



Meeting Agenda

Community Livability and Public Safety Committee

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501
Information: 360.753.8499

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

5:30 PM

Council Chambers, Online and
Via Phone

Register to Attend:

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_oBGJQrwtQMaJA1CsDzrZrA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

(Estimated Time: 0-15 Minutes)

During this portion of the meeting, community members may address the Committee for up to two (2) minutes regarding the Committee's business meeting topics.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 5.A** [26-0171](#) Approval of February 25, 2026 Community Livability and Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Minutes](#)

- 5.B** [26-0199](#) Approval of March 4, 2026 Community Livability and Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Minutes](#)

- 5.C** [26-0200](#) Approval of March 5, 2026 Community Livability and Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Minutes](#)

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- 6.A** [26-0221](#) Approval of the Parking and Business Improvement Area Phase I Findings and Discussion of Phase II

Attachments: [PBIA Evaluation Report](#)

- 6.B** [26-0233](#) Approval of the Civilian Police Auditor 2026 Work Plan

Attachments: [Civilian Police Auditor 2026 Work Plan](#)
[Community Policing Board Comment Letter](#)

6.C [26-0232](#) Approval of City Council Appointed Advisory Body 2026 Work Plans

Attachments: [Advisory Body 2026 Work Plans](#)

7. **REPORTS AND UPDATES**

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

The City of Olympia is committed to the non-discriminatory treatment of all persons in employment and the delivery of services and resources. If you require accommodation for your attendance at the City Council Committee meeting, please contact the Council's Executive Assistant at 360.753.8244 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. For hearing impaired, please contact us by dialing the Washington State Relay Service at 7-1-1 or 1.800.833.6384.



City Hall
601 4th Avenue E.
Olympia, WA 98501
360-753-8244

Community Livability and Public Safety Committee

Approval of February 25, 2026 Community Livability and Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes

Agenda Date: 3/25/2026
Agenda Item Number: 5.A
File Number:26-0171

Type: minutes **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Approval of February 25, 2026 Community Livability and Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes



Meeting Minutes - Draft

Community Livability and Public Safety Committee

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501
Information: 360.753.8499

Wednesday, February 25, 2026 5:30 PM Council Chambers, Online and Via
Phone

Register to Attend:

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_pxKrS9UGTTSD0V-dIToIvQ

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Madrone called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: 3 - Chair Dani Madrone, Committee member Kelly Green and Committee member Yên Huỳnh

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Beth Henriquez spoke.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 5.A** [26-0103](#) Approval of January 28, 2026 Community Livability and Public Safety Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- 6.A** [26-0155](#) Youth Council Update and Approval of the Proposed 2026 Youth Council Work Plan

Youth Council Liaison Susan Grisham, Youth Council Co-Chair Donovan Jojoba, Youth Council Co-Vice Chair - Policy Subcommittee Shruthi Lingam-Nattami, and Youth Councilmember Anika Parabakar presented an update on the Olympia Youth Council and the proposed 2026 Olympia Youth Council work plan.

The Committee discussed and asked clarifying questions.

Committeemember Green, seconded by Chair Madrone moved to approve the

Proposed 2026 Youth Council Work Plan and forward to the City Council for consideration. The motion passed with the following vote:

Aye: 3 - Chair Madrone, Committee member Green and Committee member Huynh

6.B [26-0152](#) Consider Recommendations Related to City Council Appointed Advisory Bodies

Assistant City Manager Stacey Ray and Consultant Genevieve Canceko-Chan presented recommendations related to City Council appointed advisory bodies.

The Committee discussed and asked clarifying questions. The Committee asked Staff to prepare additional detail on recommendations for discussion at an upcoming Community Livability and Public Safety Committee meeting that includes the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Advisory Bodies, and then brought to the full Council during a study session in the future.

The discussion was completed.

6.C [26-0114](#) Discuss Community Development Block Grant Program-Year 2026 Funding Proposal Approach

Housing Manager Jacinda Steltjes, presented the Community Development Block Grant program-year 2026 funding proposal.

The Committee discussed and asked clarifying questions.

The recommendation was discussed and closed.

7. REPORTS AND UPDATES

Assistant Stacey Ray discussed the upcoming Advisory Body interviews and asked the Committee for their input on interview questions and timing.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.



City Hall
601 4th Avenue E.
Olympia, WA 98501
360-753-8244

Community Livability and Public Safety Committee

Approval of March 4, 2026 Community Livability and Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes

Agenda Date: 3/25/2026
Agenda Item Number: 5.B
File Number:26-0199

Type: minutes **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Approval of March 4, 2026 Community Livability and Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes



Meeting Minutes - Draft

Community Livability and Public Safety Committee

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501
Information: 360.753.8499

Wednesday, March 4, 2026

4:00 PM

Online

Special Meeting - Advisory Body Interviews. Register to attend:
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86356199904?pwd=3xDnrMvb1EYXy7EBliYbarEg6BeEb6.1>

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Madrone called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Committee Member Huỳnh joined the meeting at 5:50 p.m. A quorum of the Community Livability and Public Safety Committee was present from the beginning of the meeting.

Present: 3 - Chair Dani Madrone, Committee member Kelly Green and Committee member Yên Huỳnh

3. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

3.A [26-0175](#) 2026 Advisory Body Interviews

Advisory Body candidate interviews were held.

The Committee discussed the candidate interviews and provided recommendations for appointment. The Committee postponed their recommendation for the Heritage Commission until after the second day of interviews on March 5, 2026 has been completed.

