



CAPITOL CAMPUS DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dennis Haskell, Alex Rolluda, Jonathan Taylor, Susan Olmsted

Secretary of State Kim Wyman

Senator Karen Fraser, Senator - Vacant Position

Representative Sam Hunt, Representative Drew MacEwen

Department of Enterprise Service
1500 Jefferson Street - Room 2208
Olympia, Washington 98504

MAY 22, 2014

10:00 AM

(Approved: September 18, 2014)

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dennis Haskell, Chair
Jonathan Taylor
Susan Olmsted
Senator Karen Fraser
Secretary of State Kim Wyman
Representative Sam Hunt

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator (vacant)
Alex Rolluda, Vice-Chair
Representative Drew MacEwen

OTHERS PRESENT

Dave Arbaugh, Arbaugh & Associates
Leonard Bauer, City of Olympia
Rick Browning, Department of Enterprise Services
Kim Buccarelli, Department of Enterprise Services
Peggy Clifford, South Capitol Neighborhood Assoc.
Nancy Deakins, Department of Enterprise Services
Debra Delzell, Department of Enterprise Services
Jim Erskine, Department of Enterprise Services
Tom Gow, Puget Sound Meeting Services
Darlene Heglund, Department of Enterprise Services
Shelley Sadie-Hill, Department of Enterprise Services
Sidney Hunt, Department of Enterprise Services
Anthony Ifie, Department of Enterprise Services
Bob Jacobs, Olympia Capitol Park Foundation
Gary Larson, Legislative Services

Nouk Leap, Department of Enterprise Services
Chris Liu, Department of Enterprise Services
Lenore Miller, Department of Enterprise Services
Brian Nguy, Department of Enterprise Services
Karen Parkhurst, Thurston Regional Planning Council
Deanne Price, Department of Enterprise Services
Trina Regan, Department of Enterprise Services
Jarrett Sacks, Department of Enterprise Services
Bonnie Scheel, Department of Enterprise Services
Brad Shannon, The Olympian
Vann Smiley, Department of Social and Health Services
Joni Swanson, Department of Enterprise Services
Ann Sweeney, Department of Enterprise Services
Jeff Willis, Department of Social and Health Services

Welcome and Announcements

Chair Dennis Haskell called the Capitol Campus Design Advisory Committee (CCDAC) regular meeting to order at 10:11 a.m. A meeting quorum was attained.

Notice of the meeting was published in *The Olympian* newspaper. Public comments will be accepted after the conclusion of agenda items.

Approval of Agenda

Chair Haskell requested moving the discussion on Capitol Campus Planning before the CCDAC Handbook discussion.

Secretary Wyman moved, seconded by Jonathan Taylor, to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes

February 20, 2014

Secretary Wyman moved, seconded by Susan Olmsted, to approve the minutes of February 20, 2014, as published. Motion carried.

CCDAC will review two items on the agenda for Action: Approval of the Minutes – *February 20, 2014* and the CCDAC Handbook; two items for Information: CCDAC Membership Update and the 1063 Block Replacement Project – *Status Update*; and two items for Discussion: Office Building Two Renaming – *Status Update* and the Capitol Campus Planning – *Master Plan Update and Transportation and Parking Study*.

Representative Hunt arrived at the meeting.

CCDAC Membership Update

Jarrett Sacks, Legislative Analyst, updated members on the status of filling vacant legislative positions on the CCDAC. Of the four legislative members, one seat is unfilled. Staff met with the Majority Coalition Caucus to fill the vacancy. Other meetings with other members of the Majority Coalition Caucus are planned to address an appointment to fill the vacant position.

1063 Block Replacement Project – Status Update

Rick Browning, 1063 Block Project Director, updated the committee on the status of the project.

The project, a five-story, 215,000 square-foot high performance office building will be sited on the west Capitol Campus replacing the Capital Park Building and garage located at the corner of 11th and Capitol Way. Legislation establishing the project requires the Design-Build (DB) delivery method. The Department of Enterprise Services (DES) recently completed the DB competitive process. The last element was the selection of an apparent successful firm from the three project submittals. Alex Rolluda was a voting member on the selection committee, as was former CCDAC member Barbara Swift. DES representatives express thanks to both members for their time while serving on the committee.

