

**INTERCITY TRANSIT
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA
June 18, 2012
5:30 PM**

CALL TO ORDER

- | | | |
|--------------|---|----------------|
| I. | APPROVE AGENDA | 1 min. |
| II. | INTRODUCTIONS | 1 min. |
| | A. Introduction of Joe Baker, City of Yelm | |
| III. | MEETING ATTENDANCE | 3 min. |
| | A. June 20, 2012, Special Meeting <i>(Faith Hagenhofer)</i> | |
| | B. July 18, 2012, Special Meeting <i>(Meta Hogan)</i> | |
| IV. | APPROVAL OF MINUTES - May 21, 2012 | 1 min. |
| V. | CONSUMER ISSUES CHECK-IN | 3 min. |
| | <i>(This is to identify what issues you wish to discuss later on the agenda in order to allocate time).</i> | |
| VI. | NEW BUSINESS | |
| | A. 2012 Bicycle Commuter Contest Update <i>(Duncan Green)</i> | 15 min. |
| | B. Vanpool Fares - Cost Recovery <i>(Ben Foreman/Carolyn Newsome)</i> | 20 min. |
| | C. City of Olympia Draft Comprehensive Plan Update <i>(Dennis Bloom)</i> | 15 min. |
| | D. Elections <i>(Rhodetta Seward)</i> | 3 min. |
| | E. Self- Assessment Results <i>(Rhodetta Seward)</i> | 10 min. |
| | Farewell to Gerald Abernathy and Matthew Connor | 15 min. |
| VII. | CONSUMER ISSUES - All | 20 min. |
| VIII. | REPORTS | |
| | A. June 6, 2012, Regular Meeting <i>(No Attendee - Highlights Attached)</i> | 0 min. |
| | B. June 20, 2012, Special Meeting <i>(Faith Hagenhofer)</i> | 3 min. |
| IX. | THE NEXT MEETING - July 16, 2012 | |

ADJOURNMENT

Attendance Report is Attached

**MINUTES
INTERCITY TRANSIT
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
May 21, 2012**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair S. Abernathy called the May 21, 2012, meeting of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to order at 5:32 p.m. at the administrative offices of Intercity Transit.

Members Present: Steve Abernathy; Wilfred Collins; Matthew Connor; Valerie Elliott; Sreenath Gangula; Jill Geyen; Roberta Gray; Faith Hagenhofer; Meta Hogan; Don Melnick; Joan O'Connell; Charles Richardson; Carl See; Michael Van Gelder; and Rob Workman.

Absent: Gerald Abernathy; Catherine Golding; Julie Hustoft; and Kahlil Sibree.

Staff Present: Rhodetta Seward; Carolyn Newsome; Marshall Krier; and Shannie Jenkins.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was M/S/A by Elliott and Connor to approve the agenda.

INTRODUCTIONS - Board member, Karen Stites, Labor Representative, was introduced.

MEETING ATTENDANCE

- A. June 6, 2012, Regular Meeting** - Catherine Golding.
- B. June 20, 2012, Work Session**- Faith Hagenhofer.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES -

It was M/S/A by Melnick and Elliott to approve the minutes of April 16, 2012, as distributed.

CONSUMER ISSUES CHECK-IN - Elliott asked how many CAC youth applications were received. Seward reported she's received six regular applications, but no youth applicants. The youth position will remain open and can be filled at a later time. Geyen suggested doing a youth recruitment during the fall when students are refreshed.

CAC MEETING MINUTES

May 21, 2012

Page 2 of 7

Richardson commented some students may not realize Intercity Transit is a non-profit agency and cannot be used as community service. The Avante School has a binder of service opportunities, but most schools do not. He feels students are worn out with school in the spring. Van Gelder recalls a form an organization needs to sign to be considered for community service eligibility. Krier commented the Maintenance Department had two students job shadow this last year for community service, and it worked out well.

Hagenhofer arrived.

NEW BUSINESS

A. 2012 Self-Assessment - Seward reported she's received one completed self-assessment already. Forms are included in the packet. The deadline to have them completed and turned in is June 8. Members can drop the assessment by her office, email it, or send it back to her by mail. She will send the form electronically to members. She also reminded members 100% participation is desired to report to the Authority.