Committee Member Green, seconded by Committee Member Huỳnh moved to approve a recommendation to City Council on selected applicants to fill vacancies on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Utility Advisory Committee, Planning Commission, and Olympia Metropolitan Parks District Advisory Committee. The motion passed with the following vote:

Aye: 3 - Chair Madrone, Committee member Green and Committee member Huỳnh

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.



City Hall
601 4th Avenue E.
Olympia, WA 98501
360-753-8244

Community Livability and Public Safety Committee

Approval of March 5, 2026 Community Livability and Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes

Agenda Date: 3/25/2026
Agenda Item Number: 5.C
File Number:26-0200

Type: minutes **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Approval of March 5, 2026 Community Livability and Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes



Meeting Minutes - Draft
**Community Livability and Public Safety
Committee**

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501
Information: 360.753.8499

Thursday, March 5, 2026

4:00 PM

Online

Special Meeting - Advisory Body Interviews. Register to Attend:
[https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82831189831?](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82831189831?pwd=ZkbAIDYLyrvZvF4gFYD8PKXcymDLE4.1)
pwd=ZkbAIDYLyrvZvF4gFYD8PKXcymDLE4.1

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Madrone called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: 3 - Chair Dani Madrone, Committee member Kelly Green and Committee member Yén Huỳnh

3. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

3.A [26-0177](#) 2026 Advisory Body Interviews

The Committee discussed the candidate interviews and provided recommendations for appointment.

Committee Member Green, seconded by Committee Member Huỳnh moved to approve a recommendation to City Council on selected applicants to fill vacancies on the Arts Commission, Cultural Access Advisory Board, Design Review Board, Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee, and Heritage Commission. The motion passed with the following vote:

Aye: 3 - Chair Madrone, Committee member Green and Committee member Huỳnh

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:11 p.m.



Community Livability and Public Safety Committee

Approval of the Parking and Business Improvement Area Phase I Findings and Discussion of Phase II

Agenda Date: 3/25/2026
Agenda Item Number: 6.A
File Number:26-0221

Type: decision **Version:** 2 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Approval of the Parking and Business Improvement Area Phase I Findings and Discussion of Phase II

Recommended Action

Committee Recommendation:

Not referred to committee.

City Manager Recommendation:

Move to approve the Parking and Business Improvement Area (PBIA) Phase I findings, discuss Phase II, and forward to the full Council for consideration.

Report

Issue:

Whether to approve the Parking and Business Improvement Area Phase I findings, discuss Phase II, and forward to the full Council for consideration.

Staff Contact:

Jennica Machado, Economic Development Director, Community Planning & Economic Development, 360.480.9167

Presenter(s):

Jennica Machado, Economic Development Director
Brian Scott, Founding Partner, Uncommon Bridges

Background and Analysis:

The PBIA Board was established to develop an annual recommendation to the City Council about how to invest the PBIA Fund. In recent years, concerns have emerged around the equity of the assessment structure, program sustainability, and administrative complexity.

In 2024, the PBIA Advisory Board discussed potential next steps, including the possibility of

dissolving the district. After extensive discussion, however, the Advisory Board determined that further evaluation was needed to assess current conditions and identify potential paths forward for the PBIA. City Council similarly indicated that a comprehensive evaluation would be beneficial.

In late 2025, the evaluation project was initiated, and the PBIA Advisory Board selected Uncommon Bridges as the project consultant. The evaluation examined the PBIA structure, operations, fee, and administrated processes and identified potential recommendations for improvement based on best practices from comparable downtowns. Uncommon Bridges has now completed the evaluation and will present its final findings and recommendations.

The PBIA Advisory Board received the final recommendations at their monthly meeting on March 4, 2026. The Board voted to recommend that City Council approve implementation of the report's roadmap actions by advancing to Phase Two. The recommendation included a contingency requesting that the City match the Advisory Board's use of PBIA funds to support the Phase Two scope of work.

Climate Analysis:

The PBIA evaluation does not directly affect climate mitigation sectors. The project is focused on evaluating the PBIA's fees, structure, governance, and administrative processes to determine whether and how the district could be restructured to continue operating.

Advancing the project to Phase Two would support planning and stakeholder engagement to determine the PBIA's future structure and operations. While the evaluation itself does not result in direct climate impacts, future PBIA activities could potentially support sustainability initiatives for downtown businesses depending on future priorities and work plans.

Equity Analysis:

Business and property owners within the PBIA district may benefit from the evaluation by gaining a clearer understanding of how the program operates and identifying opportunities to improve fairness, transparency, and effectiveness of the district. Advancing to Phase Two would also provide an opportunity for broader stakeholder engagement to ensure the perspectives of affected businesses are incorporated into potential changes.

The evaluation itself does not impose new financial burdens; however, the existing PBIA assessment structure has raised concerns about equity among assessed businesses. Phase Two planning and engagement would allow stakeholders to explore these concerns and identify potential changes that could create a more equitable fee structure.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

The downtown Olympia neighborhood may be interested in the evaluation considering PBIA funded programs directly impact cleanliness, safety, beautification, and overall economic vitality in the area. Additionally, any future change in rates may directly impact downtown business owners within the PBIA ratepayer zones.

Financial Impact:

The PBIA evaluation is being conducted by contractor, Uncommon Bridges. The contract is not to exceed \$30,000 and is funded by the City's annual budget. The project is assessing the PBIA fund and will identify recommendations for changes to its fee and administrative structure.

