and federal transportation agencies as the final step in this programming process.

5) Alternatives:

- A. Adopt the 2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Federal Transit Administration funding. This will meet our local requirement for Federal Transit Administration grant guidelines.
 - B. Reject the programs. This will prevent or delay federal grant funding.
-

6) Budget Notes: The TIP is consistent with projects programmed in the current Intercity Transit 2011-16 Transit Development Plan.

7) Goal Reference: The project elements support agency goals: **Goal 1:** *“Assess the transportation needs of our community.”* **Goal 4:** *“Provide responsive transportation options.”*

8) References: TIP Projects Spreadsheet.

Intercity Transit											
2013 - 2018 Transportation Improvement Program											
Federally Funded Projects											
IT #	Project	2013	2014	2015	2016-2018	Federal	Type	Local	Total	Fed %	Project Status
IT1301	Capital Preventive Maintenance (2013)	\$4,000				\$3,200	Sec. 5307	\$800	\$4,000	80%	Planning Purpose New - Pending Formula 5307
IT1401	Capital Preventive Maintenance (2014)		\$4,000			\$3,200	Sec. 5307	\$800	\$4,000	80%	Planning Purpose New - Pending Formula 5307
IT1501	Capital Preventive Maintenance (2015)			\$4,000		\$3,200	Sec. 5307	\$800	\$4,000	80%	Planning Purpose New - Pending Formula 5307
	Capital Preventive Maintenance 3 Yrs (2016-2018)				\$12,000	\$9,600	Sec. 5307	\$2,400	\$12,000	80%	Planning Purpose 2016-18 CPM Total
IT1302	Replacement, heavy duty hybrid buses (4)	\$2,800				\$2,300	Sec. 5309	\$500	\$2,800	82%	Planning Purpose discretionary grants applications pending
IT1303	Final Engineering & Construction for transit maintenance and operations facility expansion	\$5,000	\$15,000	\$2,500		\$18,000	Sec. 5309	\$4,500	\$22,500	80%	Planning Purpose discretionary grants applications pending
IT1304	Smart Corridor Project	\$444	\$444			\$710	Federal Surface Transportation (?)	\$178	\$888	80%	Planning Purpose discretionary grants applications pending
Total Federal Funded Projects		\$12,244	\$19,444		\$0	\$40,210		\$9,978	\$50,188	80%	
AMOUNTS IN THOUSANDS											
NOTES:											
Grant type:											
Sec. 5307: Urban area formula program administered by the Federal Transit Administration. Amount is determined by urban area population and population density. Also has Small Intensive Cities (5340) formula funds rolled into the total.											
Sec. 5309: Discretionary (bus) capital grant program administered by the Federal Transit Administration. Subject to annual budget earmark.											

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM NO. 4-C
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2012**

FOR: Intercity Transit Authority

FROM: Dennis Bloom, Planning Manager, 705-5832

SUBJECT: Schedule a Public Hearing on the Transit Development Plan

-
- 1) **The Issue:** Whether to schedule a public hearing for the annual update of Intercity Transit's Transit Development Plan (TDP).
-
- 2) **Recommended Action:** Schedule a public hearing for July 18, 2012, 5:30 p.m., for the purpose of receiving and considering public comments on the annual Transit Development Plan: 2011 Summary and the 2012 - 2017 Plan. Staff would bring the TDP before the Authority on August 1, 2012, for adoption.
-
- 3) **Policy Analysis:** The State requires the local transit's governing body to conduct a public hearing each year on the annual Transit Development Plan. The Authority's policy also provides an opportunity for public comment prior to approval of this plan.
-
- 4) **Background:** The State of Washington, under RCW Section 35.58.2795, requires each public transit system provide an annual status report and update of its Transit Development Plan (TDP). This requires the transit system to conduct a public hearing on the plan.

The update must include three elements:

- a) Description of the system from the previous year (a 2011 Summary);
- b) Description of planned changes, if any, to services and facilities (2012-17); and
- c) Operating and capital financing elements for the previous year (2011), budgeted for current year (2012), and planned for the next five years (2013 - 17).

Staff will present TDP information for discussion purposes to the Citizen Advisory Committee and the Authority over the next month. The Authority will receive a Draft TDP prior to the hearing. The document will be available for public review and comment starting June 27. After the public hearing, staff will request adoption by the Authority at the August 1, 2012, meeting. Upon final

approval, staff will forward the document to WSDOT, local jurisdictions and other appropriate organizations and businesses.

5) Alternatives:

- A. Schedule a public hearing for July 18, 2012, 5:30 p.m., for the purpose of receiving and considering public comments on the annual Transit Development Plan: 2011 Summary and the 2012 - 2017 Plan.
 - B. Set a later date for the public hearing. The due date for the TDP to WSDOT is September 1, 2012. Setting a later date for the public hearing would require staff to seek an extension from WSDOT past the required due date for plan submittal.
-

6) Budget Notes: This is currently covered under the 2012 Budget. This year's TDP reflects on what was achieved over the past year. The TDP simply reports on past and projected elements based on the current budget year. The development of next year's budget will be accomplished later in 2012 when discussions on the annual update of the agency's Strategic Plan takes place.

7) Goal Reference: The conducting of a public hearing for the draft TDP reflects all current goals established for the agency.

8) References:

2012 Timeline for TDP Process:

June 20 ITA: Request Public Hearing for July 18 and Adoption August 1, 2012
June 27 Public: Draft available to the public
July 16 CAC: Present Draft TDP.
July 18 ITA: Conduct Public Hearing
August 1 ITA: Adopt TDP

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM NO. 4-D
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2012**

FOR: Intercity Transit Authority
FROM: Rhodetta Seward (705-5856)
SUBJECT: Special Meeting

1) **The Issue:** Whether to cancel the July 4, 2012, meeting due to the holiday, and schedule a special meeting for July 18, 2012, to conduct regular business.

2) **Recommended Action:** Cancel the July 4, 2012, Intercity Transit Authority regular meeting due to the holiday, and schedule a special meeting for July 18, 2012, to conduct the regular business of the Transit Authority.

3) **Policy Analysis:** When needed, the Authority can schedule special meetings if the public is notified in advance of the meeting.