Gray arrived.

B. Nominations for Officers - Seward reported it is the time of year, per the bylaws, to nominate members for Chair and Vice Chair for the term July 2012 - June 2013. The CAC Operating Principals regarding Officers/Term of Office is included in the packet. The election will take place at the June meeting. Nominations will be accepted at this meeting; nominations will not be accepted from the floor at next month's meeting

It was M/S/A by Gray and Melnick to nominate S. Abernathy for Chair and Hagenhofer for Vice Chair for another term. No other nominations were received.

Gangula arrived.

C. 2011 Vanpool Program Update - Intercity Transit's vanpool program began in May 1982. We leased two vans from the Washington State Department of Transportation. Currently, we are at capacity with 213 active vanpool groups. Newsome highlighted stories of three long term vanpoolers. One of them started in our first vanpool.

The program serves over 1,500 active participants. The average commute is 69 miles. The Authority makes the program successful by their support. Five to fifteen people

CAC MEETING MINUTES

May 21, 2012

Page 3 of 7

ride in a van, and they pay a fare to cover staff costs, fuel, insurance, and maintenance. We recover 96.2% of direct cost from the fares. We have a high standard for the 860 volunteer drivers, who are trained by Intercity Transit staff. We are enrolled in a program that does a monthly "ping" to drivers' records. Thirty-four vans travel to Joint Base Lewis McCord (JBLM). With the 2012 grant for vans, we will get 11 expansion vans; five of those were needed specifically for JBLM.

The Vanpool Program recently conducted a contest asking riders to tell us what happens on their commutes. We received some nice feedback, along with some funny stories. Everyone raves about how well taken care of the vans are by our maintenance staff and appreciate the great customer service our maintenance department provides.

O'Connell asked what the shortest distance is for a group. Newsome responded the fare chart goes to 10 miles, but the average is 69 miles. Our longest trip is 142 miles. The drivers keep the vans at their homes when not in use.

Workman arrived.

Collins reported seeing one of our vanpools on I-5 toward the Seattle area. Newsome commented six vans travel to Boeing. Gangula asked about a new employee looking for a vanpool from Vashon Island to Olympia. Newsome told him to have the employee contact the vanpool office and they will help provide information.

D. Hybrid Coach Efficiency - Krier shared that Intercity Transit began operating six Gillig low-floor Hybrid powered coaches in the summer of 2010. Maintenance now has sufficient data to make life-cycle cost projections to compare operating and maintenance costs of hybrid coaches versus conventional diesel coaches. 2011 operating costs for the conventional clean diesel fleet is \$1.14 per mile. The cost to operate our hybrid fleet is \$.76 per mile. Intercity Transit will save \$142,000 in lifetime fuel costs alone for each hybrid unit.

So far, the buses are performing very well, with no major repairs. Tires and brakes are usually our high cost maintenance item, but we are doing very well with them as well. We anticipate maintenance costs will go up as time goes on. The life cycle of the Hybrid engine is unknown, but based on current trends, it is possible we may never rebuild this engine family. Seven new hybrids are due for delivery in July 2012. The 2012 coach build will include new technology such as a Modine Electric cooling fan package and a beltless Vanner alternator. In tests, these components experienced a .5 mpg increase from each vehicle. We reduced oil capacity by approximately 13,000 quarts of oil with the Hybrid fleet. This is a \$26,000 savings to the agency.

CAC MEETING MINUTES

May 21, 2012

Page 4 of 7

Hogan asked if the record of less fuel is based on buses being newer. We anticipate no major overhaul components on this fleet. Collins asked what we anticipate the battery life to be, and what do we do with the old batteries. Krier responded 8-10 years is calculated for the life of the battery, and most likely the old ones will be recycled. Geyen asked how Intercity Transit chooses the routes the Hybrids are put on. Krier reported the schedulers try to blend the Hybrid routes. Workman asked if we are involved in the specs and design of the buses. He also asked if they can change the decibel level of the buzzer by the front door, suggesting it be moved to another place on the bus. Gray suggested it could be the pitch and not the decibel. Maintenance is working with Gillig on other options and is looking at this problem. Gillig listens to suggestions and is known to be responsive.

