



Iowa Capitol Complex Master Plan Update
Survey Analysis
July 7, 2009

Completed by
Performance & Development Solutions

Brian J Mayer
Brian.Mayer@iowa.gov
515.281.6368

DATA FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	3
Summary of Processes	3
Part 1: Demographics	4
Q1.1	4
Q1.2	4
Q 1.4	5
Q 1.5	5
Q 1.6	5
Part 2: For State Employees Housed on the Complex	6
Q 2.1	6
Q 2.1 Additional Comments	7
Q 2.2	7
Q 2.3	8
Q 2.4	9
Q 2.5	9
Part 3: Frequency of Visit	9
Q 3.1	10
Part 4: Opinions of Current Capitol Complex	11
Q 4.1	11
Q 4.2	12
Q 4.3	12
Q 4.4	12
Part 5: Opinions on the Future of the Complex	12
Q 5.1	13
Q 5.1 Additional Comments	14
Q 5.2	14
Q 5.3	15
Q 5.4	16
Part 6: Parking on the Capitol Complex	17
Q 6.1	17
Part 7: Sustainable/ “Green” Building and Construction	19
Q 7.1	19
Q 7.1 – Additional Comments	20
Part 8: Final Thoughts	21
Q 8.1	21
APPENDIX A - SURVEY QUESTIONS	23
APPENDIX B – PARTICIPATING IOWA COUNTIES	26
APPENDIX C – THEMATIC PATTERNS USED FOR QUALITATIVE QUESTIONS	27

Data Findings and Analysis

Summary of Processes

This report details the findings of the Iowa Capitol Complex Master Plan Update survey. The purpose of this survey was to collect valuable input and feedback from interested parties regarding the Iowa Capitol Complex. The results will be utilized for further planning. The survey was open for a two month period in the spring of 2009. Total, 3,432 people took the survey.

Questions for the survey were developed by the Iowa Department of Administrative Services – General Services Enterprise. See

Appendix A for a complete list of survey questions. The collected data of this survey and this report is being analyzed by the Iowa Department of Administrative Services – Human Resource Enterprise – Performance & Development Solutions team.

The intent of this report is to present the Iowa Capitol Complex Master Plan steering committee with the results of their study in a concise method so that data may be interpreted for assistance with updating the Capitol Complex Master Plan.

This analysis is broken down by question to present the details on the finding and cross tabulate results where appropriate for additional analysis.

Qualitative questions were examined through a coding process in order to find thematic patterns. Significant representative samples were randomly taken from each group and coded and themed. Patterns of significance are then summarized.

Part 1: Demographics

Demographic data was collected from each participant on page one of the survey. The following data was collected for each question.

Q1.1

Participants were asked to identify an item that best described them relating to Iowa residency. Of those responding, nearly all (98.98%) identified themselves as an Iowa resident. Remaining respondents were of such a low number that the represented groups should be seen as statistically insignificant. Table 1 below provides the results of question 1.1

Table 1: Results of Question 1.1

Residency Option	Percent
Iowa Resident	98.98%
Former Iowa resident	0.67%
Other	0.35%

Individuals who chose “other” were asked to describe the nature of their relationship to Iowa. This amounted to a total of twelve individuals. Two expressed an interest in relocating to Iowa. The remaining individuals were State of Iowa employees who reside outside the Iowa border. Again, the sample is statistically insignificant to this study.

Q1.2

Participants further identified particular residency by identifying the Iowa county in which they lived. Counties containing and immediately surrounding the Iowa Capitol Complex accounted for the most significant percentage of participants. Polk county accounted for slightly less than half (49.19%) of the participants. The counties of Story, Boone, Dallas, Madison, Warren, Marion, Jasper, and Marshall represent a combined 20.44% of the responding population. The remaining 30 percent were divided fairly evenly across the remaining 90 counties. Table 2 below identifies the top ten counties by percent of respondents. See Appendix B for a detailed listing of all counties responding.

Additionally, question 1.3 asked participants to identify their ZIP code of residency. Unsurprisingly, the ZIP codes with the greatest amount of participation were within the various counties of the highest participation. Because of the large number of ZIP codes, there is no particular data to be extrapolated by further examination at this time.

Table 2: Top Ten Responding Counties

County	Percent
Polk	49.19%
Story	4.67%
Warren	4.53%
Dallas	3.87%
Jasper	2.10%
Linn	1.69%
Marshall	1.66%
Boone	1.57%
Black Hawk	1.48%
Scott	1.48%

Q 1.4

Respondents were asked a demographic question relating to any possible employment status with the State of Iowa. Over 90% of respondents identified themselves as state employees. Nearly half (49.07%) were employees that do not work on the Capitol Complex while another 43.27% are state employees working on the Capitol Complex. Table 3 below captures the percentage of respondents based on State of Iowa employment status.

Table 3: Employment Status with the State of Iowa of Respondents

Status	Percent
State employee not on the Capitol Complex	49.07%
State employee on the Capitol Complex	43.27%
Not a state employee	6.64%
Former state employee	1.02%

Q 1.5

As an optional question, respondents could identify gender. 3,331 participants chose to respond. Of those responding, there was nearly a two to one ratio of women responding to men. Table 4 provides a precise breakdown of respondents and identified gender.

Table 4: Identified Gender of Respondents

Gender	Percent	Count
Female	65.99%	2,198
Male	34.01%	1,133

Q 1.6

Additionally, participants had the option of responding to a question of age range. 3,313 responded. Over half of the respondents were placed between the ages of 40 and 59. This group outnumbered those aged 20 to 39 by two to one.

Table 5 below provides the details of respondent age ranges.

Table 5: Identified Age Range of Respondents

Age Range	Percentage	Count
19 and younger	0.09%	3
20 - 39	29.61%	981

40 - 59	58.41%	1,935
60 and older	11.89%	394

Part 2: For State Employees Housed on the Complex

Page two of the survey collected data only from those respondents that identified themselves as a state employee working on the Capitol Complex in question 1.4. Questions deal with the impact of Capitol Complex on employee engagement, the use of the tunnel system by campus employees, amount of lunch time taken, and the likelihood of frequenting area businesses over lunch time.

Q 2.1

Employees who specifically identified themselves as a state employee housed on the Capitol Complex (see results to question 1.4 above) were asked to rank on a 1-10 Likert scale (with 1 being the least important and 10 being the most important) how they would prioritize the impact on their own engagement. See Table 6 below for a list of each impact item and how it ranked overall.

Of the 1,485 individuals who identified themselves as on-campus employees, an average number of 1,198 ranked each of the items. The item of an on-campus gym facility held a higher average ranking than others with a 7.18. This was followed by an increased focus on maintenance of our current facilities (6.71) and better quality interior spaces (6.64). Somewhat surprisingly, the idea of closer parking only rated 6th overall with a score of 5.46 as the majority of comments related directly to parking issues.