If the project moves forward for Phase Two, additional funds will be required to support the scope of work. An anticipated budget for Phase Two would be \$50,000. The PBI Advisory Board indicated they will approve use of the PBI Fund to cover up to half of the project costs

Options:

1. Move to approve the Parking and Business Improvement Area (PBI) Phase I findings, discuss Phase II, and forward to the full Council for consideration.
2. Move to approve the Parking and Business Improvement Area Phase I Findings, Discuss Phase II, and forward to the full Council for consideration based on Committee feedback.
3. Do not approve the Parking and Business Improvement Area Phase I Findings, Discuss Phase II, and forward to the full Council for consideration and schedule for a future Committee meeting.

Attachments:

PBI Evaluation Report



March 11, 2026

City of Olympia

PBIA Evaluation

Parking & Business Improvement Area

INTRODUCTION

In 2005, at the request of a broad range of future ratepayers, the City of Olympia established an assessment on downtown businesses to fund services that would improve and vitalize the area. This is known as the **Parking and Business Improvement Area (or PBIA)**. From then through 2024, these assessments paid for a variety of services and activities, including cleaning, public safety, marketing, streetscape beautification, and administration. Unfortunately, the amount collected did not keep up with rising costs. Additionally, the amount of city staff time required to administer the program, changes to downtown's vitality, and other factors undermined the program's performance and credibility. In 2024, the Olympia City Council suspended assessments (collecting \$0) for 2025 and 2026, pending the results of an independent evaluation of the PBIA's structure and effectiveness compared to regional and national best practices. This report is a summary of that evaluation.

BACKGROUND

Place management districts are funding mechanisms that assess properties and/or tenants in specified districts to help pay for services that will help the area thrive. Nationally, place management districts fund placemaking and economic development organizations that provide services for the mutual benefit of district stakeholders. Place management districts go by many different names, including Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), Business Improvement Areas (BIAs), Parking and Business Improvement Areas (PBIAs), Economic Improvement Districts (EIDs), Community Benefit Districts (CBDs), Public Improvement Districts (PIDs), and so forth. Washington's enabling legislation for these districts calls them Parking and Business Improvement Districts, while individual districts in Washington deploy public-facing branding with many different names.¹

There are many reasons to create a place management district. Common motivations include increasing the area's activity, vitality, occupancy, cleanliness, and safety, as well as improving the area's image and effective voice in civic affairs. Perhaps the most attractive thing about a mandated assessment district is cost-sharing for these services. In a mandated assessment district, everyone pays their share, rather than individual businesses and/or property owners shouldering disproportionate costs. Most commonly, districts are conceived, designed, and managed locally by those who pay the assessments for their mutual benefit, with everyone in the district required to pay a share of the cost commensurate with their individual benefit. These districts reflect successful community and economic development, supported by local stakeholders collaborating toward shared goals and priorities.

National experience shows that place management districts add value to urban environments by providing a wide range of services, including leadership, public space management, planning and design, economic development, policy formation, and advocacy.

Olympia's Parking & Business Improvement Area (PBIA)

Olympia's Parking and Business Improvement Area (PBIA) was established by the Olympia City Council in 2005 at the request of local businesses to self-assess funds benefiting the downtown area. Businesses representing 60% of the initial assessment signed a petition of support for establishing the PBIA. The PBIA is governed by Olympia Municipal Code (OMC 3.62) and Washington State law (RCW 35.87A).

¹ There is no requirement that PBIAs do anything related to "parking" (despite the name).

The PBIA includes three zones, with varying assessment rates as shown on the map below.



About 500 businesses are currently assessed through the PBIA. In 2024, the City of Olympia sent PBIA assessment invoices totaling \$114,575. This amount has remained relatively consistent throughout the life of the PBIA, with typically 5-10% of the businesses assessed not paying.² The PBIA assessment fee structure is based on the Full-time Equivalent (FTE) employees of each establishment (Small: 1-3 FTEs; Medium: 4-6 FTEs; Large: 7+ FTEs). PBIA rates per OBC 3.62 are shown in the table below.

Business Type	Zone A			Zone B			Zone C		
	Large	Medium	Small	Large	Medium	Small	Large	Medium	Small
Restaurant/Retail	\$750	\$500	\$250	\$600	\$400	\$200	\$300	\$200	\$150
Professional/Service	\$400	\$300	\$200	\$300	\$200	\$150	\$200	\$150	\$150
Financial Institutions	\$750			\$600			\$300		
Lodging/ Apartments	30 or less rooms: \$200; 31–50 rooms: \$300; 51+ rooms: \$400								
Personal Care Services	Minimum: \$150 Per station (above 2): \$75; Maximum: \$500								

² In Washington, PBIA assessments are not lienable, and a certain amount of nonpayment is typical. Though no accurate accounting of nonpayment rates is available, anecdotal evidence is that nonpayment usually runs at about 3-5%.

The PBIA has a diversity of ratepayers among the categories above. The City's assessment roll for 2024 included 470 individual ratepayers, paying ten different rates from the assessment table on the previous page. Two-thirds of ratepayers pay \$200 per year or less. Three-quarters pay \$300 or less per year.

The PBIA assessment rates were unchanged from 2005 through 2024, despite a 77% increase in consumer prices over that time.³ Adjustments to the PBIA rates require public notice, a public hearing, and City Council Approval. In addition to no automatic adjustment for inflation, Olympia's PBIA ordinance has no provision for formal recertification or sunset.

A sampling of recent PBIA budgets for 2016, 2022, and 2023 show consistent total budgets (2023 includes at \$20,000 carryover from unspent funds in 2022), with an average of 42% spent on Clean & Safe services, 30% on Marketing, 22% on Streetscape Beautification, and 6% on Administration and Contingency. These figures do not include the City of Olympia's costs for collecting assessments, supporting the PBIA ratepayer board, or managing services.