The apparent successful team is ZGF Architects and Sellen Construction. Negotiations are underway with both companies and DES anticipates executing a contract on July 1. Because of technical issues surrounding the original enabling legislation, funding is not available for construction. Funding is available for early project activities to include design and demolition. DES does not plan to pursue demolition at this time, as it likely would occur closer to construction sometime in 2015. DES is negotiating a phased contract, which is a new circumstance as the original plan did not anticipate the necessity to phase the project. Essentially, instead of a true DB project, the project could be termed as a “design pause build project.” The intent is retaining as much as possible the positive aspects of the DB delivery method to include the price. DES anticipates that by next spring, the majority of design will be completed to afford a fast track permit for foundation work to enable the department to proceed with demolition and foundation work as the remaining design is completed. DES anticipates construction to begin in late spring/early summer 2015.

CCDAC - Minutes of Meeting

May 22, 2014

Page 3 of 11

The team looks forward to working with the CCDAC as a partner to refine the design, which at this point is 30 percent complete. At the next CCDAC meeting in September, the team anticipates reviewing the design to receive input.

Senator Fraser commented on the uncertainty of the Legislature. She asked about considerations afforded to the level of detail or completion should the contract be exposed to the uncertainties of future legislative decisions. Mr. Browning advised that the contract includes three phases. The first phase is design only. The second phase is demolition followed by the third phase of construction. It's likely the first two phases would occur concurrently. The commitment for Phase 1 is full design through permits. Sufficient funds are available for the first phase. Legislation directs DES to proceed through design.

Susan Olmsted asked about the phase of design DES is initiating through the contract. Mr. Browning advised that the process began with the submittal by the three firms of the preliminary 30 percent design. DES initiated a 90-day scope validation as the first task in design, whereby the DES team meets with the firm to review the details of tenant assignments on each floor and with tenants groups to validate program needs. Some changes in assigned tenants are anticipated throughout the process.

At this time, DES is not committing the state to more than what has been allocated in funds. Provisions within the contract address the possibility of not proceeding if funding is not provided for construction. There is no commitment for the state to proceed if funding is not provided.

Jonathan Taylor questioned whether 30 percent completion refers to the full design contract. Mr. Browning affirmed it is the full design contract. Because the team was required to commit to a price, the firm submitted more than a normal design-bid-build delivery proposal. The firm advanced some design elements to ensure a commitment to the price while other elements are not nearly as advanced. The design at this point is an advanced schematic or early design development level of completion with the majority of the design to be completed.

Chair Haskell cautioned against securing permits too early in the process prior to receiving funds for construction. Based on personal experience, permits have time limits that often expire and codes often change through the process of waiting for funds to pursue construction. Mr. Browning said the situation hinges on whether the Legislature allocates funding during the next session. Given the schedule submitted by the design team, DES does not believe the design would be completed to secure design permits during the legislative session but could possibly secure a fast-track foundation permit to initiate the project. It's likely permitting wouldn't occur until after the legislative session for a full building permit. DES is not committed to proceeding beyond design if no funding is awarded. DES also has the ability to halt the design process.

Representative Hunt asked about the funds invested in the project to date. Mr. Browning said the current appropriation is \$13 million. Obligations committed include the honorarium to the two unsuccessful firms and other costs, such as the pre-design consultant for assistance in preparing the Requests for Proposals documents. DES has expended less than \$2 million. A detailed budget is available. After execution of the contract, the team submits an initial billing for the work completed to date. DB competitions are intensive and the honorarium typically reimburses firms for one-half to a third of the company's costs. The first billing likely would be approximately \$600,000 to cover the work completed to date.

Members agreed to delay viewing the design illustrations until the September 2014 meeting. Senator Fraser mentioned the public meeting later in the evening, which includes a review of the design images.

Mr. Browning reported a public open house is planned later in the day at 6 p.m. in the Presentation Room at the Jefferson Building. The meeting will focus on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist and impacts of the project. The meeting provides an opportunity for the public to contribute input on potential impacts of the project prior to finalizing the SEPA. The meeting includes a brief review of the images included in the project submittal.