Table 6: Average Ranking of Priorities as Defined by Campus Employees.

Item	Avg	Rank
2.1.d Gym facilities available on campus to state employees	7.18	1
2.1.g Increase focus on maintenance/upkeep of current facilities	6.71	2
2.1.h Better quality interior spaces (lounges, coffee areas, etc.)	6.64	3
2.1.b More on-campus dining opportunities	6.35	4
2.1.c Adjacent property development (dry cleaners, lunch spots, etc.)	5.98	5
2.1.e Provide closer parking to my building	5.46	6
2.1.f Provide additional outdoor dining areas (tables, benches, etc.)	5.17	7
2.1.j Make the Capitol Complex feel more like a unified "campus"	4.41	8
2.1.i Provide bus and/or streetcar service within an easy walk (4-5 minutes) of my office	4.34	9
2.1.a Additional bicycle parking and shower facilities	3.41	10

Examining the various priorities by age group, there is little difference in terms of priority ranking. Table 7 below identifies the average ranking for on-campus employees based on age groups. Those identified as 40+ as well as those who did not identify age held the same three items at being most impactful. Younger employees between the ages of 20 to 39 did not identify maintenance and upkeep as a top priority. Instead they focused on more on campus dining opportunities. There were no individuals 19 and under who identified themselves as an on-campus employee to rank these items.

Table 7: Average Ranking of Priorities by Age Group

Age Groups	2.1.d	2.1.g	2.1.h	2.1.b	2.1.c	2.1.e	2.1.f	2.1.j	2.1.i	2.1.a
20 - 39	7.90	6.19	6.51	6.54	6.39	5.33	5.02	4.00	3.90	3.63
40 - 59	6.96	6.96	6.63	6.32	5.88	5.35	5.23	4.49	4.43	3.41
60 and older	6.35	6.79	6.87	5.88	5.49	6.35	5.30	4.99	4.96	2.83
(blank)	7.03	6.50	7.26	6.22	5.39	5.81	4.72	4.77	5.00	2.96

Grand Total	7.18	6.71	6.64	6.35	5.98	5.46	5.17	4.41	4.34	3.41
--------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

The priorities were also examined by differences of gender. When doing so, two of the items stand out in particular. First, additional bike parking and showering facilities (2.1.a). Males identified this with an average rank of 3.93 to females' 3.14, identifying a preference among males, though the ranking is still low overall. Additionally, closer parking stood out in terms of difference between genders. The average rank of females was 5.69 to the male ranking of 4.94. Still, the higher female ranking does not put the parking issue as a high ranking priority. Table 8 demonstrates the average ranking of individuals when specifically looking at gender.

Table 8: Average Ranking of Priorities by Gender

Gender	2.1.d	2.1.g	2.1.h	2.1.b	2.1.c	2.1.e	2.1.f	2.1.i	2.1.j	2.1.a
Female	7.27	6.60	6.65	6.40	6.06	5.69	5.31	4.30	4.25	3.14
Male	7.04	6.93	6.58	6.26	5.91	4.94	4.88	4.39	4.72	3.93
Grand Total	7.19	6.71	6.63	6.35	6.01	5.45	5.17	4.33	4.41	3.40

Q 2.1 Additional Comments

Employees on the state campus were allowed to provide additional comments in regards to the ranking of priorities. Nearly 300 responses were provided, varying in terms of content and focus. Individual comments ranged from positive to negative over anything from personal reactions to objective needs of the campus.

The call for additional comments didn't provide respondents with a specific question to answer, so responses were grouped and thematic patterns were found. See Appendix C, Table 28 for a listing of codes used in finding themes. A representative sample of comments was taken from the responding population in order to find thematic patterns.

The largest percentage of comments, nearly one-quarter, related to building maintenance, cleanliness, and comfort. This does support the high ranking of items 2.1.g and 2.1.h that call for an increased focus on maintenance/upkeep and better quality interior spaces. The variety of comments ranged from discussion of the Wallace Building, to temperature control, to blandness of workspaces and age of cubicles.

Interestingly, the second largest percentage of comments, nearly 20%, related to campus parking, though the ranking of item 2.1.e was sixth. This may be attributed to the limiting nature of the statement as it only discussed proximity of parking to the buildings. Many of the comments discussed a general need for more parking. A large number also discussed the need for lot maintenance, including paving all lots. It would appear quality and quantity of parking are greater priorities than closeness.

Additionally, there were numerous comments (approximately 10% each) discussing the exterior campus (beauty, landscaping, need for picnic areas, general green space), dining options (cafeterias, healthier options, bringing in restaurants or more vendors), and wellness facilities (gym, walking trails, locker rooms).

Q 2.2

On-campus employees were asked about the frequency of their use of the tunnel system. Over two-thirds of the employees responding identified using the tunnels frequently to sometimes. Table 9 provides the breakdown of tunnel usage by on-campus employees.

Table 9: Frequency of Tunnel Usage by On-campus Employees

Frequency	Percentage
Never	8.70%

Rarely	22.54%
Sometimes	35.14%
Frequently	33.62%

Q 2.3

On-campus employees were presented with several statements regarding the tunnel system; they were asked to choose those statements they agree with. Table 10 below shows the percentage of agreeing responses for each statement. The survey identified 1,485 individuals as on-campus employees. Of the statements, the one most agreed with by over three-quarters of the respondents regarded the tunnels as an important part of the Capitol Complex's walkway system.

Table 10: Percentage of On-campus Employees Agreeing with Statements of the Tunnel System

ID	Statement	Percent
2.3.a	The tunnels are an important part of the Capitol Complex's walkway system that need to be maintained.	78.7%
2.3.d	More parking lots/ramps should be attached to the tunnel system.	51.8%
2.3.c	More buildings should be attached to the tunnel system.	46.1%
2.3.g	I find the tunnel system easy to navigate.	41.1%
2.3.e	I use the tunnels regularly to get to other buildings.	39.5%
2.3.j	There should be more safety and emergency measures in place in the tunnels.	37.6%
2.3.f	I use the tunnels regularly for exercise.	32.1%
2.3.i	There are adequate safety and emergency measures in place in the tunnels.	19.5%
2.3.h	I find the tunnel system confusing to navigate.	18.5%
2.3.b	The tunnels are not necessary and should be closed to pedestrian traffic (i.e., only used for utility pipes).	3.2%

Each statement regarding the tunnel was explored by age groups of the various participants. In examining the various groups, there was little difference overall. Item 2.3.h contained the biggest differential by 9.29 points as older employees find the tunnels less confusing to navigate the younger employees. Interestingly, by a 7.68 point difference, older employees are less like to use the tunnels (2.3.e) to get from building to building than younger employees.

Table 11 shows the agreement rate by the various age groups.