4) **Background:** Due to the holiday, staff recommends canceling the meeting that would normally fall on July 4, 2012. This would then require a special meeting be held later in July so staff could bring before the Authority those items requiring action. The next regularly scheduled meeting is July 18, 2012, 5:30 p.m. Staff recommends rather than this be a work session, it's a special meeting so a variety of items can come before the Authority.

As required by law, staff would post the agenda for the public on the website and in the local newspaper.

5) **Alternatives:**
A. Cancel the July 4, 2012, Intercity Transit Authority regular meeting due to the holiday, and schedule a special meeting for July 18, 2012, to conduct the regular business of the Transit Authority.
B. Agree to meet on July 4, and keep July 18th as a work session.
C. Cancel July 4th and schedule some other date as a special meeting.

6) **Budget Notes:** N/A

7) **Goal Reference:** This does not directly fit with any one particular goal.

8) **References:** N/A

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM NO. 5
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2012**

FOR: Intercity Transit Authority

FROM: Duncan Green, BCC Assistant, 705-5874

SUBJECT: 2012 Bicycle Commuter Contest Update

-
- 1) **The Issue:** Brief the Intercity Transit Authority on the results of the 2012 Bicycle Commuter Contest.
-
- 2) **Recommended Action:** For information and discussion.
-
- 3) **Policy Analysis:** The purpose of this presentation is to provide information on the 2012 Thurston County Bicycle Commuter Contest.
-
- 4) **Background:** The annual Thurston County Bicycle Commuter Contest (BCC), which ran the full month of May, just completed its 25th year. Staff will present information about this year's event and the results of our most recent efforts.

This is Intercity Transit's seventh year administering this countywide event, coordinated through the Marketing & Communications division. For the fourth consecutive year, Duncan Green directed the BCC and related efforts as a temporary employee (a six-month position). He works with members of the Marketing and Communications staff, especially Kris Fransen, lead agency staff involved in commute trip reduction activities with commuters and area employers.

Bicycling is significant in Thurston County, and Intercity Transit's incorporation of bicycling into its trip reduction and alternative mode promotion is received well. Under the agency's guidance, the program has experienced record participation, record sponsorship, and great event attendance and media attention. The BCC broadened and sustained successful partnerships between our agency and the community and generated public goodwill. Intercity Transit was also recognized by APTA with an Ad Wheel Award, the top marketing honor within the public transportation industry, for the Bicycle Commuter Contest.

-
- 5) **Alternatives:** N/A
-

6) **Budget Notes:** The cost of the Bicycle Commuter Contest is largely staff time for one temporary position. The annual budget for the BCC is \$20,000. The BCC is able to operate on this small amount as a result of sponsorships and in-kind support.

7) **Goal Reference:** Goal #4: *“Provide responsive transportation options.”* Goal #2: *“Assess the transportation needs of our community.”*

8) **References:** N/A

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM NO. 6
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2012**

FOR: Intercity Transit Authority
FROM: Mike Harbour, ext. 5855
SUBJECT: Update on Federal Activity

1) **The Issue:** Our federal lobbyists, Dale Learn and Travis Lumpkin of Gordon Thomas Honeywell Governmental Affairs, will provide the Authority an update on our activities seeking federal funding and on the current status of federal legislation.

2) **Recommended Action:** This is an information item.

3) **Policy Analysis:** Intercity Transit depends on discretionary federal funding for major capital projects and also receives an annual allocation of federal funding. Intercity Transit employs the firm of Gordon Thomas Honeywell Governmental Affairs to assist staff in pursuing funding and in keeping up-to-date on federal activities. The Authority makes the decision to pursue specific funding and to grant the contract for this assistance.

4) **Background:** Intercity Transit contracted with the firm of Gordon Thomas Honeywell Governmental Affairs since 2008. Dale Learn has been our primary contact during our contract with the firm. Travis Lumpkin recently joined the firm and will also provide assistance to Intercity Transit. Travis was most recently the senior economic adviser to Democratic Senator Patty Murray and has worked for Senator Maria Cantwell and Representative Rick Larsen.

Dale and Travis will provide an update on the latest activity at the federal level and on reauthorization and funding for 2013.

5) **Alternatives:** N/A

6) **Budget Notes:** Intercity Transit's contract with Gordon Thomas Honeywell Governmental Affairs is for \$6,000 per month or \$72,000 per year.

7) **Goal Reference:** This agenda item addresses the following Authority goal, Goal 4: "*Provide responsive transportation options.*"

8) **References:** N/A

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM NO. 7
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2012**

FOR: Intercity Transit Authority

FROM: Ben Foreman, Finance and Administration Director, 705-5813
Carolyn Newsome, Vanpool Manager, 705-5829

SUBJECT: Vanpool Fares - Cost Recovery

-
- 1) **The Issue:** Whether to increase vanpool fares in order to keep pace with increased costs. Should a target for cost recovery be set?
-
- 2) **Recommended Action:** For information only. Based on Authority feedback, this issue may be brought to the Authority for action at a future date.
-
- 3) **Policy Analysis:** Establishing fares is the responsibility of the Intercity Transit Authority.
-
- 4) **Background:** In 2011, the vanpool program generated \$1,474,200 in fare revenue and had direct operating costs of \$1,532,200. Direct operating costs are comprised of the vanpool division expenses, vehicle maintenance, fuel and insurance. The recovery rate, based on direct costs, was 96%. Current guidelines target a recovery rate, based on direct costs, of at least 90%. However, primarily based on projections for fuel costs, our anticipated recovery rate for direct costs for 2012 is estimated to drop to 85% and by 2017 to about 73%. The target of 90% of direct costs came from discussions with the Authority in 2008. It has been used for several years and may or may not reflect the current direction of the Authority.

Another way of looking at vanpool costs is by total operating costs. This measure includes direct costs and indirect costs such as allocations for facilities maintenance, utilities and administrative staff. Our 2011 total operating costs are estimated at \$1,723,200. Our recovery rate is 85% of total operating costs for 2011. The total operating cost recovery rate drops to 77% for 2012 (again due to anticipated increases in fuel costs) and falls to 66% by 2017.

The other aspect of costs for the vanpool program is the capital cost of replacement vehicles and vehicles to expand the fleet. Between 2012 and 2017, we expect to purchase 205 replacement vehicles at \$6.3 million and anticipate

state grants to cover about 25% of these costs (\$1.6 million). We also have 66 expansion vehicles planned over the six years (11 expansion vehicles each year) which will cost an additional \$2 million with state grants covering 80% of the costs (\$1.6 million). Total capital costs over the 6 year period will be about \$8.3 million and total grant participation is expected to be \$3.2 million. The local share of the vanpool capital cost will be \$5.1 million or approximately \$850,000 per year.