Category	Rate	# of Ratepayers	Total by Category
P1	\$ 150	148	\$ 22,200
P2	\$ 200	166	\$ 33,200
P3	\$ 225	5	\$ 1,125
P4	\$ 250	51	\$ 12,750
P5	\$ 300	34	\$ 10,200
P6	\$ 375	2	\$ 750
P7	\$ 400	29	\$ 11,600
P8	\$ 500	12	\$ 6,000
P9	\$ 600	13	\$ 7,800
P0	\$ 750	10	\$ 7,500
		470	\$ 113,125

	2016	2022	2023	Average
Clean & Safe	74,500	46,200	46,200	42%
Marketing	17,500	43,000	58,000	30%
Streetscape Beautification	9,500	38,900	38,900	22%
Admin & Contingency	8,500	6,900	6,900	6%
	\$ 110,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 150,000	100%

Over time, rising costs coupled with flat revenue, as well as the program's administrative burden and disagreements about the most effective use of the funds collected, brought the program under increasing criticism. Issues identified are summarized in the following table.

Issues Identified with PBIA Effectiveness ⁴			
Equity & Fairness	Sustainability	Duplication of Effort	Governance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uniform fees may disproportionately impact smaller businesses. Classification and fee schedules do not reflect modern work realities (e.g. gig economy, remote work). Records are outdated, causing billing and voting discrepancies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual revenues do not cover City administrative and staffing costs. Significant City resources are spent on manual recordkeeping, meeting support, finance, and complaint handling. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inefficient overlaps between Olympia Strong, Olympia Downtown Alliance, PBIA, and Chamber of Commerce. Business owners often serve on multiple boards, leading to duplicated work. Multiple entities focusing on similar missions can cause confusion and division. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advisory Board's scope and purpose have drifted beyond its funding advisory role. Tensions exist due to unmet expectations and program changes (e.g., discontinuation of Downtown Ambassadors).

As a result of these concerns, the Olympia City Council unanimously passed Resolution M-2580 in November 2024, which reduced assessment rates to \$0 for all ratepayers and committed to a full program reevaluation in 2025.

³ Based on the Consumer Price Index – Urban for the Seattle-Bellevue-Tacoma region (which includes Olympia)

⁴ Internal PBIA Board and City discussions leading up to this evaluation.

Evaluation Purpose & Scope of Work

In October of 2025, the City of Olympia retained Uncommon Bridges⁵ to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of its PBIA program. The purpose of this effort is to evaluate Olympia's PBIA in comparison to regional and national best practices, recommend improvements to the program, and offer a roadmap for implementation. The evaluation included a review of program documents, as well as engagement with city staff, the PBIA board, board and staff of the Olympia Downtown Alliance, PBIA ratepayers, and other downtown stakeholders. This report accompanies slide presentations to the PBIA board and Olympia City Council.

BIA BEST PRACTICES

The place management industry has its origins in the decline and revitalization of America's downtowns in the decades following the Second World War. Downtowns declined in response to an explosion of suburban development driven by post-war economic prosperity, the G.I. Bill, and the Interstate Highway Project, as well as the proliferation of enclosed shopping centers. Downtowns began organizing to stay relevant and soon began to adopt coordinated common area improvement activities much like shopping centers. The need for ongoing beautification, maintenance, activation, and safety programs also created a need for sustainable funding for these services. Thus, the rise of assessment districts like Olympia's PBIA.

According to the International Downtown Association, the industry today consists of 4,000+ place management organizations globally with 2,500 in North America employing 100,000 people and paying \$3 billion in wages. On average, each organization provides \$1.2 million in services in its district to help businesses thrive and make the district a great place for workers, residents, and visitors.⁶

There are at least 25 place management districts in Washington state, with budgets ranging from \$50,000 to more than \$20 million annually. There are eleven districts in Seattle, two in Spokane, Yakima, Everett, and Richland, with a single district in at least eight other cities, including Olympia's PBIA.

Place management districts have different names in different states, and many use their own unique brand, but they are all funding mechanisms for locally based place management and share many characteristics, including:

- They are enacted by the City Council
- They are managed in and by the district itself
- Assessments are on properties and/or tenants for mutually beneficial services
- Assessment calculations are based upon local preferences (i.e., square footage, value, sales, etc.)
- Services provided are also based upon local preferences. Typical services include cleaning, safety, marketing and promotions, business development, and professional management.

⁵ Uncommon Bridges is a Seattle-based consulting firm specializing in urban place management and assessment districts like Olympia's PBIA. The firm has helped plan, create, renew, expand, and/or evaluate most of these districts in Washington state, as well as in Oregon, Idaho, California, and across the country, supporting districts that collect and deploy more than \$75 million annually.

⁶ International Downtown Association, <http://downtown.org>

Services

Each place management district is unique and provides its own bundle of services based on local needs and ratepayer preferences. Public area cleaning and day-to-day maintenance, as well as a friendly uniformed presence on the street offering assistance and a sense of safety, are by far the most common place management services. An informal survey of place management programs nationally shows a wide range of activities, including but not limited to the following:

Marketing, Promotions & Events	Economic Development	Beautification	Parks & Public Spaces	Clean & Safe	Homeless Services	Transportation
Signs & Banners	Market Opportunities	Hanging Flowers	Park Activation & Management	Street Sweeping	Outreach	Connectivity
Festivals	Real Estate Development	Planters & Street Furniture	Storefronts	Pressure Washing	Care Centers	Pedestrian Safety Improvements
Farmers Markets	Development Loans – Small Business Grants	Landscaping	Green Spaces	Litter & Graffiti Removal	Mental Health Services	Parking Improvements
Advertising Campaigns	Data & Research	Seasonal Décor	Streetscapes	Ambassadors	Skill Development	Non-motorized initiatives
Business Directory	Affordability	Public Art	Emergency Preparedness	Lighting	Workforce Development	Encourage Public Transit

Assessment Methodology

As noted earlier, the vocabulary and specific requirements for place management districts are different in each state. Similarly, assessment methodology varies from one city to another and often even from one district to another in the same city. Nationally, there are two broad categories of place management districts: those that assess properties and those that assess tenants (which might be businesses, nonprofits, public agencies, residents, and so forth). These two types of districts have many similarities but are quite distinct in important ways.