Table 11: Agreement Rate Percentage by Age Group

Age Group	Percents by Statement									
	2.3.a	2.3.d	2.3.c	2.3.g	2.3.e	2.3.j	2.3.f	2.3.i	2.3.h	2.3.b
20 - 39	79.80%	54.04%	47.22%	39.14%	43.94%	36.36%	31.82%	21.46%	24.49%	3.03%
40 - 59	80.44%	52.27%	45.98%	44.00%	39.12%	38.77%	33.29%	19.21%	17.00%	3.14%
60 and older	77.78%	50.88%	47.37%	36.84%	36.26%	35.67%	29.24%	19.88%	15.20%	2.34%
Grand Total	78.7%	51.8%	46.1%	41.1%	39.5%	37.6%	32.1%	19.5%	18.5%	3.2%

The various agreement rates were explored by gender in order to determine any possible gap rates. Most noticeably is item 2.3.j that differed by nearly 15 points between male (27.41%) and female (42.56%) respondents. Additionally, there was nearly a 13 point difference on item 2.3.f, as males agreed with the statement only 23.98% of the time to females' 36.72%. Finally, one other note of difference is item 2.3.i, as males ranked it higher than females with a score of 28.05% to 16.0%, accounting for 12 points. Table 12 provides the breakdown of agreement rates by statement and gender.

Table 12: Agreement Rate Percentages by Gender

Gender	Percents by Statement									
	2.3.a	2.3.d	2.3.c	2.3.g	2.3.e	2.3.j	2.3.f	2.3.i	2.3.h	2.3.b
Female	79.28%	51.18%	46.15%	40.51%	40.62%	42.56%	36.72%	16.00%	19.79%	2.26%
Male	80.51%	54.82%	46.68%	44.33%	38.33%	27.41%	23.98%	28.05%	16.49%	4.71%
Grand Total	78.7%	51.8%	46.1%	41.1%	39.5%	37.6%	32.1%	19.5%	18.5%	3.2%

Q 2.4

On-campus employees were asked about the amount of lunch time taken. Over 80% of on-campus employees take anywhere from 30 minutes to one hour of time. Most employees take precisely 30 minutes or one hour. Table 13 identifies the percentage of employees who take a particular period of time for lunch. When examined by age range, all groups showed approximately the same results.

Table 13: Amount of Lunch Time Taken by On-campus Employees

Period of Time Taken	Percentage
I usually don't take a lunch break	9.22%
Less than 30 minutes	9.00%
30 minutes	29.39%
More than 30 minutes but less than an hour	22.21%
1 hour	29.90%
More than an hour	0.29%

Q 2.5

A final question was asked only of on-campus employees regarding the likelihood of patronizing more restaurants, shops and services over lunch if they were located on or immediately adjacent to the Capitol Complex. Over 80 percent identified that they would be very or somewhat likely to frequent such establishments. Table 14 demonstrated the likelihood of using such businesses. When examined by identified age ranges, there were no discernable differences among the various groups.

Table 14: Percentage of Employees and Utilization of Businesses On or Near Campus

Likelihood of Utilizing On or Near Campus Facilities	Percent
Very likely	43.84%
Somewhat likely	38.91%
If I had more time for lunch	8.77%
Not likely	7.83%
I wouldn't patronize such businesses	0.65%

Part 3: Frequency of Visit

Page three of the survey was open to all respondents. They were asked to identify the frequency of their visits. This question was used as a demographic comparison in other areas to cross tabulate results.

Q 3.1

All survey participants were asked about the frequency of their visits. Nearly half of the respondents visit the Capitol Complex on a daily to frequently basis, while the other half is occasionally or less. 7.67% of the survey participants have never been to the Capitol Complex. Table 15 below identifies the survey participants by their frequency of visits.

Table 15: Percentage of Respondents by Visit Frequency

Frequency of Visits	Percent
Never	7.67%
Rarely	22.72%
Occasionally	20.30%
Frequently	8.61%
Daily/nearly every day	40.69%

There was a discernable difference in responses when excluding on-campus state employees from the results. With that group removed, only 15% of the respondents are on the Capitol Complex on a daily to frequently basis. Table 16 shows respondents by visit frequency when on-campus employees are removed from the examination.

Table 16: Percentage of Non On-campus Respondents by Visit Frequency

Frequency of Visits	Percent
Never	13.10%
Rarely	37.86%
Occasionally	33.28%
Frequently	13.21%
Daily/nearly every day	2.55%

Part 4: Opinions of Current Capitol Complex

In part 4, all respondents were asked questions about their opinions of the Capitol Complex.

Q 4.1

All participants were asked for their opinion in rating their satisfaction with current aspects of the Capitol Complex. These aspects were rated on a 5-point Likert scale with 1 meaning not satisfied and 5 meaning very satisfied. Satisfaction averages ranged from 2.83 to 3.79 for all participants. Parking showed the lowest overall satisfaction while navigating the Capitol Complex showed the highest rating.

Table 17: Average Satisfaction with Aspects of the Capitol Complex

ID	Statement	Avg
4.1.a	Finding your way to the Capitol Complex (includes signage)	3.79
4.1.e	Accessibility of the grounds	3.73
4.1.g	Beauty/aesthetic value of the Complex	3.72
4.1.d	Accessibility of buildings	3.53
4.1.h	Maintenance level of all Complex buildings and grounds	3.48
4.1.f	Easy public access to state services	3.35
4.1.c	Finding your way around the Complex (includes signage)	3.34
4.1.b	Parking	2.83

When results were filtered for those who are on campus daily to frequently, the numbers change slightly with an increase overall. Though, parking is still the lowest in satisfaction, and navigating the Complex is highest. See Table 18 for a complete list of averages for high frequency visitors.

Table 18: Satisfaction by High Frequency of Visits

Frequency	Various Items for Rating Satisfaction							
	Avg of 4.1.a	Avg of 4.1.e	Avg of 4.1.g	Avg of 4.1.d	Avg of 4.1.h	Avg of 4.1.f	Avg of 4.1.c	Avg of 4.1.b
Daily/nearly every day	3.90	3.85	3.65	3.63	3.27	3.40	3.44	2.97
Frequently	3.78	3.62	3.78	3.46	3.52	3.27	3.23	2.48
Grand Total	3.88	3.81	3.68	3.60	3.31	3.38	3.40	2.89

Results were also filtered for those who currently do not visit the Capitol Complex on a regular basis. In this case, satisfaction level ranged from a 3.78 to 2.76. Most satisfaction went to the aesthetic value of the Complex (3.78) followed closely by building and grounds maintenance (3.71). Parking still rated lowest in satisfaction with a drop from all employees to 2.76. Table 19 demonstrates the satisfaction level for those who do not visit the campus on a regular basis.