The attached tables illustrate the expected revenues, direct costs, total operating costs, total costs and recovery rates for the vanpool program over the next six years. Staff is seeking Authority direction on whether the 90% of direct cost recovery rate should continue to trigger consideration of a fare increase or if a different measure should be used.

5) **Alternatives:** N/A

6) **Budget Notes:** In 2012, we anticipate a recovery of approximately 85% of direct operating costs.

7) **Goal Reference:** Goal #4: *"Provide responsive transportation options."* Goal #2: *"Assess the transportation needs of our community."*

8) **References:** Vanpool Six Year Financial Plan

Three Potential Views for Cost Recovery

Method 1 - Operating Revenue/ Direct Operating Costs	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Projected Operating Revenue	1,547,944	1,621,655	1,695,367	1,769,078	1,842,790	1,916,502
Projected Direct Costs	1,815,063	2,017,178	2,157,410	2,308,333	2,468,247	2,638,883
Recovery % for Direct Costs	85%	80%	79%	77%	75%	73%

Method 2 - Operating Revenue/Total Operating Costs	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Projected Operating Revenue	1,547,944	1,621,655	1,695,367	1,769,078	1,842,790	1,916,502
Projected Total Operating Costs	2,013,612	2,225,606	2,375,097	2,535,866	2,705,690	2,886,503
Recovery % for Total Operating Costs	77%	73%	71%	70%	68%	66%

Method 3 - Total Revenue/Total Costs	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Projected Total Revenue (Incl Grants)	1,927,344	2,195,459	2,311,750	2,391,513	2,165,703	2,583,269
Projected Total Costs (Incl Capital)	2,853,612	3,819,506	4,114,766	4,274,335	3,219,780	4,748,795
Recovery % All Costs and All Revenues	68%	57%	56%	56%	67%	54%

Vehicle (Capital) Costs and Revenue	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Replcement Vehicles	19	44	47	45	5	45

Costs	532,000	1,275,120	1,409,732	1,396,985	160,653	1,496,485
Projected Grant Revenue	133,000	318,780	352,433	349,246	40,163	374,121
Grant Participation rate	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%
Expansion Vehicles	11	11	11	11	11	11
Costs	308,000	318,780	329,937	341,485	353,437	365,807
Projected Grant Revenue	246,400	255,024	263,950	273,188	282,750	292,646
Grant Participation rate	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Total Vehicle Costs	840,000	1,593,900	1,739,669	1,738,470	514,090	1,862,292
Total Grant Participation	379,400	573,804	616,383	622,434	322,913	666,767
Grant Participation Rate	45%	36%	35%	36%	63%	36%

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM NO. 8
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2012**

FOR: Intercity Transit Authority

FROM: Dennis Bloom, Planning Manager, 5832

SUBJECT: City of Olympia Draft Comprehensive Plan Update

-
- 1) **The Issue:** Staff will review comments submitted to the City of Olympia on their Draft Comprehensive Plan Update.

 - 2) **Recommended Action:** Presentation and discussion only.

 - 3) **Policy Analysis:** Jurisdictional land use review process may result in changes to existing service or may affect plans for future service changes. In the either case, the Intercity Transit Authority may approve significant service changes.

 - 4) **Background:** The City of Olympia's Comprehensive Plan Update is necessary to conform to the state's Growth Management Act. The process began in 2009 with the City's Planning Commission's review, then the Olympia City Council approved in June 2010 a list of 10 community issues and challenges they wanted to address in updating the Plan. Since 2009, City staff and the Planning Commission reached out to the community through meetings, events, personal interviews, online surveys and more. The City states that over "one thousand community members shared their insights for how we can best shape our community, face collective challenges, and meet shared goals."

In general, the effort of the Plan was directed by City Council to help address the future of the downtown area, neighborhood planning, re-evaluation of the high density corridors and environmental stewardship. It also considers other areas of community interest including: Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Environment and Public Safety.

Intercity Transit staff participated over the past several years in a number of the City's outreach efforts and the public participation process. We attended community meetings, Planning Commission meetings, and met with City staff to review and provide feedback on the Draft to refine and define the vision and direction the City is considering. Of particular interest is the section on Transportation and the concept of creating 'bus corridors' that can support

higher density residential and commercial development with high frequency fixed routed service.

More details about the plan can be found at: <http://olympiawa.gov/imagine-olympia>.

5) **Alternatives:** N/A

6) **Budget Notes:** N/A

7) **Goal Reference:** Goal#1: *“Assess the transportation needs of our community.”*

8) **References:**

- a. Comprehensive Plan Update “Substantive Change List” (City of Olympia)
- b. Intercity Transit’s Comments on the Transportation section of the Draft Comprehensive Plan Update.

Proposed substantive changes to the Plan are entirely new goals or policies, or an updated policy direction or emphasis. These would result in changes to the way our community develops or in how the City does business.

You may see ‘new’ goal and policy statements in the April Draft that are not “substantive changes.” These may be existing goals or policies that have been edited for readability, moved to a new section of the Plan, or a new statement that reflects current City practice. Here’s an example: part of the City Council adopted Scope of the Update is to *Revise the Public Involvement chapter; especially with respect to use of new technology to inform and receive input from the public.* Although the number of goals in the Public Participation chapter expanded from one to four, these are not all “substantive changes.” For example, the new goal statement, “people of all ages, backgrounds and physical abilities can access public meetings and information” is something the City currently strives for, but the goal statement is new to the Plan. Likewise, a new policy statement about using and evaluating new technologies is current City practice, but the policy statement is new.