Mr. Browning advised that the legislative proviso did not provide funding for parking for the new building. DES initiated an update of the 2009 Capitol Campus Parking Study, which has transitioned to a Transportation and Parking Study. Additionally, an alley vacation process is underway, as the site is bisected by an alley. The City has agreed in theory to vacate and sell the alley to the state. Demolition is planned in late spring 2015 in conjunction with funding certainty from the Legislature with substantial completion of the project scheduled in late spring 2017.

Office Building Two Renaming – Status Update

Lenore Miller, Asset Manager, DES, reported Office Building Two (OB2) houses the primary tenant of the Department of Social and Health Services. In February 2014, DES received a request to rename the building. The statute governing the renaming of state buildings requires a review and recommendation by the CCDAC to the Director of DES and to the State Capitol Committee (SCC). The statute directs that the Legislature shall approve names for new or existing buildings on the state capitol grounds based on the recommendations of the SCC and the DES Director only after substantial renovation or a change in the predominant tenant agency. The trigger for renaming the building is the substantial renovation to the building. Renovation of the building was initiated in 2002 and completed in 2007 at a cost of more than \$20 million to renovate the core of the building and improvements to major building structures. Work remaining is on office space located throughout the building at a cost estimated to be \$35 million. The work would update a variety of systems including seismic and technology improvements.

Vann Smiley, Director, Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), introduced Jeff Willis, Chief of Leased Facilities Unit, DSHS. The unit governs all lease spaces across the state for DSHS.

Mr. Willis reported DSHS is Washington State's largest state agency serving 2.2 million customers with a variety of services ranging from assistance, shelter, care, protection, or support. The mission of DSHS is "To Transform Lives."

DSHS is requesting the name change based on several reasons. Most facilities on East Capitol Campus are named after the agencies that are housed within the facility. Mr. Willis referred members to a map of the campus and the location of OB2. The area also includes the Departments of Transportation, Licensing, Natural Resources, and the Employment Security buildings.

DSHS is proud of the services it delivers and would like the building name to reflect the work the department provides and to enable residents of the state to identify the department when visiting the campus. DSHS proposes renaming OB2 to the "Human Services" building.

Mr. Willis reviewed the RCW governing the renaming of state buildings. Renaming the building is based on substantial renovation, predominant tenant agency, and the purpose of the building. DSHS has relocated various divisions and administrations to OB2 and has completed four of five phases of renovation and reconfiguration. DSHS provides "Human Services" to people in need and believes the department meets all the requirements for renaming OB2 to the "Human Services" building.

Since FY 2000, the state has invested over \$20 million in OB2 to replace major infrastructure equipment and focus on exterior improvements including a new roof, two new entrances, and major window and leak repairs. Since 2007, DES has planned for and persistently requested funds for a major renovation; however, the Legislature has not been able to provide requested funding. During the 2015-2017 biennium, DES is seeking \$4 million for design and planning followed by a 2017-2019 biennium budget request of \$30 million to fund construction of major interior reconfigurations, critical safety and seismic improvements, and continued building system improvements.

Mr. Willis said DSHS is seeking the committee's support to move forward and rename the building to reflect the services provided by the department.

Discussion followed on how the existing name was designated by default and never formally adopted.

Secretary Wyman shared that until the recent tour of the building, she was unaware DSHS was the major tenant in OB2.

Senator Fraser supported the recommendation. According to the information, approximately one-third of the state's population receives services from DSHS. She asked about the final decision-maker. Ms. Miller replied that the final decision is rendered by the Legislature. The SCC submits the naming recommendation to the Legislature for consideration to enact legislation to rename the building.

Senator Fraser moved, seconded by Susan Olmsted, to recommend approval to the SCC for renaming OB2 to Human Services Building. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Miller reported the recommendation would be presented to the SCC at its June 12 meeting.

Capitol Campus Planning – Master Plan Update

Ms. Miller reported that at the last meeting in February, the committee agreed to assist DES in the update of the 2006 Master Plan. Two work sessions were held on April 9 and May 12. A scope of work was developed identifying key areas of focus for the update. Several members of the CCDAC agreed to assist the assigned leads in developing proposals. A draft recommendation will be presented to the committee prior to submittal to the SCC for its input and approval.