Table 19: Satisfaction by Low Frequency of Visits

Frequency	Various Items for Rating Satisfaction							
	Avg of 4.1.a	Avg of 4.1.e	Avg of 4.1.g	Avg of 4.1.d	Avg of 4.1.h	Avg of 4.1.f	Avg of 4.1.c	Avg of 4.1.b
Occasionally	3.76	3.71	3.82	3.47	3.72	3.34	3.29	2.64

Rarely	3.57	3.51	3.75	3.41	3.70	3.27	3.24	2.87
Grand Total	3.67	3.61	3.78	3.44	3.71	3.31	3.26	2.76

Q 4.2

Participants ranking any of the satisfaction items as dissatisfied were asked to explain why or what could be done for improvement. The largest response rate, over 40%, related to parking, as demonstrated by the low score in question 4.1. Responses included comments about the lack of parking, especially during the legislative session. Additionally, comments referred to such things as lots needing paved, lot maintenance, lot space, lot security, lot distance and pedestrian crossing. Parking issues cross over into many groups, from employees to visitors to off-campus employees attending a meeting or a training session. All groups would like to see more of their respective parking spaces because of the difficulty in locating one.

Nearly a quarter of respondents discussed dissatisfaction with campus signage, supporting its second lowest satisfaction rating above. Numerous individuals indicated a need for campus maps or signs from various parking areas towards the different buildings. It was also indicated in many responses that buildings are not well marked and signs could not be seen from sidewalks or streets.

Building maintenance, cleanliness and comfort were also identified as a theme of dissatisfaction for respondents. Issues discussed included the Wallace Building as a whole. Additional discussions ranged from the length of time to get something fixed to various problems. While general maintenance can be seen as a discussed issue, the specifics were varied from response to response.

Appendix C, Table 29 provides a listing of the various themes used to code Q4.2.

Q 4.3

Respondents were asked to identify the strongest feature on the Capitol Complex; 929 people responded. By far the Capitol itself was identified as the strongest feature, named in half of the comments provided. The number increases as various aspects of the Capitol building are included, such as the dome, its iconic status, and the West Capitol Terrace (named specifically about 15% of the time).

Exterior aspects of the Capitol were named about 20% of the time, though increasing if you again consider the West Capitol Terrace and the view of the Capitol and dome as previously named. Items located on the Complex, such as monuments and memorials, and the landscaping and amount of green space were also specifically identified in describing the strengths of the outside Complex. Appendix C, Table 30 identifies the codes used to find thematic patterns for this question and set of responses.

Q 4.4

Survey participants were asked to identify their favorite feature of the Capitol Complex. 1,533 of the participants responded to the question. The majority of respondents identified the Capitol building itself and its various aspects. Over 50% specifically said the Capitol or such features as the West Capitol Terrace (identified itself nearly 25% of the time). Additional Capitol features specifically mentioned include the dome and rotunda. Historical monuments and memorials as well as various other aspects of the grounds were also frequently mentioned. Appendix C Table 31, provides the themes identified in the results of Question 4.4.

Part 5: Opinions on the Future of the Complex

Page five of the survey asked participants about the future of the Capitol Complex and what should be done from their perspective. Individuals were asked for a ranking of priorities as well as what they thought should be improved first. Additional items were sought from participants as were items to not include in the Complex.

Q 5.1

Participants of the survey were asked what planners should focus on in the 2010 Master Plan by ranking elements on a 1 to 10 scale with 1 being least important and 10 being most important. The two greatest priorities as seen by survey participants were cost saving efficiencies and protecting historic buildings and features (both with a rank of 7.1). Lowest focus included connections to adjacent neighborhoods (3.7) and adding features that will bring more people to the Complex (4.1).

Table 20 provides the average ranking of all focus points for possible future master plan focus points.

Table 20: Participant Ranking of Future Master Plan Focus Points

ID	Element	Avg Rank
5.1.c	Cost-saving efficiencies	7.1
5.1.d	Protect historic buildings & features	7.1
5.1.a	Accessibility of the Capitol Complex – ensuring all buildings and areas of the grounds are accessible to persons with disabilities (including in wheelchairs and the visually impaired), and are otherwise ADA-compliant	6.7
5.1.b	Sustainable / “green” / environmentally sensitive features	6.3
5.1.h	Improve parking options	6.2
5.1.f	Update state office buildings	5.9
5.1.g	Improve the grounds – including landscaping and adding more “park-like” features, such as picnic tables, benches, walking paths, etc.	5.3
5.1.i	Improve signage and way-finding (access to and around the Complex)	4.4
5.1.e	Add features that will bring more people to the Complex	4.1
5.1.j	Connections to adjacent neighborhoods (interaction between the two: for example, employees go to lunch and other provided services nearby and neighborhoods use the Complex as park space)	3.7

When examining the ranking based on the frequency of visiting the Capitol Complex, there is some change. For those visiting daily to frequently, the top ranking item is the protection of the historic features and buildings (7.0) followed by cost saving efficiencies (6.8). Interestingly, the updating of state buildings moved from a ranking of sixth to third with an average of 6.5. Table 21 provides the average rankings for high frequency visitors. Low frequency visitors matched the overall ranking of participants very closely.

Table 21: Priority Ranking of Various Focus Points for High Frequency Visits

Frequency	Average Ranking of Future Priorities									
	Avg of 5.1.c	Avg of 5.1.d	Avg of 5.1.a	Avg of 5.1.b	Avg of 5.1.h	Avg of 5.1.f	Avg of 5.1.g	Avg of 5.1.i	Avg of 5.1.e	Avg of 5.1.j
Daily/nearly every day	6.7	7.0	6.3	6.3	6.0	6.7	5.7	3.9	3.9	3.8
Frequently	6.8	7.2	6.7	6.3	6.8	5.9	5.1	4.7	4.0	3.6
Grand Total	6.8	7.0	6.4	6.3	6.1	6.5	5.6	4.0	3.9	3.8

Examining the ranking based on age of participants also showed very little change. For those aged 20 – 39, there was very little difference in top priorities. Accessibility to the Capitol Complex decreased from ranking third to fifth with a score of 6.0. All other items were within one place. Those individuals between 40-59 were also within one placement in average ranking. Interestingly, for those aged 60 and

above, the top ranking focus of cost saving efficiencies dropped to third (6.9). Protecting historical buildings and features was the top-ranked for this group with a score of 7.5. Those that did not identify age came in very close to the overall ranking. Finally, those 19 and under were not looked at closely as the participating sample was so statistically small.

Table 22 shows averages based on the various age groups.