	Chapter	Change	Reason/Comment
1	Olympia’s Vision	Goal SEC4 in the existing Sustainable Economy chapter states: “set a positive example of sustainable business practices.” Because the existing goal is more of a policy statement, the goal has been updated to express a desired end state: “Olympia is recognized as a model sustainable city through the leadership of the City and other partners (GO1).” The goal has also been moved to the <i>Olympia’s Vision</i> chapter to stress the importance of sustainability in all elements of the Plan.	During outreach, we heard strong feedback that community members want Olympia to be a model sustainable city and they want the City to provide leadership toward that end.
2	Olympia’s Vision	A new policy is also proposed beneath this goal, regarding balancing community goals and objectives, and considering environmental, economic and social factors when making decisions. (PO1.1)	As recommended by the Utility Advisory Committee and staff, a consistent approach is needed across departments to ensure and communicate the City is making balanced decisions.
3	Public Participation and Partnerships	New goal: The City, individual citizens, other agencies and organizations all have a role in helping accomplish the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan. (GP1)	This is a major new emphasis of the Plan. The City will focus on partnerships as a method of Plan implementation. This will help the community find creative solutions and pool resources to achieve our vision and goals.

4	Public Participation and Partnerships	New policy: Engage partners with development and regular updating of an implementation strategy (or action plan) to fulfill Comprehensive Plan goals. This strategy will include a monitoring and reporting process.(PP1.1)	An action plan or implementation strategy is part of the City Council adopted scope of the update.
5	Public Participation and Partnerships	New policy statement: Provide opportunities for interested parties to get involved early in the land use decision making processes (PP3.2).	The City strives to do this currently, so the policy may not be a complete substantive change; however, we heard strong feedback from the public that implementation of this policy needs to be improved so proposed addition of a new policy statement is highlighted here.
6	Public Participation and Partnerships	New goal and policies: Sub-area planning is conducted through a collaborative effort by community members and the City and is used to shape how neighborhoods grow and develop. (GP4 and policies)	This is part of the City Council adopted scope of the update. During outreach, we heard strong feedback from the public that they want more opportunities to shape how neighborhoods grow and develop. This is a tool to increase the public’s level of impact.
7	Natural Environment	Coordinate critical areas ordinances and stormwater management requirements regionally based on best available science (PN1.2).	This policy recognizes a city effort to coordinate with partner jurisdictions on critical area protection and stormwater management; recognizing that these are issues that are often regional and cross political boundaries.
8	Natural Environment	Preserve the existing topography on a portion of new development sites; integrate the existing site contours into the project design and minimize the use of grading and other large scale land disturbance (PN1.5).	Integrates existing site contours into the project design and minimizes and use of grading and other engineered methods to preserve natural hydrology, soil structure, and tree tracts in designated areas with a project site.
9	Natural Environment	Increase the use of low impact and green building development methods through a combination of partnerships, education efforts, technical assistance, incentives, regulations, and grant funding opportunities (PN 1.8 and PN1.9).	Preserves and restores water absorption on site, saves energy, and encourages the reuse and recycling of materials.

10	Natural Environment	Design, build, and retrofit public projects to incorporate sustainable design and green building methods, require minimal maintenance, and fit naturally into the surrounding environment (PN1.11).	Reduce the environmental impact of city facilities through materials used, energy usage, maintenance, etc.
11	Natural Environment	Prioritize acquiring and preserving land by a shared set of priorities that consider the environmental benefits of the land, such as stormwater management, wildlife habitat, and access to recreation opportunities (PN2.1).	Sets the stage for establishing a consistent method citywide for how land is prioritized for acquisition and/or preservation (can be inclusive of a variety of methods). Prioritization scheme intended to weigh heavily towards the environmental benefits of preservation.
12	Natural Environment	Identify, remove, and prevent the use and spread of invasive plants and wildlife. (PN2.3)	Restores the environment and protects intact ecosystems from existing or new invasive plants and wildlife (ex. English ivy, New Zealand mud snails.)
13	Natural Environment	Conserve and restore habitat for wildlife in a series of separate pieces of land, in addition to existing corridors (PN2.6).	In response to a 1994 Wildlife Study that found that corridors are not effective for wildlife habitat in Olympia; focus should be on habitat “islands.”
14	Natural Environment	Practice maintenance and operations that reduce the City’s environmental impact (PN2.7).	Minimize the use of toxic substances and production of greenhouse gases in City maintenance practices.
15	Natural Environment	Measure the tree canopy and set a citywide target for increasing it (PN3.2).	Focuses tree preservation and planting on a citywide scale that considers the environmental benefits of tree canopy.
16	Natural Environment	Evaluate the environmental benefits of the urban forest (PN3.4).	Determine and incorporate into future management decisions the ecological benefits of trees.
17	Natural Environment	Provide new trees with the necessary soil, water, space, and nutrients to grow to maturity, plant the right size tree where there are conflicts, and protect the natural structure and growing conditions of trees. (PN3.5 and PN3.6).	Create planting spaces, select, and plant trees to grow to maturity, and manage trees for long-term establishment and health in the landscape.

18	Natural Environment	Support the process for determining a balanced and sustainable approach to the management of Capitol Lake; participate when the opportunity is available as a party of significant interest in the outcome (PN4.3).	The City has an interest in the health and condition of Budd Inlet, as well as in a balanced approach (consideration of the environmental, social, and economic impacts) and process for deciding the future management of Capitol Lake (recognizing that the City is not the decision-maker).
19	Natural Environment	Protect Olympia from the potential impacts of sea-level rise (PN4.4).	The City will protect those areas at risk from sea-level rise and urban flooding; details will be established in the “Action Plan” or other Master Plan or Strategic Plan document based on PW studies.
20	Natural Environment	Retrofit existing infrastructure for stormwater treatment in areas of the City with little or no treatment (PN5.3).	Treat currently untreated stormwater runoff, a leading cause of pollutants threatening fresh and marine waters.
21	Natural Environment	Limit or prohibit uses and require restoration in Drinking Water (Wellhead) protection areas based on best available science and the level of risk to drinking water supplies (PN5.6).	Protect our water supply in areas of the city identified as most vulnerable (Wellhead protection areas).
22	Natural Environment	Restore and manage vegetation next to streams, with emphasis on native vegetation to greatly improve or provide new fish and wildlife habitat (PN6.1).	Promotes active vegetation management with a focus on benefiting wildlife habitat in stream corridors.
23	Natural Environment	Retain and restore floodways in a natural condition to the extent necessary for flood insurance (PN6.5).	Language changed to reflect current practice and regulations.
24	Natural Environment	New efforts to coordinate with partners to reduce the use of fossil fuels, as well as measure, track, and potentially offset greenhouse gas emissions, including making a determination of a City target for reduction (GN8, PN8.1, PN8.2, and PN8.3).	New efforts to coordinate with partners to monitor and reduce City and community sources and levels of greenhouse gas emissions as a leading contributor to climate change.
25	Natural Environment	Plan to adapt, mitigate, and maintain resiliency for changing environmental conditions due to climate change, such as longer periods of drought and increased flooding (PN8.5).	Promotes a future planning process or strategic plan to consider likely community impacts of climate change and how to