Ms. Miller reviewed the update schedule. The first draft of the update is anticipated be completed by the end of the year. During 2015, editing and revisions of the master plan would occur with the goal to adopt the master plan by the end of 2015. During that time, considerable stakeholder engagement is planned. Stakeholders include state government, DES customers, Office of Financial Management, local government, Legislature, the local community, and other stakeholders. All stakeholders will be engaged throughout the process and receive iterations of the update as it develops.

One of the important issues is the need for a clear vision about the future of Capitol Campus in terms of physical changes and enhancements for future use of the campus and the physical requirements to serve those uses. Some of this work will be piloted because of the necessary resources as DES develops its comprehensive 10-year plan.

Transportation & Parking Study

Ms. Miller shared that part of the master plan update, as well as in support of the 1063 Block Replacement Project, DES determined a need to study transportation and parking on campus. Late last year, DES commissioned Rick Williams Consulting to analyze transportation and parking, identify

current conditions, and develop recommendations for improving and responding to transportation and parking needs more effectively and responsibly.

Rick Williams, Principal, Rick Williams Consulting, said the company is a parking and transportation demand management firm based in Portland, Oregon. He acknowledged the assistance of DES during the study process.

The scope of work included the following tasks:

- Update the 2009 Parking Study and translate the information for moving forward with a Transportation and Parking Management Plan for the campus and evaluate impacts of the 1063 Block Replacement Project estimated to add 400 employees to the campus.
- Evaluate existing conditions under transportation demand management as required by the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Act.
- Recommend refinements and changes.
- Recommendations to include how to maximize existing parking resources.

The first step was conducting a complete inventory of all campus parking. Today, 6,095 parking stalls exist on campus in 35 parking areas. Many of the stalls are dedicated for visitor parking. The survey entailed a three-day effort of counting cars in parking stalls every hour on the hour over a 10-hour operating day over three days. The baseline date was when the Legislature was not in session and two high activity survey days when the Legislature was in session to measure the variation between the days. Data from the two-day legislative period were blended into an average. The average revealed very little variation in parking activity on the two legislative days (less than 1 percentage point).

The traffic model considers points of constraint. Parking areas are considered constrained when it reaches 90 percent at any hour of the day. The data reveals when and where practical capacity is reached in employee parking areas. Employee parking areas have a higher practical capacity than visitor parking because employees are habituated parkers who work on campus each day and learn the parking system navigating through constraints better than visitors to the campus who lack the same level of experience. The level of angst or frustration felt by a visitor begins to occur at approximately 85 percent as opposed to an employee who experiences it at 90 percent. The model evaluated when that level is attained.

During non-session, factors evaluated included occupancy at peak hour of combined supply of employee and visitor parking and peak occupancies of each individual supply of parking. Of the 6,095 parking stalls, 4,549 parking stalls were occupied by vehicles between 10 and 11 a.m. Parking fluctuations occur across the day. During non-session, there are approximately 1,546 empty parking stalls on campus. Theoretically, there may be opportunities to move parking seasonally during the non-legislative session and switch back during the legislative session.

Mr. Williams displayed a heat map during the peak hour between 10 and 11 a.m. The study effort produced a heat map for every hour of the day for the three days of the study showing how the campus behaves every hour. Red designates practical capacity with parking very constrained, orange reflects parking as tight, and the remaining colors of yellow and green reflect parking is available.

During the non-legislative session, nine of the 35 parking areas reflect practical capacity and areas of constraint. Four of those parking areas are visitor parking with the remaining areas employee parking areas.

The overall assessment during non-session reflects reasonable opportunities to park on campus; however, a better job of helping people find parking is needed.

During a legislative session, the overall combined parking occupancy is 84 percent. For a visitor, parking on campus appears constrained. The employee supply of parking is at approximately 84 percent of occupancy. Most importantly, 600 vehicles are on campus during the peak hour during a legislative session reflecting a 13 percent increase in volume. During the legislative session, employees are able to find parking while visitors are less successful. Strategies have been identified to help consolidate and identify visitor-parking supply. Twenty of the 35 lots are parking constrained, as well as eight of the 11 visitor facilities exceeding practical capacity.