Table 22: Average Ranking for Various Focus Points by Age Group

Age Group	Averages for Focus Items									
	5.1.c	5.1.d	5.1.a	5.1.b	5.1.h	5.1.f	5.1.g	5.1.i	5.1.e	5.1.j
19 and younger	6.0	3.0	10.0	7.0	9.0	8.0	1.0	4.0	2.0	5.0
20 - 39	7.4	6.7	6.0	6.7	6.0	5.9	5.1	4.2	4.2	4.0
40 - 59	7.0	7.2	7.0	6.2	6.3	5.9	5.3	4.5	4.1	3.5
60 and older	6.9	7.5	7.4	6.5	6.1	5.9	5.6	4.4	4.1	3.8
(blank)	7.4	7.6	6.7	5.6	6.7	6.2	5.3	4.8	3.8	3.8
Grand Total	7.1	7.1	6.7	6.3	6.2	5.9	5.3	4.4	4.1	3.7

Q 5.1 Additional Comments

Participants were asked to provide additional comments to question 5.1. There were 350 comments provided by respondents. The comments were varied as there was not a particular question to answer. In looking for themes, the greatest standout was for fiscal responsibility by about 30% of the respondents, with the process of a Complex Master Plan being called into question. Many of these responses see this as nothing more than a beautification process.

Beyond the issue of fiscal responsibility, responses ranged from parking to aesthetics of the campus to building maintenance and utilization. No other theme stood out to have statistical value in support of describing the quantitative ranking. Appendix C Table 32 provides a listing of the various codes used in analysis.

Q 5.2

Survey respondents were asked what they thought was most important to improve on the Capitol Complex. 1,342 participants responded to this question. Responses were quite varied with no one item having a true priority. This supports the centralized numbers of question 5.1 where averages were not spread.

When combined, the themes of building maintenance, building updates, building accessibility and building efficiency were mentioned by approximately 42% of the responding comments. Specifically identified was keeping what we have and keeping things working appropriately. Certainly buildings need updates and there are concerns of air quality and other issues. Many would like to see cost efficiencies and green efficiencies explored in light of these economic times.

Additionally, a focus was parking and signage by over 32% of the comments. Needs identified included all lots paved, safe pedestrian crossings, use of legislative parking when not in session, and additional parking ramps.

Finally, there were a number of concerning comments about the fiscal irresponsibility of this study and moving forward with a Capitol Complex Master Plan. The comments seemed centered on the opinion that the master plan provides nothing more than aesthetic growth to the Capitol Complex. Appendix C,

Table 33 provides a listing of codes used in determining thematic patterns for question 5.2.

Q 5.3

Survey respondents were asked what they would like to see added to the Capitol Complex and 1,169 comments were made. A large number of the responses included multiple items and were coded for each one.

The largest number of responses related to the grounds of the Capitol Complex. Nearly one-third of the responses covered this topic with items including more green space, such as landscaping and park areas; signage; and benches/shelters/tables. There was a strong indication in these responses that participants want to make use of the Capitol grounds for enjoyment and recreation.

Parking was also a consistent answer in approximately 30% of the comments. Specifics included the general need for more parking to parking for visitors, accessible parking, paved lots, and shuttles from lots to buildings.

Access to various services received several comments. More dining options is definitely recognized as a service desired, mentioned by over half of this group of comments and in 10% of the overall comments to question 5.3. Additional services include day care, events, and free public Wi-Fi.

Finally, a gym or some sort of dedicated wellness area with showers and locker facilities was desired by over 15% of the respondents. Appendix C,

Table 34 provides the listing of codes utilized in addressing question 5.3.

Q 5.4

Survey participants were asked what they think should not be a part of the Capitol Complex. Overall, there were 687 responses to this question. There were not any particular themes that stood out as a majority item. The theme with the greatest number of respondents belonged to those saying no or having no answer with approximately 34%. This would be followed by the idea of any commercial development, including outside dining, day cares, credit unions, and others, with nearly 15% of the comments referring to these types of items as not belonging on the Capitol Complex. Appendix C,

Table 35 provides the codes utilized in going over question 5.4.

Part 6: Parking on the Capitol Complex

Page six of the survey focused specifically on parking and the respondents' agreement (or not) with several statements regarding parking on the Capitol Complex.

Q 6.1

Participants were presented with several statements regarding parking on the Capitol Complex and asked to agree or disagree with each. 3,342 individuals participated in the survey and that number was used to determine average agreement. Overall, of the various statements, there was no majority agreement. The statement with the largest volume was about the need for more visitor parking, which amounted to 40.6%. This was followed closely by the need for more employee parking, with a 33.5% agreement rate. Less than 2% of the respondents feel we have too much parking. Less than 30% feel it's more important to have parking close to the Complex rather than have green space.

Table 23 shows the overall agreement rating for the various parking statements.

Table 23: Agreement Percentage for Parking Statement

ID	Statement	Percent
6.1.b	There needs to be more parking for visitors on the Capitol Complex.	40.6%
6.1.c	There needs to be more parking for employees on the Capitol Complex.	33.5%
6.1.g	It would be better to build parking ramps on the periphery of the Complex and remove or reduce surface lots to increase green space, than to keep or expand surface lots in the interior of the Complex grounds.	32.8%
6.1.f	It's more important to keep parking as close to state buildings as possible (that is, keep current surface lots near every state building) than to increase green space on the Capitol Complex.	27.8%
6.1.d	There needs to be more ADA-accessible parking on the Capitol Complex.	13.8%
6.1.a	Parking on the Capitol Complex is adequate at its current level.	12.7%
6.1.e	There needs to be less parking overall on the Capitol Complex.	1.9%

The numbers do change when examined by frequency of visits. The majority of those visiting the Complex daily would like to see more employee parking (51.0%). The majority of those who visit the Capitol Complex frequently would like to see more visitor parking. Table 24 shows the agreement rate based on frequency of visits. Those that have never visited the Complex or did not answer about their frequency of visits are not counted in Table 24.

Table 24: Percentage of Agreements on Parking Based on Frequency of Visits

Frequency of Visits	Counts	Percent of Agreement						
		6.1.b	6.1.c	6.1.g	6.1.f	6.1.d	6.1.a	6.1.e
Daily/nearly every day	1347	46.2%	51.0%	38.7%	37.4%	17.9%	18.6%	1.6%
Frequently	285	53.7%	44.2%	43.2%	32.6%	16.5%	8.4%	3.5%
Occasionally	672	48.2%	25.4%	36.6%	23.8%	13.2%	11.5%	3.0%
Rarely	752	30.3%	15.7%	21.8%	17.8%	9.2%	8.4%	1.2%
Grand Total	3056	40.6%	33.5%	32.8%	27.8%	13.8%	12.7%	1.9%

Part 7: Sustainable/ "Green" Building and Construction

The seventh page of the survey asked about the investment in sustainable building and construction. Two simple questions were asked as well as providing an option for additional comments.

Q 7.1

Respondents were asked two questions regarding investing in environmentally sustainable options. First, is it appropriate if the investment leads to lower cost over the life of the building or facility? Second, is it appropriate if the investment leads to similar costs over the life of the facility?