			prepare and respond to them.
26	Natural Environment	Artificial sources of nighttime light are minimized so as to protect wildlife and vegetation and preserve views of the night sky (GN9, PN9.1, and PN9.2).	Expands Council-initiated and OPC work on moving towards a darker community at night; commonly referred to as “dark skies.”
27	Natural Environment	Rely on the appropriate agencies to monitor, while the City minimizes its purchase, use, and disposal of harmful toxics, pollution, or other emerging health threats (GN10 and PN10.1.)	Resolution M-1621; Reduce the amount and kinds of toxic materials the City produces, uses, and disposes of into the environment.
28	Land Use & Urban Design	Future Land Use Map amended to consolidate 34 categories into 14 with less definite boundaries. High-Rise Multi-family category within Heritage Park deleted. South Bay Road area proposed to change from Light Industrial to Auto Services. Capitol Campus proposed to change from Cap Campus/Commercial Services High Density (CC/CSHD) to Planned Development. Henderson Park to change from CC/CSHD to General Commercial. Two Professional Office blocks in vicinity of City Justice Center changing to City Center. LOTT treatment plant changing from Industry to Urban Waterfront. Description of “Auto Services” added to text. (Page 2 of text and PL1.3 and PL5.5.)	Specific zoning would change little, but could be more readily refined in response to new information. Future Land Use Map would establish parameters for any zoning changes.
29	Land Use & Urban Design	Policies added of using zoning, building codes, and other regulations to require functional, efficient and sustainable development (PL1.4)	Long-standing practice was not in the Plan.
30	Land Use & Urban Design	Requiring bike parking at new businesses added to policy of encouraging bike parking. (PL1.13)	Consistent with regulatory practice.
31	Land Use & Urban Design	Policy added to require clustering of housing (PL2.3)	To protect environmentally sensitive areas
32	Land Use & Urban Design	Policy added to allow cottages and townhouses everywhere, not just in multi-family areas. (PL10.9)	Consistent with current practice
33	Land Use & Urban Design	Mix of housing mandate reduced from multi-family ten to five acre threshold. (PL10.12)	To avoid large apartment-complex-only areas.
34	Land Use & Urban Design	Policy added to provide for light industry in commercial areas (PL5.8)	To allow more economic flexibility and more ‘walk to work’ options.
35	Land Use & Urban	Policy changed to allow on-street parking even if it “unduly slows traffic	Change to accommodate ‘less suburban’

	Design	flow.” (PL6.5)	vision.
36	Land Use & Urban Design	Design review directive extended to all commercial structures adjacent to public streets (PL3.7)	To avoid the ‘NAPA on Fones’ appearance from public spaces.
37	Land Use & Urban Design	View protection narrowed from all public street views of listed features, to certain point to point views (PL3.10)	Broad view protection rules difficult to administer. New policy focuses on a few views.
38	Land Use & Urban Design	Policy added regarding restricting downtown building heights to retain Capitol dome views (PL12.8).	Consistent with current regulation.
39	Land Use & Urban Design	Policy of limiting industrial areas to industry and industry-support businesses relaxed to allow other uses that do not conflict with industry. (PL5.4)	Balances with policy change of allowing more light industry in commercial areas.
40	Land Use & Urban Design	Preserve view of water at street ends expanded from Budd and Capitol Lake to all major water bodies (PL3.9)	No known basis for Budd/Capitol only limit; and current policy inconsistent with state law.
41	Land Use & Urban Design	‘Covered walkways’ removed as element of former “HDC-3” areas (policy removed).	Consistent with adopted regulation.
42	Land Use & Urban Design	Landscaping buffer at Port reduced from all industry to only the terminal; e.g., would no longer include B&B (PL12.6)	Landscaping buffer between industry and other commerce is inconsistent with City’s urban form goals.
43	Land Use & Urban Design	Other “place of public assembly” added as alternative n’hood place of assembly. (Under “N’hoods, Villages and Planning Sub-Areas text”)	There are not enough elementary schools for every neighborhood to include one.
44	Land Use & Urban Design	Urban agriculture support policy added (PL13.4)	Sense of Council and public preference.
45	Land Use & Urban Design	Encourage healthy and active lifestyle features added (PL13.5)	Consistent with new GMA goals.
46	Land Use & Urban Design	Discourage “fortress” design added (PL13.6)	To add policy consistent with design regulation concept of not isolating areas
47	Land Use & Urban Design	“Planning Areas” added – section describing new process for public involvement in subarea planning. (Subarea Planning text – begins page 24, GL16 & PL16.1, 16.2, and 16.3)	Revival of this approach is to provide new opportunities for public involvement at neighborhood scale.
48	Land Use & Urban	Downtown Plan moved to separate, mandated, “Master Plan” (Downtown	Separate document will provide more

	Design	Olympia section of plan – begins page 21)	flexibility for focusing on key part of City.
49	Land Use & Urban Design	Policy of coordination with GA campus plan and Port plan added. (PL9.6& 11.5)	To clarify relationships of Comprehensive Plan to land use planning by Port and State.
50	Land Use & Urban Design	Port Plan summary deleted. (Focus Area text – page 16.)	Port Plan within City Comprehensive Plan for background info has led to misunderstandings.
51	Land Use & Urban Design	Stoll Road area identified for a special area plan.(PL9.4)	Proposal enlarges the similar former “Urban Center” area east of Lilly to include this area.
52	Land Use & Urban Design	Policy added re opportunity for 20-acre campus plans (SPSCC, St. Peter’s, etc.) (PL9.6)	To provide predictability, this policy would support new regulation by which City would approve long-term large-area land use plans.
53	Land Use & Urban Design	Policy allowing private use of public right-of-way expanded to include public lands (PL12.4).	To allow opportunities to rent and lease public spaces for private use.
54	Transportation	A new policy requires an analysis when a street connection is opposed. Based on the assumption that all planned street connections are needed, this evaluation asks an opponent to describe why a proposed connection is not valuable to the street network. This analysis will occur at the development-review level (PT 4.20).	Consistent with the <i>Olympia Transportation Mobility</i> .
55	Transportation	The capacity of a transportation system is traditionally the space needed on our streets to move cars. The street system can move more people when more trips are made by walking, biking, or riding the bus. New goals and policies throughout relate to relieving traffic congestion and increasing capacity on major corridors by adding bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and improving transit services.	Consistent with the <i>Olympia Transportation Mobility Strategy</i> .
56	Transportation	Bus corridors are selected major streets with high-quality, frequent transit service. The City’s role in developing bus corridors includes: modifying traffic signals so that buses are not stuck in traffic, providing pedestrian facilities to enhance people’s access to transit, and encouraging a mix of land uses and increased densities along these corridors (GT16 and policies).	Consistent with the <i>Olympia Transportation Mobility Strategy</i> .