Senator Fraser asked whether the study considered parking areas outside of state ownership, such as the Farmers Market or carpooling from homes near the campus. Mr. Williams said the scope did not consider those situations; however, the assessment of those opportunities are included as future opportunities through work with the transit agency or with the City of Olympia to determine whether that parking is imposing any constraints in those external areas. The scope of the work remained focused on the campus. However, the study includes anecdotal observations based on the survey results.

During a legislative session, over 57 percent of total parking supply is constrained. Employee parking supply is below 90 percent practical capacity, but it's well used and key facilities are constrained.

The study also included modeling the impact of removing 260 parking stalls from the parking supply as part of the 1063 project assessment, which reduces total parking stalls on the campus to 5,833. It was also recognized that those employees currently parking in those stalls would park at other locations within the existing parking supply. The model assumed the 400 new employees would arrive on campus similar to existing employees. For every 100 employees, approximately 77 require a parking space. Modeling results were produced during session and non-session times.

Modeling results based on the base rate of 5,833 stalls during the session reflect an increase of peak occupancy from 84 percent to 93 percent. Segregating parking between employee and visitor areas increases employee-parking capacity to 93 percent and visitor parking increases from 86 percent to 98 percent. The addition of 400 new employees increases parking occupancy up to and over practical capacity unless other measures are employed to mitigate the impact. One of the solutions is building more parking. Another is managing parking supply better and considering how the campus is achieving its CTR transportation demand management goals.

Mr. Williams shared results during the non-session peak hour by dropping the supply to 5,833 stalls and including 400 new employees. Combined supply increased to 83 percent from 75 percent with employee parking increasing to 85 percent from 77 percent and visitor parking decreasing to 61 percent.

Mr. Browning pointed out that all the percentages and conclusions are focused on the peak hour of the day.

Currently, there is no central source of CTR employee performance data. A model was created of all 64 state agencies on the campus of all trip reduction performance percentages consolidated into a single campus number. The number was compared against the state's CTR goal for reducing drive alone trips by 10 percent over four years. Unfortunately, good progress hasn't occurred in reducing drive alone trips on the campus over time. Opportunities are available if the campus met some of the CTR goals. Approximately 71 percent of all employees drive alone. The state is not meeting its CTR established goals and is not having a positive impact on reducing campus demand for parking. However, CTR can

serve as a good mitigating factor for managing employee growth over time. Reducing and creating other modes of access over time could result in a significant impact. To achieve results, implementation of new programs would be required.

Coupled with efficiency programs recommended within the report, the state could achieve savings of \$14 million in parking costs. Meeting current CTR goals would save 390 parking stalls each day (peak hour) saving the state \$16 million. The study factors the cost of one above grade parking stall at \$40,000 (structured parking). The cost of each parking space could increase as most of the state's parking supply is below ground.

The report includes 35 specific recommendations. The recommendations are allocated across five performance elements of:

1. Policy element;
2. Consolidation of CTR and parking services into one division on campus responsible for delivering CTR and parking services to agencies and employees;
3. Operational recommendations affecting demand, supply, infrastructure, and non-parking infrastructure (bike lanes, transit systems, and pedestrians facilities);
4. Conveyance of information, and;
5. Funding recommendations.

Mr. Williams shared highlights of the recommendations:

- Engage senior management in the new approach to achieve the goals, objectives, and targets of CTR.
- Commit adequate funding.
- Consider pricing strategies for parking on campus
- Consolidate the delivery of parking services through a single campus access manager.
- Ensure adequate amenities to support alternative modes.
- Downsize the number of reserved parking stalls.
- Restripe the Plaza Garage to increase number of parking spaces.
- Consider satellite-parking locations, which would be more affordable and could be shared.
- Equip leadership with messages emphasizing the importance of CTR.
- Centralize performance. Use centralized data in decision-making in an ongoing effort.

Ms. Miller added that engaging senior management speaks to engaging and focusing the efforts of all agency executives to meet the collective goals of CTR to achieve results on the entire campus rather than independently striving to achieve CTR goals.