Of those responding to the first question, nearly all agreed it would be appropriate (96.58%) if it lead to lower cost. Of those answering no, there were no discernable patterns. In comments, several of those who answered negatively discussed the need for fiscal responsibility in our national economic situation over investment in green technologies. Additionally, there were a small number of comments that referred to green technologies as nothing more than a buzzword or fad.

In regard to the second question, over three quarters of respondents (78.14%) agree it would be appropriate if the investment lead to similar costs.

Table 25 below provides a look at the agreement percentages of the two questions.

Table 25: Responses Regarding Appropriateness of Environmentally Sustainable Investing

Is it appropriate to invest in environmentally sustainable options if the investment leads to	Yes	No
Lower costs over the life of the building or facility?	96.6%	3.4%
Similar costs over the life of the facility?	78.1%	21.9%

Q 7.1 – Additional Comments

Respondents were asked for additional comments to question 7.1. There were 281 comments provided by respondents. The variety of comments was across the board with no particular stand-out areas, as there was not a particular question to guide the qualitative responses. The two themes that did come out the most frequently with a near matching percentage of approximately 15% include the need to examine cost as the priority in green investing compared to the theme that cost should not matter as the priority, rather Iowa should place itself as a leader in environmental building. No theme had an amount to be considered statistically significant. Appendix C, Table 36 provides the listing of codes used in examining the additional comments of questions 7.1

Part 8: Final Thoughts

The last page of the survey provided participants with the opportunity to give additional comments and thoughts on any aspect of the Iowa Capitol Complex Master Plan Update.

Q 8.1

Participants were asked to provide any final thoughts they would like the planners to know or keep in mind during the update of the plan. There were 861 comments provided by survey participants. The general context of each statement regarded what the respondent found particularly important. With the variety of respondents and responses, there was no particular theme that stood out as a majority item.

Of the themes that had a considerable number of comments, building maintenance and updating was addressed in approximately 22% of the responses. General Complex maintenance was cited in the comments most often. Additionally, the importance of the tunnels and therefore their care and maintenance were prescribed by many of the respondents. Building temperature control was frequently mentioned as a part of Complex maintenance. The razing of the Wallace Building, also mentioned more than other items, was included in the theme of maintenance and updating.

Addressed in just over 16% of the comments was the issue of parking. Improvements are desired from increasing the amount of parking, to the under utilization of legislative spots, to an increased need for visitor parking and accessible parking. There were requests for everything from a paving of lots to new lots, to new ramps, to parking farther away but shuttle employees to buildings. Parking is at the front of many of the respondents' minds.

Finally, green initiatives were also discussed slightly frequently in the final comments – about 15% of the time. This included a desire for Capitol Complex green spaces, increasing public transportation initiatives, being environmentally sound, and acting as an overall leader in green initiatives.

It should be noted the public accommodation and budget responsibility were two themes identified and there is some commonness between the two that could lead to some significance. Public accommodation identified citizen participation as desirable in the process as well as a thoughtfulness of the current economic situation in relationship to our citizens and the impact. Numerous comments spoke of what they felt as inappropriateness by the state to consider projects for aesthetic reasons during such times. These tie into the idea of budget responsibility where the current financial crisis was mentioned, as was the need for fiscal responsibility in going through such a planning project.

Appendix C,

Table 37 provides the various codes and themes used in assessing question 8.1.

Appendix A - Survey Questions

Table 26: Iowa Capitol Complex Master Plan Update Survey Questions

ID	Question	Type
1.1.a	Select the following that best describe you:	Multiple-choice
1.2	If you are a current Iowa resident, please select the county you currently reside in:	Multiple-choice
1.3	Please enter your residential ZIP code:	Open-Ended Response
1.4	Select one of the following statements that best describe you:	Multiple-choice
1.5	Gender:	Multiple-choice
1.6	Age:	Multiple-choice
2.1	In terms of making the Capitol Complex a work environment that increases employee satisfaction, attraction and retention, rank the items below in order of what would have the greatest impact on improving your daily work environment. 1 = Least important; 10 = Most important (Remember, you may only use each number once.)	Ordinal ranking: 1-10
2.1.a	Additional bicycle parking and shower facilities	
2.1.b	More on-campus dining opportunities	
2.1.c	Adjacent property development (dry cleaners, lunch spots, etc.)	
2.1.d	Gym facilities available on campus to state employees	
2.1.e	Provide closer parking to my building	
2.1.f	Provide additional outdoor dining areas (tables, benches, etc.)	
2.1.g	Increase focus on maintenance/upkeep of current facilities	
2.1.h	Better quality interior spaces (lounges, coffee areas, etc.)	
2.1.i	Provide bus and/or streetcar service within an easy walk (4-5 minutes) of my office	
2.1.j	Make the Capitol Complex feel more like a unified "campus"	
2.1.k	Additional comments:	Open-Ended Response
2.2	How often do you use the tunnel system on the Capitol Complex?	Multiple-choice
	Please check any of the following statements about the tunnel system that you agree with:	Check boxes
2.3.a	The tunnels are an important part of the Capitol Complex's walkway system that need to be maintained.	
2.3.b	The tunnels are not necessary and should be closed to pedestrian traffic (i.e., only used for utility pipes).	
2.3.c	More buildings should be attached to the tunnel system.	
2.3.d	More parking lots/ramps should be attached to the tunnel system.	
2.3.e	I use the tunnels regularly to get to other buildings.	
2.3.f	I use the tunnels regularly for exercise.	
2.3.g	I find the tunnel system easy to navigate.	
2.3.h	I find the tunnel system confusing to navigate.	
2.3.i	There are adequate safety and emergency measures in place in the tunnels.	