57	Economy	Allow for more home based businesses (PE12.2)	From Imagine Olympia public process.
58	Economy	The City achieves maximum economic, environmental and social benefit from public infrastructure. (GE4)	Addition of the words “environmental and social” address triple bottom line of value to the City.
59	Economy	Base public infrastructure investments on analysis determining the lowest life-cycle cost and benefits to environmental, economic and social systems. (PE4.3)	Addition of the words “and benefits to environmental, economic and social systems” address triple bottom line of value to the City.
60	Parks, Arts, Recreation and Historic Preservation	Consider acquisition of saltwater shoreline property to create public access on a case-by-case basis (PC5.5)	Clarifies and makes more concise the City’s long-term shoreline goals and policies.
61	Utilities	New goal and policies pertain to protecting downtown from the future impacts of sea level rise (GU 11).	This topic was not addressed in the ’94 plan.
62	Utilities	Clarify that the EDDS will be updated regularly. (PU1.5)	This is consistent with current practice and we want to establish a regular update timeline.
63	Utilities	Place new private utility distribution lines underground wherever practical. This should be based on sound engineering judgment, on consideration of health and safety, and in accordance with the regulations and tariffs of the WUTC and the City’s Engineering Development and Design Standards. (PU17.1)	Reflect current practice.

Chapters

Olympia’s Vision

Introduction

Public Participation and Partners

Merger/update of existing Urban Growth and Annexation and Public Involvement chapters

Natural Environment

Merger/update of existing Environment and Urban Forestry chapters; some portions of the Energy chapter; Shoreline Master Program goals and policies

Land Use & Urban Design

Merger/update of existing chapter; portions of housing chapter related to land use; introduction of concepts linked to other chapters, such as the HDC link to transportation

Transportation

Update of existing chapter

Economy

Update of existing chapter

Parks, Arts, Recreation and Historic Preservation

Merger/update of Parks, Arts & Recreation and Historic Preservation chapters

Utilities

Update of existing chapter

Services for the Public

Merger/update of existing Public Services, Public Safety and portions of the Housing chapter

Capital Facilities Plan

Update of existing chapter

CITY OF OLYMPIA

DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMENTS – TRANSPORTATION

Mike Harbour and Dennis Bloom, Intercity Transit

June 12, 2012

Transportation:

Street Design Creates Options

- a) ‘Complete Streets’ is a good concept. Would suggest pedestrian and ADA elements that reference improving access be “universal design standards.”

1) **GT1 – All streets are safe and inviting for pedestrians and bicyclists. Streets are designed to be human scale, while accommodating motor vehicles.**

1. Could add policy – Transit priority measures will be implemented where such measures increase transit speed and/or reliability. These could include signal priority measures, bypass lanes or exclusive bus lanes.
2. Provide safe pedestrian access to bus stops and incorporate features to make crossing of arterials safer.

PT1.2 - Build streets to be as narrow as possible in individual lane width and overall width, while facilitating the movement of larger vehicles, as needed.

- 1 Outside/curb lane needs to be wide enough to allow safe passage for transit buses (generally 11’ wide lanes – bus is 10.5’ (w/ mirrors). Otherwise, buses will be forced to take parts of two traffic lanes in order to stay out of a striped bike lane.

PT1.6 - Provide attractive streetscapes with sidewalks, street trees, planter strips, and pedestrian-scale streetlights. In denser areas, provide benches, building awnings, and attractive transit stops and shelters.

- a) Transit bus stops: City should consider adding bicycle stand near transit stops.
- b) Shelter stops need enough room to allow size variations in shelter dimensions.
- c) Shelter stops need lighting added to amenity (solar possible)
- d) Trash receptacles are needed and collection of garbage needs to be considered.

2) **GT2 - As new streets are built or existing streets are reconstructed, multimodal features will be added. Features defined for different types of streets are specified in the [City of Olympia Engineering Design and Development Standards](#)**

1. Provide safe pedestrian access to bus stops and incorporate features to make crossing of arterials safer.

PT2.1 - Build arterial streets to serve as primary routes connecting urban centers and the regional transportation network. These streets include bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips, pedestrian crossing features, and in dense areas, a high-quality streetscape.

- 1 Should this section include/suggest where pedestrian crosswalk locations can be placed? Any particular standards?

PT2.5 - Provide transit stops and service accommodations, based on the transit service on that street.

- 1 Suggest edit: “Provide transit stop amenities based on Intercity Transit stop criteria.”
- 2 Stops with shelters must meet federal ADA requirements. All stops should accommodate ADA stop landing dimensions: 5’ wide x 8’ deep.

PT2.8 - Build bulb-outs at street corners for shorter pedestrian crossings and traffic calming. Build bulb-outs on local access and neighborhood collector streets with on-street parking. Add bulb-outs to existing arterials and major collectors with on-street parking for the same reasons.

- 1 Caution on corner bulb-outs: placement and locations of radius will create restrictions on bus turning movements. Legion Way is a good example of adding bulb-outs but transit vehicles can no longer make right-hand turns onto side streets.

3) **GT3 – Streets allow the efficient delivery of goods and services**

PT3.1 - Design streets to allow the efficient and safe delivery of goods and services, providing access for buses, commercial trucks, emergency and other public service vehicles.

- 1 Buses are 10.5' wide (w/ mirrors). Need outside lane widths (curbside) of 11' to accommodate transit vehicles.

Connected Streets Mean Shorter Trips

1) **GT4 – The street network is a well-connected system of small blocks allowing short trips that are as direct as possible for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, motorists, and all types of service vehicles.**

PT4.3 - Build street connections so that people walking, biking, or accessing bus stops have short route options, making these modes more inviting.