Ms. Olmsted commented that as a member of the stakeholder group working on the Landscape Preservation Master Plan adopted in 2009, one of the key recommendations considered the historic resources of West Capitol Campus and eliminating parking spaces that should not be located on the historic campus. The supply figures should not include some of the parking spaces that currently exist as surface parking on the West Capitol Campus. If the parking continues to be counted as spaces, the state would be perpetuating the prioritization of automobiles over pedestrians in one of the most important civic spaces in the state. She recommended the removal of those surface parking spaces near buildings to ensure a truly democratic historic campus as it was intended by the Olmsted Brothers design. Historic documentation reflects how the Olmsted Brothers advocated against parking near buildings designed by Wilder and White. She noted that the 1063 Block Replacement Project would pressure the West Capitol

Campus because of proximity. She asked about the emphasis on the historic campus and whether the program for the 1063 project includes showers, locker rooms, and bike racks to promote multimodal transportation options.

Mr. Browning responded that the project includes external short-term covered bicycle parking in the project submittal from ZGF Architects, as well as locker rooms, showers, and indoor secure bike parking for both genders. Since Washington State Patrol utilizes bike patrols, the department is supporting plans for a shared bike parking area.

Secretary Wyman asked about the date of the state's adoption of the CTR Act. Karen Parkhurst, Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC), reported the state implemented CTR approximately 20 years ago. Secretary Wyman asked about the actual reduction documented through the CTR program. Ms. Parkhurst reported TRPC is the lead agency for the CTR Program on behalf of Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater, and Thurston County. Capitol Campus has not achieved its goals in general; however, there has been a 7 percent reduction over the last 20 years by participating jurisdictions. Because of confusion in the numbers, a new baseline was created in 2007. Another element of the goal is maintaining consistency in the reduction as there are more people driving, as well as more miles driven. Maintaining the reduction achieved to date is also beneficial. Support from leadership in state agencies is also a factor. There's been reluctance by state agencies to implement telework despite good data documenting cost savings that could be achieved by the state if more state agencies encouraged telework.

Secretary Wyman asked whether the costs of incentives are factored when considering the \$40,000 cost for each parking stall, as those costs should be considered long-term costs. From the perspective of a state agency, decisions are made during a different biennium with conditions changing each year and no mechanisms in a future biennium to support previous funding decisions. She expressed concerns of adding a new building with 400 new employees that accommodates additional parking based on a plan of parking incentives. The parking plan could fail if future legislative bodies do not fund the elements to ensure the plan is successful. It's important to consider the long-term cost of \$40,000 per parking stall over the 30-year lifespan of the building and comparing it with a plan to manage parking through incentives. She understands and supports the goal to reduce the number of vehicles; however, in January people typically do not ride bikes. She has spent too much time circling campus and expending gas to locate a parking space to attend a legislative hearing. The all or nothing and forcing people not to drive is concerning as the decision is for the long-term and it's important to consider all impacts.

Mr. Williams replied that the report considers the long term. Additionally, many inexpensive alternatives are not being pursued by the state. Bicycling is one of the least expensive modes, telework and flexible hours are another. If the state met its goal for telework of 9 percent on the campus, that alone represents 6 percent. Some of the options are dependent on funding, such as the cost of transit passes versus the cost of building a parking stall. However, it should be compared to the charge for each parking stall as opposed to transit. The points are valid. However, the economics indicate that at some future point, growth may entail the need for new parking.

Mr. Taylor mentioned purchasing parking off campus and providing a shuttle. Mr. Williams said the report documents that option as the first approach prior to adding parking on campus. Mr. Taylor recommended increasing the parking stall estimate of \$40,000 to \$60,000 because it's unlikely the state would construct above grade structured parking. Mr. Williams offered to pursue additional research on structured parking costs.

Chair Haskell said the notion of off-site parking is an important consideration. Although he arrived on campus earlier with a pass, he was unable to locate a parking space requiring him to park on the street.

Discounting off-site parking inventory is shortsighted and should be incorporated within the study, as well as ways to communicate the location of all parking lots, such as maps or online information on all parking locations. Similar to garages in Seattle, it's also possible to electronically display the number of parking spaces available in lots. Circulation availability on the campus is another issue if parking is at a remote site.