E. Funding of Centennial Station Maintenance & Operations - Seward shared information on the maintenance and operations funding of the Centennial Station. In 2011, the City of Olympia informed Intercity Transit it did not budget funds for their contribution toward the station. Intercity Transit called a meeting of all jurisdictions. During the meeting, we found the Centennial interlocal agreement for all jurisdictions were not the same. The City of Olympia had a clause allowing them to not pay the funding if they had budget constraints. Several agreements had slight variations, so it was agreed all the jurisdictions should operate under the same agreement language. Seward went through all contracts and developed one agreement for all jurisdictions to sign. This agreement runs through 2013.

Also at this same meeting through discussion, the jurisdictions asked Intercity Transit to look at other means of funding options. A list of funding options is provided in the packet. The current funding formula is based on population. The County used to own the property, and over time deeded the property over to Intercity Transit. Intercity Transit now maintains and operates the facility.

Parking: Charging for parking at Centennial Station is difficult because it is a very remote facility. The parking lot area was originally built with Department of Transportation funds. Harbour looked at other Amtrak facilities from Eugene, Oregon all the way up to the Canadian area. No other station is quite like ours, with it being staffed by volunteers and sitting in a non-urbanized area. The closest one we could find that was similar was Stanwood, and it was just a platform.

Revenue Generating: We were asked to look for a revenue generating source; however, such a service has to be mainly for our customers. Presently we have approximately 200 customers per day. Any revenue-type contract of this type has to have first option going to the Washington State Commission for the Blind.

CAC MEETING MINUTES

May 21, 2012

Page 5 of 7

Utilizing Volunteers: The two major costs for the facility are landscaping and maintenance. The main question is would the volunteers be willing to do this type of work on a long-term basis.

Amtrak Contributing More Revenue: Presently, Amtrak contributes \$8,877 per year. The boarding's are averaging 60,000 per year. There is not enough activity at this station for Amtrak to consider increasing their contribution, and Intercity Transit has asked the question multiple times.

Intercity Transit Assuming All Costs: It was asked if Intercity Transit could incorporate the entire cost into our budget, after Amtrak's portion. The remaining cost is \$63,836 per year. A major concern is the facility is being operated by the in-kind services of the volunteers. What would happen if these 49 volunteers just decided to not do this work anymore - could Intercity Transit cover these costs - should we take on this type of expense? Also, as the facility becomes older, the cost to maintain it will increase and if we take it on solely, it will be our responsibility to cover all expenses. Harbour put together a table summarizing the operating costs of the facility, and the expected contribution by each of the partners. Also included are some suggested options for funding the costs.

Gray likes the benefit of parking your car for two to three days while traveling on Amtrak. She suggested creating a parking fund for people to donate. Can it become a nonprofit organization where the volunteers could be part of it and do fundraisers? Hagenhofer believes the original group of volunteers was part of a non-profit organization. She asked what the Authority's response was when asked about this issue. Seward responded one thing they suggested was charging an additional fee on the Amtrak tickets. The Authority likes the existing collaboration with the jurisdictions; however, they recognize the budgetary concerns. They requested staff send a memo to the jurisdictions with positive suggestions. They recommended looking into charging a fee on the tickets.

S. Abernathy asked if we looked at King Street Station. He commented the City of Seattle charges Amtrak the right of entry fee to serve the station. Van Gelder feels checking on other Access Agreements is a good idea. Melnick feels an additional fee seems reasonable. See asked about an espresso stand to generate revenue and could it serve other people as well. Seward understands it needs to be for the purpose of serving our customers. Gray voiced concerns with the stations in Tacoma and Centralia, and if we put too much pressure on Amtrak, they may drop our station.

CAC MEETING MINUTES

May 21, 2012

Page 6 of 7

Workman tried three times to get a ticket at Amtrak and was told he was unable to board at the Olympia station because he needs help with baggage. He was told he needed to board in Tacoma or Centralia. S. Abernathy told him he needed to look into this more because this may be a discrimination issue that Amtrak cannot do this.