Property-Based Districts: Most property-based districts assess each property parcel within a specific boundary to pay for services that benefit all properties in the district. Some districts vary the assessment rates for certain uses and/or ownership types. For example, some districts do not assess owner-occupied residential properties; others don't assess residential uses at all or assess residential uses at a different rate than commercial properties. Similarly, some districts do not assess government properties or assess such properties at a different rate. The same goes for properties that are owned by nonprofits and/or occupied by nonprofit uses. How the assessments are calculated is also unique to each district. The most common metrics are land area, building square footage, land and/or improvement value. The most important distinguishing characteristic of property-based districts is that property data is almost always public information and kept up to date by the local tax assessor because it is a primary factor in levying general government taxes. This means that place management district assessments can be based on widely available public information that anyone can look up to confirm the accuracy of an assessment invoice.

Tenant-Based Districts: Tenant-based districts generally operate on similar principles, with all tenants within a specific boundary paying for services that benefit all establishments in the district. Variations are common for certain types of businesses, residential uses, nonprofits, government uses, and so forth. Common metrics for calculating tenant-based assessments include total square footage, occupied square footage, number of employees, gross sales, and others. Discounts or exemptions for nonprofit, government, and/or community service uses are common. The primary challenge with tenant-based assessments is that there is no accurate data available for what tenants exist, how many square feet they occupy, how many employees they have, and/or what their gross sales are. Some of these metrics are known by individual landlords or tax

assessors but are rarely public information and often quite closely guarded. As a result, building and maintaining a schedule of who is required to pay the assessment how much they need to pay is exceedingly labor intensive and time-consuming.

Some observers note that property owners are likely to pass property-based assessments through to their tenants as added charges on top of lease payments and/or through higher rents. Despite the truth in this observation, the benefits of simplicity and accuracy of property-based assessment remain. As the place management industry evolved over the last several decades, many tenant-based districts were replaced by property-based districts for the reasons noted above. Some places have both property- and business-based districts performing complementary functions. Some districts assess both properties and tenants. In general, ***the best practice in the place management industry is to base assessments on publicly available information, which usually means property assessments using county assessor data to calculate individual payments.***

The Olympia PBI uses a tenant-based assessment methodology which has many of the associated challenges noted above.

Governance & Operations

How place management districts are governed and operated is as varied as the way their assessments are calculated. Several issues frame these variations:

- Who calculates the assessments, invoices ratepayers, and collects payments? (This is usually the city.)
- Who provides the services?
- Who supervises service delivery operations?
- Who holds the operators accountable to ratepayers?
- How does the city mitigate its risks? (Assessments, collections, and services are all under the city's authority.)
- How do ratepayers ensure that their payments are being appropriately used?
- How do local citizens follow these public services being undertaken under their city government's authority?

Over time, the place management industry has evolved toward a best practice in which three entities are involved in governing and operating a district. The **city government** levies assessments, collects funds, and ensures compliance with local regulations. A **Ratepayer Advisory Board** represents the ratepayers to establish annual priorities, oversee operations, and ensure accountability to ratepayers. A **Program Manager** delivers the appropriate services, either directly or through one or more contractors.

City Government: It is the city council's authority that allows mandatory assessments for special purposes that make place management districts possible. With the city council's authorization, the city government calculates assessments on, sends invoices to, and collects payments from individual ratepayers according to the assessment formula in the ordinance. The city then contracts with the Program Manager as advised by the Ratepayer Advisory Board. The City Council also receives annual reports from the Ratepayer Advisory Board on the district's performance and adjusts assessment amounts when needed.

Ratepayer Advisory Board: In most cases, a Ratepayer Advisory Board establishes priorities for services within the parameters of the ordinance, approves an annual budget for use of assessment revenues, monitors service delivery, and advises the City Council on whether the program is meeting ratepayer expectations.

Program Manager: The organization that administers the operations of the district. The Program Manager is recommended by the Ratepayer Advisory Board to the City Council, and the city administration contracts with the Program Manager operate the programs of the district in alignment with the ordinance. The Program Manager administers the funds in accordance with the approved budget through direct expenditures and/or contracts with service providers. The Program Manager's administration must comply with all applicable provisions of law, resolutions and ordinances, and with all regulations lawfully imposed by the state auditor or other state agencies.

The most common type of Program Manager is a nonprofit organization whose mission is dedicated to the betterment of the area, like the Olympia Downtown Alliance. It is also common for the Program Manager entity to have additional sources of revenue for programs beyond the scope and/or budget of the assessment district. Such funds often come from membership fees, grants and donations, service contracts, and/or voluntary assessments from properties or tenants outside the district's

boundaries or otherwise exempt from assessment. The use of those funds is not determined by the Ratepayer Advisory Board, but rather by the board of directors of the Program Manager entity.