Senator Fraser pointed out the importance of accounting for parking stresses on non-state-owned facilities. Previously, political upheaval has occurred at the City of Olympia and within the Capitol Campus over parking because there is insufficient parking on campus, especially during the session. Visitors often park in surrounding neighborhoods. In an attempt to control neighborhood parking, the City imposed one- and two-hour parking limits. The City had to allocate resources to enforce parking. The neighborhood has also objected to many yards converted to parking lots. The issue is real and it's important to recognize the substantial impacts on properties not publicly owned. Another request is consideration of strategies to reduce the demand for parking during the session. Today, it's not practical to visit the campus unless the person is driving. Transit service schedules and the main population centers to the north must be considered. It's often not possible to arrive during the day and depart in the evening by bus because of transit schedules. Many regional transit dysfunctions affect parking supply. To afford an opportunity for citizens to participate in the democratic process, transit to and from the campus must be considered.

Senator Fraser added that the team should explore creative financing. The City of Olympia has strived for many years to build a parking structure. An opportunity might exist for sharing the expense. She often travels to downtown Seattle for meetings and is impressed with the availability of parking garages in downtown Seattle. Parking is available in most blocks.

Representative Hunt echoed similar comments. He often travels to Seattle by taking the bus from Lakewood to Seattle, which has worked well for him. He questioned whether transit service is available from local transit centers and park and ride lots to the campus. Park and ride lots afford free parking and are located adjacent to the freeway. If reliable transit service were available, it likely would relieve parking pressure on the campus. He acknowledged the need to work with the City and the transit agency, as well as securing funding to expand shuttle service to outlying park and ride lots.

Mr. Taylor agreed the recommendations for restriping and eliminating some underutilized reserve parking are good ways to add to the parking inventory.

Chair Haskell invited public comments.

Leonard Bauer, City of Olympia, acknowledged and thanked Senator Fraser and Representative Hunt for their comments and extended an offer to work with them to address external impacts and how downtown parking is managed in neighborhood areas.

Peggy Clifford, South Capitol Neighborhood Association, said the neighborhood is highly impacted by the lack of campus parking and not just during the session because the impacts occur when there are campus demonstrations or committee weekends. The neighborhood has experienced many problems and the situation has often improved and worsened. The Jefferson Building was the site of a park and ride lot enabling people to use Dash to access the campus. Many use the Farmers Market parking lot to ride Dash, which is somewhat more difficult because of the distance. The neighborhood is nearly at capacity and adding 400 new employees and eliminating 260 parking spaces is very concerning to the association. She agreed with the comments that the parking likely could be managed in the short-term but the neighborhood has experience in terms of what occurs in the long term when situations change, funding is

CCDAC - Minutes of Meeting

May 22, 2014

Page 11 of 11

no longer available, and programs disappear. She would like to see a more permanent solution other than managing parking through incentives.

Karen Parkhurst, TRPC, reported she has been involved in some of the discussions and meetings. TRPC wants to continue participating. TRPC completed a Capitol Campus Study several years ago as well as a telework study. That information can assist in the efforts. Today, Dash service is funded entirely by Intercity Transit and not by the state or the City of Olympia, which previously contributed. Another piece to consider is including the cost of maintenance when factoring the cost of parking. Maintaining parking space costs money. Maintenance of the CTR Program could be less than maintaining parking structures. Lifecycle costs of transportation investments should be factored rather than only the initial construction.

Senator Fraser referred to cost avoidance and how government tends to fund from various pots. It may be possible to avoid a cost in one area that's not compensated in another area. She advocated for creative financing and how different funding sources are related.

Representative Hunt referred to the Labor and Industries and Corrections Buildings in Tumwater, which are surrounded by surface parking.

CCDAC Handbook

Chair Haskell reported members have had many opportunities to review and comment on the draft CCDAC Handbook.

Senator Fraser recommended including RCWs when provisions refer to statute. Chair Haskell noted that some members recommended capitalizing some language. However, the text is from existing legislation, which is not capitalized and cannot be changed. In those instances, he recommended italicizing the language within the handbook.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled on Thursday, September 18, 2014 at 10 a.m.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Haskell adjourned the meeting at 11:39 a.m.

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President
Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net