Collins asked if staff conducted an energy audit to cut down costs of energy, and maybe put in plantings to save costs on mowing. Melnick suggests reducing utilities and operating costs. Some suggestions are updating the energy with more up-to-date technology. Also eliminating lawns and going to native planting will reduce water and maintenance expenses. O'Connell likes the idea of indigence planting. She asked is there a way to advertise ridership with an express bus to make it more attractive. Hogan feels this will come up again with jurisdictions and feels there needs to be a plan in place. Hagenhofer is a frequent train rider and received a survey asking how often she rides, and feels the survey is a great opportunity to share how important the Centennial Station is. Van Gelder reported Amtrak gives out coupons; Amtrak is anxious to increase ridership. He feels the Department of Transportation is interested in this and can possibly come up with marketing funds or materials as a partnering collaborator with Intercity Transit. He also suggested local hotels provide shuttles. See asked if we could focus on capital funding to reduce maintenance costs, and other jurisdictions leverage their use of capital funds. Collins asked if we presently have any vending machines on site. Freeman-Manzanares responded there are a couple machines which pay for electricity. Gray feels there are some excursions we can advertise on to taking the train. We can advertise on our website to inform people they can take the train to Portland and the MAX to the airport. Van Gelder suggested providing a link on our website to Amtrak information to Seattle to Portland package deals.

CONSUMER ISSUES -

- Melnick reported a Panorama City resident was impressed when the driver helped him remove his bike off the bus.
- Workman became an uncle and needed to get to the Northgate Mall area. Customer service provided a trip plan ready for him within 20 minutes, and it only cost him \$1.50 for a four hour bus ride. When he was coming in on the bus today to this meeting, the Westside Safeway put up a "for lease sign" that blocks the bus stop. When coming to Intercity Transit from the bus stop, he was almost hit by two vehicles. He would also like to see sidewalks on Pattison Street. Van Gelder suggested Workman contact the City of Olympia and request the sidewalks be placed on their comp plan. They are taking comments through June 12.

CAC MEETING MINUTES

May 21, 2012

Page 7 of 7

- Gray asked about an ORCA station in our area to purchase cards. Since she has a senior card, she must go in person to Tacoma. Collins informed Gray she could mail a photocopy of a driver's license in and they will mail her pass to her.
- See asked about the multi-agency Bike-to-Work program on Friday. He suggests Intercity Transit provide a table with information on how to catch a bus with their bikes.
- Geyen's son takes the bus to the Tacoma University of Washington campus, and appreciates the Operators holding the connecting bus for him.
- Collins reported Intercity Transit provides un-driver licenses.

REPORTS

- A. **May 2, 2012, Regular Meeting** - Geyen shared highlights from the regular meeting. The main highlight she covered was ridership and sales tax is up.
- B. **May 16, 2012, Work Session** - Connor shared highlights from the work session.

NEXT MEETING: June 18, 2012. G. Abernathy and Connor will leave the CAC at the end of June; the CAC will honor them at the June meeting for their service. Seward will also contact the volunteers to set up interviews for the new recruitment.

ADJOURNMENT

It was M/S/A by Elliott and Hogan to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Prepared by Shannie Jenkins, Executive/HR Assistant

**INTERCITY TRANSIT
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA ITEM NO. VI-A
MEETING DATE: June 18, 2012**

FOR: Citizen Advisory Committee

FROM: Duncan Green, BCC Assistant, 705-5874

SUBJECT: 2012 Bicycle Commuter Contest Update

-
- 1) **The Issue:** Brief the Citizen Advisory Committee 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
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA ITEM NO. VI-B
MEETING DATE: June 18, 2012**

FOR: Citizen Advisory Committee

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 Citizen Advisory Committee feedback, along with comments received at the Authority meeting, 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
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA ITEM NO. VI-C
MEETING DATE: June 18, 2012**

FOR: Citizen Advisory Committee

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
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA ITEM NO. VI-D
MEETING DATE: June 18, 2012**

FOR: Citizen Advisory Committee

FROM: Rhodetta Seward, (705-5856)

SUBJECT: Elections

1) **The Issue:** The Citizen Advisory Committee will conduct elections for their officers.

2) **Recommended Action:** Cast a unanimous ballot, electing Steve Abernathy, Chair and Faith Hagenhofer, Vice Chair.