ID	Question	Type
2.3.j	There should be more safety and emergency measures in place in the tunnels.	
2.4	We're curious about how state employees utilize their lunch time. How long do you usually take for a lunch break?	Multiple-choice
2.5	If there were more restaurants, shops and service-oriented stores located on or immediately adjacent to the Capitol Complex, how likely would you be to frequent them during your lunch break?	Multiple-choice
3.1	How frequently do you visit Iowa's Capitol Complex?	Multiple-choice
	Please rate your satisfaction with the following:	Rating scale: 1-5
4.1.a	Finding your way to the Capitol Complex (includes signage)	
4.1.b	Parking	
4.1.c	Finding your way around the Complex (includes signage)	
4.1.d	Accessibility of buildings	
4.1.e	Accessibility of the grounds	
4.1.f	Easy public access to state services	
4.1.g	Beauty/aesthetic value of the Complex	
4.1.h	Maintenance level of all Complex buildings and grounds	
4.2	If you ranked any of the above as a 1 or 2 (dissatisfied), please tell us why and how this area could be improved:	Open-Ended Response
4.3	What do you think is/are the strongest feature(s) of the Capitol Complex today?	Open-Ended Response
4.4	Do you have a favorite spot or feature on the Capitol Complex?	Open-Ended Response
	What should planners focus on in the 2010 Master Plan? Please rank the following elements in order of importance to you. 1 - <u>Least</u> important; 10 - <u>Most</u> important (Only use each number once.)	Ordinal ranking: 1-10
5.1.a	Accessibility of the Capitol Complex – ensuring all buildings and areas of the grounds are accessible to persons with disabilities (including in wheelchairs and the visually impaired), and are otherwise ADA-compliant	
5.1.b	Sustainable / "green" / environmentally sensitive features	
5.1.c	Cost-saving efficiencies	
5.1.d	Protect historic buildings & features	
5.1.e	Add features that will bring more people to the Complex	
5.1.f	Update state office buildings	
5.1.g	Improve the grounds – including landscaping and adding more "park-like" features, such as picnic tables, benches, walking paths, etc.	
5.1.h	Improve parking options	
5.1.i	Improve signage and way-finding (access to and around the Complex)	
5.1.j	Connections to adjacent neighborhoods (interaction between the two: for example, employees go to lunch and other provided services nearby and neighborhoods use the Complex as park space)	
5.1.k	Comments (optional):	
5.2	What do you think is most important to improve on the Capitol Complex?	Open-Ended Response
5.3	What would you like to see added to the Capitol Complex?	Open-Ended Response

ID	Question	Type
5.4	Is there anything you think should <u>not</u> be a part of the Capitol Complex?	Open-Ended Response
	Please check any of the statements below regarding parking on the Capitol Complex that you agree with:	Check boxes
6.1.a	Parking on the Capitol Complex is adequate at its current level.	
6.1.b	There needs to be more parking for visitors on the Capitol Complex.	
6.1.c	There needs to be more parking for employees on the Capitol Complex.	
6.1.d	There needs to be more ADA-accessible parking on the Capitol Complex.	
6.1.e	There needs to be less parking overall on the Capitol Complex.	
6.1.f	It's more important to keep parking as close to state buildings as possible (that is, keep current surface lots near every state building) than to increase green space on the Capitol Complex.	
6.1.g	It would be better to build parking ramps on the periphery of the Complex and remove or reduce surface lots to increase green space, than to keep or expand surface lots in the interior of the Complex grounds.	
	Is it appropriate to invest in environmentally sustainable options if the investment leads to:	
7.1.a	Lower costs over the life of the building or facility?	Yes/No
7.1.b	Similar costs over the life of the facility?	Yes/No
7.1.c	Comments (optional):	Open-Ended Response
8.1	What else would you like planners to know or keep in mind during this update of the Capitol Complex Master Plan?	Open-Ended Response

Appendix B – Participating Iowa Counties

Table 27: Survey Respondent Participation by County

County	Count	Percent	County	Count	Percent	County	Count	Percent
Polk	1,663	49.19%	Union	12	0.35%	Humboldt	5	0.15%
Story	158	4.67%	Cass	11	0.33%	Worth	5	0.15%
Warren	153	4.53%	Clay	11	0.33%	Hancock	5	0.15%
Dallas	131	3.87%	Mahaska	11	0.33%	Clayton	5	0.15%
Jasper	71	2.10%	Adair	11	0.33%	Allamakee	5	0.15%
Linn	57	1.69%	Dickinson	11	0.33%	Shelby	4	0.12%
Marshall	56	1.66%	Bremer	11	0.33%	Adams	4	0.12%
Boone	53	1.57%	Clinton	11	0.33%	Kossuth	4	0.12%
Black Hawk	50	1.48%	Delaware	10	0.30%	Palo Alto	4	0.12%
Scott	50	1.48%	Carroll	10	0.30%	Mitchell	4	0.12%
Pottawattamie	44	1.30%	Wapello	10	0.30%	Davis	4	0.12%
Mills	43	1.27%	Winneshiek	10	0.30%	Wright	3	0.09%
Marion	39	1.15%	Fremont	10	0.30%	Winnebago	3	0.09%
Johnson	38	1.12%	Poweshiek	9	0.27%	Van Buren	3	0.09%
Woodbury	36	1.06%	Montgomery	9	0.27%	Chickasaw	3	0.09%
Lee	34	1.01%	Clarke	8	0.24%	Monroe	3	0.09%
Des Moines	31	0.92%	Iowa	8	0.24%	Audubon	3	0.09%
Madison	30	0.89%	Plymouth	8	0.24%	Taylor	3	0.09%
Buchanan	29	0.86%	Lucas	7	0.21%	Ringgold	3	0.09%
Page	26	0.77%	Benton	7	0.21%	Monona	3	0.09%
Dubuque	26	0.77%	Greene	7	0.21%	N/A	3	0.09%
Webster	26	0.77%	Jackson	7	0.21%	Emmet	2	0.06%
Cerro Gordo	20	0.59%	Fayette	7	0.21%	Louisa	2	0.06%
Henry	19	0.56%	Jefferson	6	0.18%	Keokuk	2	0.06%
Tama	18	0.53%	Pocahontas	6	0.18%	Butler	2	0.06%
Muscatine	18	0.53%	Sac	6	0.18%	Wayne	2	0.06%
Cherokee	16	0.47%	O'Brien	6	0.18%	Lyon	1	0.03%
Guthrie	14	0.41%	Hamilton	6	0.18%	Osceola	1	0.03%
Buena Vista	14	0.41%	Crawford	5	0.15%	Grundy	1	0.03%
Jones	14	0.41%	Cedar	5	0.15%	Franklin	1	0.03%
Appanoose	13	0.38%	Harrison	5	0.15%	Ida	1	0.03%
Calhoun	12	0.35%	Howard	5	0.15%	Decatur	1	0.03%
Hardin	12	0.35%	Washington	5	0.15%	Floyd	1	0.03%

Appendix C – Thematic Patterns Used for Qualitative Questions

Table 28: Question 2.1 – Additional Comments

Codes	
Accessibility	Parking
Building maintenance/comfort/cleanliness	Pedestrian crossing
Dining	Pub transport
Efficiencies	Recognition
Exterior Appreciation	Shops and services
Fiscal responsibility	Smoking options
Frivolous	Wellness
Historical appreciation	

Table 29: Question 4.2 – If you ranked any of the above dissatisfied, tell us why and how this area could be improved

Codes	
Accessibility	Open meetings
Aesthetics	Operating hours
Building cleanliness	Parking
Building maintenance/comfort/cleanliness	Paved lots
Building updates	Pedestrian crossing
Green space	Public transportation
Greening	Security
Grounds keeping	Signage
Historic appreciation	Temp Control
Landscaping	Tunnel maintenance
Less security	Wallace
Lighting	