FINDINGS

A fundamental best practice in the formation and amendment of place management districts is engaging with the community, particularly current and potential ratepayers. Buy-in from those who are paying is important as their feedback and support are key to ensuring the success and longevity of the organization. For a new district or a major restructuring of an existing district, many jurisdictions require documented support from the affected ratepayers. As such, while it is useful to look to comparable districts to better understand the types and levels of services provided, each district has its own unique collection of ratepayers, stakeholders, and resources that shape priorities. Soliciting and integrating ratepayer input is critical to the success of any district. In Uncommon Bridges’ experience, this input is most effectively gained through an iterative process in which various scenarios for services and assessments are tested with influential ratepayers to find the right fit for local conditions and priorities.

The findings and recommendations provided here offer comparisons to regional and national best practices, as well as reflections of interviews, focus groups, and informal discussions with dozens of stakeholders in downtown Olympia, including many of those paying into, managing, and impacted by the existing PBIA. It is not, however, the product of a thorough, iterative process of testing and evaluating options with key stakeholders to refine a specific structure for assessment, services, governance, and operations for a place management district that would be the best fit for downtown Olympia. That iterative process is the logical next step.

Olympia’s current PBIA structure does not align with best practices

PBIA rates are unchanged since 2005

As noted earlier, Olympia’s PBIA rates are based largely on the number of employees of individual ratepayers, as well as a flat fees for residential rooms and personal care workstations. None of these metrics inherently keep up with inflation. Best practices are that if constant metrics are the basis of assessment, then rates should be adjusted regularly to reflect rising costs.

The amount assessed in 2024 would be \$200,231 if the 2005 rates had been adjusted for inflation, as shown in the table on the right.

Category	2005	# of Ratepayers	2005 Totals	2024 CPI Adjusted	
	Rate			Rate	2024 Totals
P1	\$ 150	148	\$ 22,200	\$ 266	\$ 39,294
P2	\$ 200	166	\$ 33,200	\$ 354	\$ 58,764
P3	\$ 225	5	\$ 1,125	\$ 398	\$ 1,991
P4	\$ 250	51	\$ 12,750	\$ 443	\$ 22,568
P5	\$ 300	34	\$ 10,200	\$ 531	\$ 18,054
P6	\$ 375	2	\$ 750	\$ 664	\$ 1,328
P7	\$ 400	29	\$ 11,600	\$ 708	\$ 20,532
P8	\$ 500	12	\$ 6,000	\$ 885	\$ 10,620
P9	\$ 600	13	\$ 7,800	\$1,062	\$ 13,806
P0	\$ 750	10	\$ 7,500	\$1,328	\$ 13,275
		470	\$ 113,125		\$ 200,231

Tenant-based assessments are problematic

As noted earlier, the problem with tenant-based assessments is that there is no accurate data available for what tenants exist, nor verifiable metrics on which to base an equitable assessment. Tenants also change much more often than property owners. This means that building and maintaining a schedule of who is required to pay how much is difficult and time-consuming. The best practice in the place management industry is to base assessments on publicly available information, which usually means property assessments using county assessor data.

Conversations with ratepayers, PBIA board members, and city staff in Olympia highlighted challenges with the calculation and collection of assessments from ratepayers. With a tenant-based assessment, the work of developing and maintaining an accurate list of ratepayers is an ongoing and time-consuming process that consumes considerable district resources.

Burnout due to failed property-based district effort

For the reasons noted, a group of downtown property and business owners organized by the Olympia Downtown Alliance attempted to create a property-based district a few years ago. The proponents formulated a proposal for a *Downtown Improvement District* or *DID* and circulated a petition of support to property owners. They documented support from property owners representing a majority of the assessment, but failed to meet the 60% threshold required and eventually gave up. When asked about making another effort to replace the existing tenant-based PBIA with a property-based assessment, downtown opinion leaders expressed considerable burnout from the earlier effort and showed little enthusiasm for trying again.

Olympia’s PBIA doesn’t raise enough money to be effective

The level of services and corresponding assessment that are appropriate for downtown Olympia is clearly a local decision that should be guided by iterative engagement with influential ratepayers, as noted earlier. Nevertheless, it is instructive to compare Olympia’s current levels of services to those of nearby districts with similar characteristics. Place management districts in the Puget Sound region vary significantly, with budgets ranging from \$100,000 to more than \$20 million annually, but this evaluation offers two useful comparisons.

Downtown Everett has had a BIA in place since 1990, renewing and adjusting its boundaries and rates every five years since then. The City of Everett collects slightly more than \$600,000 each year from a property-based assessment that is based on the total value and land area of individual properties. The City contracts with the Downtown Everett Association (DEA) to manage and deliver services. The DEA also gets revenue through donations, grants, and service contracts that bring its total budget to about \$1.2 million per year. Everett’s PBIA (known locally as the Downtown Improvement District) provides cleaning and beautification services, marketing and events, business development, and professional management.

The **West Seattle Junction** Business Improvement Area assesses businesses like Olympia’s PBIA. The City of Seattle formed the WSJBIA in 1987 and has made several adjustments to boundaries and rates since then. The City contracts with the West Seattle Junction Association to manage and deliver services. The Association also generates revenue through donations, grants, and service contracts, bringing its total budget to about \$1.3 million annually. The West Seattle Junction district provides clean and safe services, as well as marketing and events, repairs and maintenance, business support, and professional management.

While neither downtown Everett nor West Seattle is just like downtown Olympia, they are of a similar scale, as shown here.

Downtown Everett and West Seattle have somewhat more and somewhat less total real estate value than downtown Olympia, respectively. Both have substantially less land area. Everett has about the same building square footage, while West Seattle has just over half as much. Both have somewhat more value per building square foot (150% and 130% respectively).