1. Should there be a reference to including accessible sidewalks and pathways as a part of the street design that supports pedestrians and pedestrian safety?

PT4.8 - Build new arterials, major collectors and neighborhood collectors based on the general location defined on the Transportation Maps in Appendix H and using the guidance of the [Engineering Design and Development Standards](#)..

1. Along transit routes turns at intersections need a radius that can accommodate 45' vehicle turning movement.
2. Vehicle lane widths need to accommodate the width of a transit coach (side mirrors, too).

PT4.19 - Use traffic-calming devices to slow vehicles, where necessary, and especially when new streets are connected to existing neighborhoods.

1. Coordination of where traffic calming devices are added and the design of the device should be coordinated with Intercity Transit. Many calming devices mean the street can no longer be used for a transit route.

PT4.20 - Pursue all street connections. If a street connection is opposed, analyze how not making the street connection will impact the street network. At a minimum, this evaluation will include:

- Impact on directness of travel for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists
 - Impact on directness of travel for emergency-, public-, and commercial-service vehicles.
1. Intercity Transit is supportive of the need to analyze the potential impacts that potentially limit public access to or through neighborhoods or developments. The loss of access typically requires longer trips for pedestrians and the additional operating costs for public service vehicles.

2) **GT 5 - Pathways enhance the transportation network by providing direct and formal off-street routes for bicyclists and pedestrians..**

- 1 Give priority to pathways connecting to transit routes.

3) GT6 - A network of regional and local trails enhances mobility for bicycles and pedestrians.

- 1) Provide secure, bike parking at intersection of regional and local trails and transit routes.
- 2) Provide adequate signage identifying trails and connections to transit routes and other uses.

Finding Solutions to Congestion/Goals and Policies

1) GT9 – In designated Strategy Corridors, when road widening is no longer an option, system capacity is added through increasing walking, biking and transit trips.

PT9.1 - Add bike lanes and sidewalks, improve transit services, and use demand management measures to ensure that transit, bicycle and pedestrian transportation are attractive and easy to use during peak travel periods on all streets, but especially Strategy Corridors.

1. Consider adding 'access to bus stops' as part of transit services.

PT10.2 - Separate voluntary concurrency mitigation measures from other transportation mitigation measures required by either State Environmental Policy Act or the City's Transportation Impact Fee policies and programs.

1. Would the City's Commute Trip Reduction ordinance for employers be a possible component of this element?

Linking Land Use and Transportation/Goals and Policies

1) GT13 – Greater density along bus corridors optimizes investments in transit and makes transit and inviting mode of travel. (see Appendix I, the Corridors map for Bus Corridors.)

- 1 Discourage location of auto-oriented or low-density developments along bus corridors.

PT13.2 - Guide transit-dependent land uses to locate on bus corridors. This includes schools, public services, major employers, and multi-family housing.

1. Consider identifying 'senior housing' as a component of this item. Senior housing projects should not be developed in isolated or auto-dependent locations given their general need for public transportation.
2. Locating developments along transit corridors will be a big step in the right direction for encouraging transit use. But proximity to a bus stop is another element to consider. A general rule of thumb for drawing people to a transit stop is around a ¼ mile distance, about a 5 - 10 minute walk for many people. A building or development wouldn't necessarily have to be directly on the corridor but proximity and convenience to transit service would be key element.

PT 14.4 - Partner with the cities of Lacey and Tumwater to pursue the land-use and transportation measures identified for the Urban Corridors of Martin Way, east 4th and State Avenues, Pacific Avenue and portions of Capitol Way.

1. Cross jurisdictional consistency in land-use development will be a vital component for improving transit related services along these corridors, which span across geo-political boundaries.

Fast and Frequent Bus Service/Goals & Policies

1) GT 16 - Bus corridors have high-quality transit service allowing people to ride the bus spontaneously, and easily replace car trips with trips by bus.

PT16.1 - Develop a system of bus corridors with fast, frequent and predictable transit service

1. Roadway infrastructure and traffic signal technology will need to be integrated into corridor development, which will contribute to allowing and maintaining this type of service.

2) GT 17 – Intercity Transit’s short and long range plans are supported.

PT 17.7 – Encourage Intercity Transit to provide service to passenger rail stations.

1. Replace “passenger rail stations” with “intermodal facilities.”

PT 17.8 – Delete the reference to a specific vehicle type. Suggest reference the City will work with Intercity Transit and Thurston Regional Planning to consider using higher capacity vehicle types that may require dedicated right-of-way.

3) GT 18 – The region is prepared to advance high-capacity transit.

1. The reference should be to “high-capacity transportation”

PT 18.1 – Delete “right-of-way” purchase.”

PT 18.4 – This assumes rail will be achievable when in reality no studies have come to that conclusion. Eliminate it or reference that dense urban centers will be developed around “high capacity transportation services.”

PT 18.5 – This assumes passenger rail service will occur within Olympia. Delete this item or add that the effort will be toward working with Thurston Regional Planning to study and consider high capacity transportation options.

Inviting People to Walk/Goals & Policies

1) GT 21 – Sidewalks make streets safe and inviting for walking.

PT 21.1 – Add adequate street lighting will be provided to help improve visibility.

PT 21.2 – Add, “Priority will be given to crossings providing access to transit stops.”

2) GT 22 – Pedestrian crossing improvements remove barriers for pedestrians on major streets, especially wide streets with high-vehicle volumes.

Add “PT 22.6” – Priority will be given to crossings providing access to transit stops.

3) GT 23 – Streetscapes buffer pedestrians from motor vehicle traffic, enhance the experience of walking, and increase the attractiveness of an area.

Add “PT 23.8” – Incorporate ADA accessible bus stop waiting area, including shelters where appropriate, into new sidewalk construction and streetscape design.

Bicyclists Share our Streets/Goals & Policies

1) GT24 - Bicycling is safe and inviting, and more people bike for transportation.

1. Build secure bike parking areas at intersection of trails and bike paths with transit routes.

Fewer Car Trips, Big Benefits/Goals & Policies

- 1) **GT25 - Walking, biking, riding the bus and carpooling are inviting for trips to work or school. Fewer drive-alone trips will reduce pollution, energy consumption, and the growth in traffic congestion.**

PT25.14 – Add “and use public transportation”.