3) **Policy Analysis:** Per the Operating Principles, nominations are made in May and elections conducted in June.

4) **Background:** At the May 21, 2012, meeting, members conducted nominations for officers, and *Steve Abernathy* was nominated for Chair and *Faith Hagenhofer* for Vice Chair. No other nominations were received. At that time, it was recommended in June a unanimous ballot be cast.

Per the bylaws, nominations will not be accepted from the floor. Both members accepted the nomination.

The members are currently serving in these positions and are eligible to serve in these positions for one more year.

5) **Alternatives:**

- A. Cast a unanimous ballot, electing Steve Abernathy, Chair and Faith Hagenhofer, Vice Chair.
- B. Defer the elections; both of these individuals currently serve in these positions, so they would continue until the elections were completed.

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

7) **Goal References:** N/A

8) **References:** Pages 2-3 of the Operating Principles

Staff Liaison shall mail the agenda to CAC members at least five days prior to the meeting and will send a copy of the packet to each member electronically. (Amended 02/13/12)

MINUTES

The Staff Liaison shall distribute a summary of the meeting. Verbatim transcripts and detailed documentation of discussion will not be available. Members will be asked to consider and approve the minutes for the record by majority vote. The minutes will include a list of all members present and absent.

QUORUM

It is intended a quorum should be present at each meeting. One more than half of the current CAC members constitutes a quorum. If a quorum is not present, the meeting may still be held and any decisions made by members present will be forwarded to the Authority with a note indicating a quorum was not present at the vote. If a meeting starts with a quorum, the quorum requirement is considered met, even if members leave following the opening of the meeting. (Amended 07/16/01)

The CAC shall use Robert's Rules of Order as a guideline for conducting its business except as provided otherwise by State law or the operating procedures.

OFFICERS/TERM OF OFFICE

Officers will consist of Chair and Vice Chair. The process for choosing officers shall consist of nomination in May (either self-nomination or nomination by others) and affirmation by majority vote in June. (Amended 07/16/01; 2/06/08)

Officers will serve a term of one year and may serve up to two terms in the same office. If a CAC member completes an officer vacancy during the year, it shall not be considered against the two term limitation. A member may serve two years as Chair and two years as Vice Chair consecutively.

Officers may be removed prior to the end of term by majority vote of the CAC members. If an officer resigns or is removed prior to the end of the term, a replacement will be nominated and affirmed by majority vote. Such replacement will serve until the end of the regular term. (Amended 07/16/01; 12/20/04)

Section 1. *Chair*

The Chair shall:

- preside at all meetings;

- develop the agenda in coordination with the Staff Liaison;
- act as spokesperson for the CAC;
- provide leadership and direction for the CAC;
- appoint members to attend the Authority work sessions, who then report back to the CAC at their monthly meeting; and
- perform other duties as may be requested from time to time by the CAC or the Authority (*Amended 07/16/01*)

Section 2. Vice Chair

The Vice Chair, in the absence or inability of the Chair to serve, shall have the powers and shall perform the duties of the Chair. The Vice Chair shall perform such other duties from time to time as may be requested by the CAC or the Chair.

Section 3. Authority Work Session Representation

All members are expected to share the responsibility of representing the CAC at Authority work sessions. The Chair, working with the Staff Liaison shall seek CAC members to attend the monthly Authority work sessions. The CAC representative shall sit with Intercity Transit Authority members, participate fully in the meeting, and share the CAC's comments on respective issues. CAC representative(s) will serve at the work sessions in an advisory capacity to the Authority. (*Amended 07/16/01; 12/20/04*)

MEETING PROTOCOL

- ***Presentations*** made by staff or others should be succinct and relevant.
- ***Discussion*** of relevant issues and development of recommendations should constitute the majority following adequate briefing and presentation. All members' opinions will be respected and considered. The CAC may seek, at its discretion, input from the Authority and staff.
- ***Agreement*** on the CAC's position and recommendation to the Authority, prior to transmittal to the Authority, is the preferred method. Consensus is one method of agreement. (*Amended 2/19/01*)
- ***Opposing positions will be shared with the Authority.***
- ***Majority Vote*** is considered a majority of members present. (*Amended: 12/20/04*)

PRODUCTS

It is anticipated the CAC will have a product in the form of a recommendation and/or a summary of the various points of view to the Authority following study and discussion of an issue. The recommendation and/or points of view will be forwarded to the Authority through the Staff Liaison, using the appropriate agenda forms and process.