Table 30: Question 4.3 – Strengths of the Capitol Complex

Code	
Aesthetics	Maintained
Buildings	Monuments
Capitol	N/A
Connect to East Village	New Parking Areas
Displays	Ola Babcock
Dome	People
Exterior	Proximity
Gardens	Public Access
Green Space	Tunnel
History	View
Identifiable	West Capitol Terrace
Judicial	

Table 31: Question 4.4 – Favorite areas of the Capitol Complex

Code	
All	Lincoln statue
Art displayed	Lucas cafeteria
Atrium	Mall
Cafeterias	Memorial - WW2
Capitol	Monument - Civil War
court rooms	Monument - Soldiers/Sailors
Dome	Monument - WW2
East lawn	Monument area
Fountain	Monuments
gardens	Monuments - Veterans
Gold Dome	NA
Green space	No
Grounds	Ola Babcock
Historical building	Ola Babcock nook
Historical monuments	Old viaduct
Historical museum	Pagoda
History Museum	Renovations
Hoover building	Rotunda
Japanese Bell	Sidewalks
Japanese Garden	Smoking area
Joe's Place	South park
Judicial building	State Library
Judicial grounds	Statuary
Lady Liberty	Tunnels
Landscaping	View into chambers
Liberty bell	Wallace exterior
Lilac bushes	West Capitol Terrace

Table 32: Question 5.1 – Additional Comments

Codes	
Accessible	N/A
Aesthetics	Parking
Building maintenance	Pedestrian crossing
Building utilization	Public transport options
Campus feel	Security/safety
Dining options	Share plan/open records
Don't demolish Wallace	Signage
Fiscal responsibility	Strength utilization
Go green	Surrounding business connection
Green space	Sustainable government
Historic value	Tunnel support/maintenance
Landscaping	Urbanize Campus

Table 33: Question 5.2 – Most Important Improvements

Code	
Accessibility	Landscaping
Aesthetics	Maintenance
Bring employees back to campus	N/A
Building updates	Nothing
Building utilization	Open meetings
Bus shelters	Parking
cleanliness	Paved lots
Close businesses/services	Pedestrian crossing
Consolidate locations	People
Day care	Planning process
Dining options	Public transport
Efficiency	Recycling
Events	Safety
Family friendly	Security
fiscal responsibility	Signage
Go green	Smoking options
Green space	Traffic
Grounds keeping	Tunnel system
History	Walking paths
Hoover	Wallace
Image	Wellness

Table 34: Question 5.3 – Desired Complex Additions

Codes	
Access to services (Commercial)	Nothing
Access to top of dome	Office space
Accessibility	Open meetings
Adult day care	Park areas
Aesthetics	Parking
Art	Parking shuttles
Artifacts	Parks
Asbestos removed	Paved parking
Beer	Pedestrian crossing
Benches/tables/shelters	Public transportation
Bike lanes	Ramps
Bike parking	Recognition
Blocked roadways	Recycling
Building updates	Reflecting pool
Centralized offices	Safe environment
Children's area	Security
Day care	Security - parking
Dining options	Shuttle
Elevators	Signage
Events	Sitting areas
Extended hours	Sledding
Fountains	Tour guides (audio)
Free Wi-Fi	Tourist attractions
Go green	Tours
Green space	Trash containers
Gym	Tunnel access
History display	Tunnel connections
Improved tunnels	Tunnels
Landscaping	Viaduct replacement
Memorials (polio)	Visitors center
Memorials (USS Iowa)	Walking paths
N/A	Wallace
Native American history	Winter maintenance
New buildings	

Table 35: Question 5.4 – Points that Should Not Be a Part of the Complex

Codes	
Accessible improvements	Visible parking
Beatification	Visual obstacles
Building styles	Buildings housing non govt. entities
Aesthetic improvement	Centralized offices
Commercial development	Construction
Fiscal irresponsibility	Demolition of Wallace (keep it)
Gold on domes	Junk
Inefficient buildings	Mercy Capitol
Children's areas	New building for legislature
Green space	Non neutral signs
Parks	Non-green - pesticides
Gym	Religion
N/A	Security
No	Smoking
Assigned parking	Spanish signs
East Cap parking lot	Surveys about Complex
Gravel lots	Tunnels
Ground parking	Wallace
Parking ramps	

Table 36: Question 7.1 – Themes Found in Additional Comments

Codes	
Alternative energy	Leading environmental building
CBR	N/A
Conserve resources	Natural lighting
Cost first	No spending on buildings
Doubt "green's" value	Parking on periphery
Energy efficiency	Parking shuttles
Ensure proper maintenance	Public transport
Fiscal responsible	Quality first
Green conscious	Sustainability is priority
Green roofs	Temp control
Green space	Underground parking
Grimes	Wallace
Invest	Wind turbine

Table 37: Question 8.1 – Themes and Codes Utilized in Final Thoughts

Themes and Codes		
<i>Accessibility</i>	<i>Leadership</i>	<i>Quality</i>
Accessible Complex	Attempt leading edge	Do the work right
<i>Aesthetics</i>	Flexible plan	<i>Signage</i>
Aesthetic importance	Have a flexible plan	Signage
<i>Appreciation</i>	Keep it up	<i>Updates/maintenances</i>
Appreciate diversity	Plan carefully	Air circulation
<i>Budget responsibility</i>	Thank you	Building cleanliness
Budget crisis	Worker participation	Building maintenance
Fiscal responsibility	<i>Location</i>	Comfortable work environment
Keep costs down	Centralized offices	Complex maintenance
Sensible planning	It represents the state	Elevators
Stop renting office space	<i>Nothing</i>	Grimes
Think about furloughs	Na	Maintain buildings
Think long term	No updates at this time	Maintain structures
<i>Green</i>	Nothing	Maintain tunnel
Energy efficiency	<i>Parking</i>	Raze Wallace
Environmentally sound	Attach fees to parking	Safety first
Green leadership	Faster shuttle to Complex buildings	Temp control
Green space	Legislative parking is unused	Tunnel connections
Less auto-centric	Parking	Tunnel updates
Natural light	Parking - visitor	Tunnels are important
Public transport	Parking improvements	Work space environment
Shut down all electricity at end of day	Parking is an issue	<i>Miscellaneous</i>
Update for energy efficiency	Parking shuttle	Don't forget off-campus
<i>Grounds</i>	Paved lots	Don't let construction be hindrance
Landscaping	<i>Public accommodation</i>	
Park	Citizen participation	
Park areas	Events	
Trail system	Expand hours	
<i>Gym</i>	Favor needs of others	
Gym	Investments should benefit everyone	
<i>Historic preservation</i>	Issues with neighborhood and school system	
Historic preservation	Lengthen hours	
	Maintain security	
	Think of economy and citizens	
	Tourism	
	Tourist attraction	