- 2) **GT26 - Parking is provided in a way that reduces drive-alone commute trips by employees.**

Add PT26.5 - Publicly provided parking should be designed for shopping and customers with pricing established to discourage long-term parking. (This is similar to PT26.1 but is a little more direct.)

Funding Brings Vision to Reality/Goals & Policies

- 1) **GT27 – Transportation facilities and services are funded to advance the goals of the City and the region. Future transportation needs are identified to provide a comprehensive view of the system we envision, and to be prepared for funding and other opportunities.**

1. Support and partner with other agencies such as Intercity Transit and the Thurston Regional Planning Council to obtain funding to improve public transportation services and planning for a sustainable community.

Working with Our Neighbors/Goals & Policies

- 1) **GT29 – Olympia engages with neighboring jurisdictions to advance common goals and solve regional problems.**

PT29.3 – add “and Thurston County”.

Other Comments/Observations

- Intercity Transit’s Olympia Transit Center is a regional transportation hub. Both Grays Harbor Transit and Mason Transit serve it (Pierce Transit only recently dropped service to Olympia) and Greyhound service will be relocated to this facility within the next couple of years.

Appendix F: Transportation Facilities

- Park & Ride Lots served by transit:
 - Lacey - Martin Way P&R, Hawks Prairie P&R (opening in fall of 2012)
 - Thurston Co – Centennial Station P&R
- Park & Ride Lots – WSDOT – Mud Bay P&R

Comprehensive Plan section on Land Use and Urban Design:

1. Concurrency - can mitigation fees be applied to assist with costs of providing transit service?
2. Senior Housing/Multi-family zoning: can there be standards applied to suggest that senior housing be located along or near transit service corridors?

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM NO. 9
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2012**

FOR: Intercity Transit Authority

FROM: Rhodetta Seward, Executive Services Director (705-5856)

SUBJECT: Citizen Advisory Committee Appointments

-
- 1) **The Issue:** Consider recommendations of the ad hoc committee for Citizen Advisory Committee appointments.
-
- 2) **Recommended Action:**
A. Appoint *Dani Burger and Midge Welter* to a term beginning July 1, 2012, ending June 30, 2015.
-
- 3) **Policy Analysis:** As per the Operating Principles, the Intercity Transit Authority appoints members to the Citizen Advisory Committee.
-
- 4) **Background:** At the direction of the Intercity Transit Authority, an ad hoc committee formed to conduct interviews of five applicants for the Citizen Advisory Committee. Interviews took place on June 11, 2012. Citizen Representative Karen Messmer chaired the ad hoc committee, which consisted of Messmer, *Virgil Clarkson, Gerald Abernathy, Meta Hogan and Don Melnick*. Upon conclusion of the interviews, the group deliberated applicants and is bringing their recommendation to the Authority for consideration for appointment.

The ad hoc committee took into consideration the remaining composition of the CAC and considered the needs of the CAC members and community. After completing the interviews, they reviewed the qualifications of the applicants and each ad hoc committee member shared their views on each applicant.

It is the recommendation of the committee to appoint two positions for 3-year terms: *Dani Burger and Midge Welter*. At their last meeting, the Authority appointed *Charles Richardson* to a term and reappointed four current members. This fills all current vacancies, except the youth position. The committee recommends conducting recruitment in the fall.

There were many good candidates with this recruitment. It was agreed should a member need to leave the committee for any reason within the next six months, one of those not selected at this time could be appointed should they still be available for service.

5) Alternatives:

- A. Appoint *Dani Burger and Midge Welter* to a term beginning July 1, 2012, ending June 30, 2015.
- B. Recommend other applicants from the pool of candidates be appointed.
- C. Defer appointments. This would leave the CAC with 17 members rather than 20.
- D. Recommend staff conduct a recruitment.

6) Budget Notes: No further costs unless a second recruitment is desired.

7) Goal References: Appointment of new members to the CAC meets Goal #1: *"Assess the transportation needs of our community."*

8) References: N/A

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM NO. 10
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2012**

FOR: Intercity Transit Authority
FROM: Marilyn Hemmann, 705-5833
SUBJECT: Bus Stop Pad Construction

-
- 1) **The Issue:** Consideration of an award for the construction of bus stop pads.
-
- 2) **Recommended Action:** Authorize the General Manager to enter into a contract for the construction of 33 bus stop pads with a firm and in an amount to be announced at the June 20, 2012, meeting.
-
- 3) **Policy Analysis:** The procurement policy states the Authority must approve any expenditure over \$25,000.
-
- 4) **Background:** Intercity Transit issued a Request for Bids May 24, 2012. Interested contractors attended a pre-bid conference and site inspection on June 5, 2012. Bids are due at 1:00 pm on June 15, 2012. The engineer's estimate for this project is \$150,000 to \$180,000.
-
- 5) **Alternatives:**
- A. Authorize the General Manager to enter into a contract for the construction of bus stop pads, with a firm and in an amount, to be announced at the June 20, 2012, meeting.
 - B. Defer action. Deferring action will cause us to lose the construction season.
-
- 6) **Budget Notes:** The 2012 budget for bus stop enhancements is \$467,185. This consists of \$384,185 in federal grant funds and \$83,000 in local dollars. In addition to construction, this budget item includes engineering and the cost of building permits.
-
- 7) **Goal Reference:** This agenda item meets Goal 2: *"Provide outstanding customer service."*
-
- 8) **References:** N/A

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY
SPECIAL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM NO. 11
MEETING DATE: June 20, 2012**

FOR: Intercity Transit Authority
FROM: Ann Freeman-Manzanares, 705-5838
SUBJECT: Olympia Transit Center Expansion Update

-
- 1) **The Issue:** Staff will provide an update on the status of the Olympia Transit Center expansion project.

 - 2) **Recommended Action:** This item is for information and discussion.

 - 3) **Policy Analysis:** Staff provides periodic updates on major capital projects.

 - 4) **Background:** Staff will share latest design drawings which will be utilized in developing construction cost estimates and for value engineering.

 - 5) **Alternatives:** N/A

 - 6) **Budget Notes:** Continuing to define building requirements and design elements. This work will better define anticipated construction costs. With this information we can better assess next steps.

 - 7) **Goal Reference:** Goal No. 2: *"Providing outstanding customer service."*

 - 8) **References:** N/A