**INTERCITY TRANSIT
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA ITEM NO. VI-E
MEETING DATE: June 18, 2012**

FOR: Citizen Advisory Committee

FROM: Rhodetta Seward, (705-5856)

SUBJECT: CAC Self Assessment Results

1) **The Issue:** The Citizen Advisory Committee will discuss the results of their recently completed self-assessment.

2) **Recommended Action:** Discuss results of the assessment; prepare to share the information with the Authority at a future joint meeting.

3) **Policy Analysis:** Per the Operating Principles, the Citizen Advisory Committee will conduct a self evaluation (assessment) at least annually and present the results to the Transit Authority.

4) **Background:** Nineteen members were eligible to complete the assessment - everyone completed the assessment for 100% participation.

The results and comments are included on the attached document.

Members will have opportunity at the meeting to seek clarification, identify areas of both strength and areas of opportunity. If the CAC identifies areas needing further work, staff will work with the Chair to schedule time for further discussion.

5) **Alternatives:** N/A

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

7) **Goal References:** The CAC works with the Authority to meet all goals of Intercity Transit.

8) **References:** 2012 CAC Self-Assessment Results

**INTERCITY TRANSIT
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SELF ASSESSMENT
MAY 2012**

<i>Total Members Eligible to Participate: 19</i>	<i>Members Participating in Survey: 100%</i>
<i>of Participation:</i>	

2011 Results posted in blue.

	<i>Strongly Agree</i>		<i>Somewhat Agree</i>		<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Don't Know</i>
1. We remained faithful to our purpose.	19	100%	2	13%			
	13	87%					

Comments: As I complete my third year on the CAC, I am confident in stating the committee is very clear on what their purpose is and remain consistently faithful to that purpose. Yes, I think we took seriously our job of providing input to the Authority on proposals, and in providing new ideas. We also worked to listen to input we heard from the community and to bring that into discussions. We take the pulse of our community, thus allowing us that serve to help shape the thinking and positions of "Intercity Transit." As a newcomer, I am pleasantly surprised the CAC still remains very engaged - generally advisory committees lose their zest, interest or purpose after a number of years. As far as I can see, the members stick to the CAC's purpose and goals, even during the occasional roaming and rabbit trails we get lost on. And staff helps keep us on course. The purpose of Intercity Transit's CAC is for the Authority board to have a stronger grasp on consumer issues. We were actively informed and aware of what changes were being made within I.T. I think we do a good job of giving our opinions on various issues to the ITA. I believe this is our main purpose for existing.

Strongly Agree Somewhat Agree Somewhat Disagree Strongly Disagree Don't Know

2. The Citizen Advisory Committee represents the community.	14	74%	5	26%			
	12	80%	3	20%			

Comments: Youth, minorities, citizens with disabilities, and gender distribution seems to be strongly proportional to local demographics. We have a great mix. Members from all part of I.T.'s service area, at least locally are all diverse and depend upon mass transit for transportation. CAC appears to be representative of the community. I am not sure of the demographics to "strongly agree." In any case, we do have a good cross-section of age, gender, ethnicity. Not sure about economic status - but possible. This is why we exist. Even more so than previously with the student representative. I have a hard time strongly agreeing with this comment, but I do think we have a diverse mix of community residents on our board that represent a variety of transit users. Perhaps it's the lack of formal community outreach that keeps me from feeling more strongly. It would be great to have a regular vanpool or village vans user on the committee as well, if such applicants were to arise. The addition of the youth member(s) was healthy for our discussions. I do believe that the diversity of our community is very well represented on our committee. Hopefully, we will have a couple of determined youth that will step forward to keep that diversity present. It would also be nice to get a senior on board. I feel so uncomfortable using an inexact and undefinable term like "community" to describe who is or is not represented on the CAC. While it does represent some places both inside the PTBA and adjacent geographic areas, the question might better ask whether Thurston County is well represented, if, for example, that could describe the largest possible area IT would serve. Knowing this is as precise a way as possible allows for flexible thinking, flexible solutions. We have many community groups and interest represented; I believe the people on the CAC speak up for them when it is needed.