	Downtown Olympia	Downtown Everett	West Seattle Junction
PBIA Assessment	\$114,575	\$510,249 (400% of Olympia)	\$570,000 (500% of Olympia)
Real Estate Value	\$800 million	\$1.3 billion 150%	\$600 million 75%
Land Area (Lot Square Feet)	7.5 million	4.5 million 60%	1.7 million 20%
Building Area (Building Square Feet)	4.3 million	4.5 million 105%	2.5 million 58%
Value / Square Foot (of land)	\$186	\$288 150%	\$240 130%

The major takeaway from this table is that downtown Everett and West Seattle Junction are assessing four and five times as much as downtown Olympia. As such, this simple peer comparison would suggest that downtown Olympia may benefit from a substantially larger assessment.

Another relevant observation on the amount collected is that with a tenant-based assessment with collections, governance, and operations all managed by the city itself, the administration costs will be high in relation to the total amount collected and value of services delivered. Raising and deploying additional resources would not increase administrative costs proportionately to the amount collected, and therefore, the proportion of collections dedicated to administration would go down.

Perceptions

PBIA Services may not align with ratepayer priorities

Ratepayers in Olympia have expressed their interest in services focused on a clean and safe downtown environment, along with more support in advocacy. Historically, due to the limited assessment revenue, funding has gone to beautification and arts-related services such as flower baskets. During this evaluation process, stakeholders said that a clean and safe downtown is a priority for them, primary services including Trash pickup and removal, glass recycling, addressing pests/rodents, and public restroom availability. They also expressed the value of investments in public safety, such as non-police crisis response and homelessness response services being available in the city. Stakeholders showed their appreciation for programming such as the ArtWalk and said their hope is that the expansion of the footprint of those programs to better reach all businesses in the PBIA zone would enhance their satisfaction. Scaling up service delivery so that all businesses in the PBIA zone feel they are served by the board's work would be a strategy to move the work forward. Ratepayers want the benefits received to be equitably distributed across the area.

A review of the PBIA's 2024 workplan and notes from its 2024 advisory board retreat (at right) show recent emphasis on physical improvements, beautification, and lighting, with less on direct cleaning and safety services (though lighting is certainly a safety improvement).

Public perceptions of PBIA are quite poor

The perception of a place management district is important to its success. Ratepayers are choosing to pay for services that go beyond essential government services and directly benefit their business and community. People want to know that they are getting the best value for their money and have faith in the individuals they are entrusting to deploy those funds.

During community engagement for this evaluation, downtown Olympia ratepayers shared their dissatisfaction with the relationship between City of Olympia employees who were

2024 PBIA Work Plan Priorities & Considerations

Recap of the 2024 PBIA Advisory Board Retreat

In 2024, the PBIA Advisory Board is seeking to prioritize projects, activities, and budget recommendations that:

- Improve perceptions of Downtown
- Invest in tangible benefits that enhance the experience of Downtown
- Strengthen Downtown's unique character and culture
- Ensure the voices of Downtown businesses are heard
- Connect Downtown businesses with valuable information and resources (especially for those who don't feel like they have access)
- Build community and foster connection among Downtown businesses
- Strengthen the relationship between downtown businesses and the City
- Create and strengthen partnerships and collaborations that benefit Downtown
- Engage in the democratic process
- Cultivate Downtown community pride, loveability, and resiliency (placemaking)
- Promote and support Downtown's small and independent business network

Additional criteria PBIA Advisory Board may seek to consider in developing the 2024 Work Plan:

- Opportunities that require minimal staff lift so that staff efforts can also go toward addressing equity issues and process improvements
- Opportunities to "right-size" investments and projects so that impact is aligned with the size of the PBIA Fund (budget)
- Opportunities that are meaningful and effective (e.g. investments that make a difference for Ratepayers, not duplicating efforts of others, etc.)

PBIA Workplan 2023

Title	Board	Staff	Budget
	Hours	Hours	
Annual Ratepayer Meeting	3	3	\$ 2,000
PBIA Projects			
Event Sponsorship	2	3	\$ 7,000
Public Art	1	5	\$ 6,000
Special Project (Night Market RFP)	4	20	\$ 37,500
Lighting	2	5	\$ 10,000
Murals	1	1	\$ 18,000
Alley Lighting	1	1	\$ 15,000
Mural Tours	1	1	\$ 3,500
Board Activities			
Monthly Meetings	20	20	\$ -
Business Survey			\$ -
Downtown Imp. District discussions	2	2	\$ -
Updates			
Public safety & homelessness	0.5	1	\$ -
Garbage pick-up	0.5	1	\$ -
Other	0.5	0.5	\$ -
Administration	2	2	\$ -
	40.5	65.5	\$ 99,000

managing the PBIA and the PBIA Board they were supporting. Much of the dissatisfaction was centered on individuals who are no longer working on the PBIA, and ratepayers expressed a much more positive view of the current working relationship between the PBIA and the city.

There were also comments about the PBIA funding the wrong services, being ineffective, and/or inefficient. In Uncommon Bridges experience with many place management districts, these perceptions probably hold some truth but are likely also very much influenced by how well the PBIA communicates what it is doing. In our experience, most city employees have many responsibilities, with the PBIA as only a small part of their job description. As such, the reality and perceptions of PBIA effectiveness are only a small part of that city employee's overall job performance. This provides little motivation to put in extra effort either on PBIA services or on communicating with ratepayers. A Program Manager entity whose mission and very existence are dependent on effective services and communication with stakeholders has a much higher motivation to get the services right and make sure everybody is aware of the work being done.