3. Intercity Transit and the community benefited from our input.	16 10	84% 67%	2 5	11% 33%			1	5%
---	------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	--	--	----------	-----------

Comments: I believe they do benefit, though at times we are like silent warriors on their behalf. Yes, I do think our input benefited Intercity Transit and the community, if only in assisting the Authority in making more informed and thought out decisions. These could be for internal operations, or for community focused services, so both benefited. We also had our own ideas we value as contributions to improving service and resolving problems. The riders and community at large are positively impacted by input. We are the voice of the community in this regard. I did not see any impact from my time on the CAC manifest into something I could see or use. As an easier access point to an agency serving the people, by the people, the CAC enables a variety of citizens to engage in sharing opinions, ideas and various perspectives while contributing to the continued success and constant improvement of intercity Transit. I hope they have. I believe we have thoughtful comments that enhance most discussions, and I think what we have to say has value most of the time.

4. We add value to the Transit Authority's decisions.	13 10	68% 67%	6 4	32% 27%			1	7%
--	------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------	--	--	----------	-----------

Comments: While I certainly believe we maintain a sense of influence and are well-respected by the Transit Authority, I believe if members of the CAC and the Authority met in a large group setting more frequently, the Authority would further benefit from our input. Of course, this is a bit idealistic, but if lines of communication were simply made more convenient between the CAC and the ITA, our voice would go a bit further in aiding the Authority. Sometimes, it can be a little fuzzy as to how our discussions and opinions impact policy as only one CAC member generally attends Authority work sessions and meetings, and vice versa in regards to CAC meeting attendance by members of the Authority. Without the CAC, the Authority Board would be acting without a voice of the consumer close to guide decisions. Our diversity adds to the Transit Authority's considerations. When decisions are difficult, I am sure the Authority appreciates the feedback and input from a group of concerned citizens. And we certainly do give ample feedback. Not only am I sure we add value, but the Authority also shares their appreciation often. I believe they think so. We asked them this earlier this year, and they said they take what the CAC thinks very seriously. That is good! Strongly agree, as we are additional eyes and brains for consideration of issues before the Authority. We also contribute ideas that can lead to Authority action. Doing more to foster community input could further add value.

Strongly *Somewhat* *Somewhat* *Strongly* *Don't*
Agree *Agree* *Disagree* *Disagree* *Know*

5. Our meetings are run well.	18 11	95% 73%	1 4	5% 27%		
<p>We follow our agenda and stay on task most of the time. Occasionally we get off on a tangent or a personal issue that probably doesn't need to take the time it has, but for the most part, we stay on track. We have problems staying on time, but we're getting better. Yes, we get a lot done in just a couple of hours. Only possible when a meeting is well run! Yes, our chair and vice-chair, along with Rhodetta do well in keeping us on task and in encouraging comments. I think that adding the agenda items near the beginning of the meeting for concerns/issues to be shared later was a positive addition to how the meetings are run, so we can be sure to save enough time. Thought there was more idle chatter and side conversations than in the past, which seemed to make meetings longer than needed. I think that the May meeting provided a good clue that we add to the Authority's information - not necessarily decisions. In the discussion of the Train Station, I believe the CAC provided not only a number of alternatives, but in depth details of exploring them. Thanks Steve and Faith. Meetings run a little long sometimes but that just means we are getting a lot done. I appreciate our professional leadership. Having time allotted for points of group discussion helps hold the group accountable for having productive meetings.</p>						

<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Don't Know</i>
---------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------

8. I feel comfortable contributing at the meetings.	17	89%	1	5%			1	5%
	14	93%	1	7%				

Comments: I'm never afraid to share my thoughts, ask questions when I'm unclear about something, or admit I want just ONE more cupcake. The addition of Consumer Issues to each agenda encourages more participation by all of us. Nothing of strong importance has been brought to my attention. Always. Much more so than I did two years ago. I'm looking forward to my final year as Chair and serving on the Intercity Transit CAC. Everyone is equally invited to share their opinion. I don't unless I have something to say!

Are there any topics, specific to Intercity Transit services, you are interested in discussing, getting further clarification on, or having presentations made available at CAC monthly meetings? If so, please share below:

My primary concern, as a Youth Representative is ticket prices. I want to ensure that the bus remains an accessible resource to everyone my age, as the bus is my, and most youths, primary mode of transportation.

Presentations of our web site, Facebook page and Apps; so we can understand what transit tools consumers are using and how we can help riders locate any IT resource more efficiently.

I have experienced excellent trip assistance, cross counties, from just calling IT customer service. Are there other services available? Maybe have a refresher of resources available to customers every couple of years for the CAC "Where to find the Information on IT, First." (possible social media brochure title)

Nothing at this time!

Name: _____

(Please include your name so staff will know who has completed the form. Thank you.)

Authority Meeting Highlights
a brief recap of the Authority Meeting of June 6, 2012

Action Items

Wednesday night, the Authority:

- Authorized the General Manager to execute a one-year contract with Siemens for the maintenance of the agency telephone system for \$32,578.17, including taxes. *(Marilyn Hemmann)*
- Scheduled a special meeting for June 20, 2012, to consider action items. *(Rhodetta Seward)*
- Authorized the General Manager to issue a purchase order to Cummins Northwest for a spare engine for the hybrid Gillig coaches in an amount not-to-exceed \$31,197.99, including freight and taxes. *(Marilyn Hemmann)*
- Authorized the General Manager to enter into an agreement with WSDOT to make connections and provide the use of two strands of its fiber optic cable, running from T-COM 911 to the Olympia Transit Center, in the amount of \$109,366.45, including taxes. *(Marilyn Hemmann)*
- Reappointed *Joan O'Connell, Faith Hagenhofer, Wilfred Collins and Valerie Elliott* to a term beginning July 1, 2012, through June 30, 2015, and appointed *Charles Richardson* to a term beginning July 1, 2012, through June 30, 2015. *(Rhodetta Seward)*
- Directed staff to set up interviews for five Citizen Advisory Committee applicants for June 11, 2012, beginning at 5:00 p.m., for two open positions. It was agreed the youth position will remain open with another recruitment set for this September. *(Rhodetta Seward)*.

Other items of interest:

- **Sales tax** dropped 8.5% this past month, which brings us down to 2.0% year-to-date.
- **PERS rates** are 2% below expectations, a positive equivalent of approximately \$400,000 on the budget.
- We included **health care rates** at 10% more in our 2012 budget (rates were \$850/employees – budgeted \$935/employee). Actual costs are \$800/employee for a savings of approximately \$450,000 to \$500,000 for the year.
- We received 28,800 gallons of **B20 fuel** on June 4 @ \$3.197308/gallon. This was a drop of \$0.44/gallon from two weeks earlier. We budgeted \$3.50 per gallon.

- **Ridership** is up 6% in May 2012 over 2011 – This is the second highest month for use ever. We are up 3% year-to-date.
- The **Hawks Prairie Park-and-Ride** is significantly under budget; however, there will be unexpected costs as the project moves forward.
- Staff will present Olympia Transit Center expansion **design changes** addressing budget issues and other challenges at the June 20th meeting.
- The **Sound Transit Sounder to Lakewood** will begin October 1st; with five trips in the a.m. and five in the p.m., beginning at 4:42 a.m. and coming back at 4:20 p.m.
- **Dump the Pump** activities will take place June 20 and 21.
- The **editorial board** is scheduled for July 25.
- The **Bicycle Commuter Contest** awards event is scheduled for June 23, 9:00 a.m. at the Farmer's Market.
- **Pierce Transit** is seeking a .3% sales tax increase in November.
- The City of Lacey is hosting a **local short planning** course, scheduled for June 12, 6:30 to 9:30 p.m. The class will only take the first 35 to sign-up, so if you are interested, we encourage you to sign-up quickly.
- Harbour will serve on a **panel** for the TRPC – I-5 Corridor discussion along with Lon Wyrick.

Rhodetta Seward
prepared: June 7, 2012