Public perceptions of the Olympia Downtown Alliance are strong

While many downtown stakeholders expressed frustrations with the PBIA, most spoke quite highly of the Olympia Downtown Alliance (ODA). ODA's mission is to act as a catalyst for a vibrant and thriving downtown through service to businesses and property owners. Its goals are advocacy, clean, safe & healthy, economic development, branding, and financial health.

ODA is an active member of the Washington Main Street Program and uses meaningful donations from the Main Street Tax Credit Program toward its mission. The ODA also provides quite a few services to downtown that are funded by the City of Olympia. It also receives funds through memberships, donations, and other service contracts. One of ODA's most visible programs is the Downtown Guide program, which plays an ambassadorial role to visitors while also working with Olympia's most vulnerable street populations. Funded by the city and private contracts, the program serves downtown seven days a week and employs four full-time guides.

Several stakeholders said they think the ODA is oriented to serve property owners, while the PBIA is more for businesses. A review of each entity's activities and conversations with their leaders does not support this perception, however, with both being dedicated to the overall health of downtown and all of its stakeholders.

Efficiencies

PBIA board meets more often than needed to do its job

In alignment with industry best practices, the purpose of a Ratepayer Advisory Board is to set priorities, approve budgets, monitor program delivery, and advise the City Council about future rates and the effectiveness of the Program Manager. Most Ratepayer Advisory Boards defer operations decisions to the Program Manager, and many find quarterly (or bi-monthly) meetings to be adequate to do their jobs. More frequent meetings are time-consuming for both volunteer board members and staff, and they also increase the board's temptation to get involved in decisions and activities that go beyond their primary purpose. This might include micro-managing operational decisions, inventing new initiatives without resources to carry them out, and taking on an advocacy role with the city that is beyond the board's charge. This evaluation heard quite a few examples of each of these digressions from the PBIA board's primary functions.

City staffing of the PBIA board and services is cost-inefficient

Government agencies are well known for their substantial administrative overhead costs. This is because governments operate in an environment of intense public scrutiny at every level, with expectations of transparency, documentation, oversight, and detailed public accountability that exceeds most private and nonprofit organizations. Government employees are also comparatively well compensated in both salary and benefits, especially at the lower and middle ranges. All of this means that using city staff to support the PBIA board and manage service delivery is more expensive than using a nonprofit partner for these functions. Most place management district boards are supported by the Program Manager entity that also manages and deploys district services.

Strengths | Weaknesses | Opportunities | Threats Summary (SWOT)

To summarize the findings above, it may be useful to organize them as internal strengths and weaknesses, and external opportunities and threats. That is, strengths and weaknesses reflect things the PBIA board and staff can control, while opportunities and threats reflect developments in Olympia and the larger world that are less within PBIA's control but will nevertheless impact its success.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robust business base • Solid history of services • City commitment to downtown • Passionate PBIA board • Reputation of strong performance by the Olympia Downtown Alliance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thin business mix & economic base • Persistent issues with street disorder • Not enough money to get much done • Inefficient staffing • Out-of-date assessment model • No provision to keep up with inflation
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property-based assessment • More revenue and services • Cost-effective management & operations • Partnership with ODA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erosion of credibility • Ratepayer revolt • Termination of the PBIA • Downtown stagnation

RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite current challenges with its current structure, downtown Olympia has enjoyed many benefits from its Parking and Business Improvement Area and continues to do so. Many physical improvements, clean and safe services, events, and marketing activities exist because the PBIA provided start-up, catalytic, and/or operational funding. Olympia still needs stable funding for place management and would benefit from more of it. This will be even more beneficial if the district's structural, governance, and operational weaknesses are corrected.

For reasons that have already been explained, Olympia will be best-served by a property-based assessment district that relies on publicly available data from the Thurston County Assessor. Because the recent attempt to create a property-based district (DID) is still fresh in people's minds, it may be too soon to launch another effort. Nevertheless, this should still be the goal.

In the meantime, the City Council should 1) substantially increase PBIA assessments and budgets to fund more robust services; and 2) reconfigure PBIA administration and services for cost-efficiency and effectiveness.

Substantially increase PBIA assessments & budgets

As noted earlier, simply catching up with inflation would mean doubling the PBIA budget to something like \$200,000 per year. A simple peer comparison with other communities in Washington, and especially with PBIA's and PBIA's in similar areas, suggests that downtown Olympia might consider assessments and services with an annual budget on the order of \$500,000. This is four to five times the last PBIA annual budget, and such a change will require support from a substantial number of ratepayers. Getting that support will require an iterative outreach process led by a small group of influential downtown stakeholders. An increase in budget should be accompanied by the administrative and services reconfigurations outlined in the following section.

The simplest way to increase the PBIA assessments to provide resources for more robust services would be to increase the rates within the current structure. This table shows rates to reflect inflation since 2005 (~ \$200,000 budget) and rates to produce a budget of about \$500,000. This is just simple arithmetic and does not reflect agreement by ratepayers on priorities or levels of service. Regardless, it may offer a place to start in building consensus around a more robust PBIA program.

Category	2005		2005 Totals	2024 CPI Adjusted		\$500k Budget	
	Rate	# of Ratepayers		Rate	2024 Totals	Rate	Budget
P1	\$ 150	148	\$ 22,200	\$ 266	\$ 39,294	\$ 663	\$ 98,122
P2	\$ 200	166	\$ 33,200	\$ 354	\$ 58,764	\$ 884	\$ 146,740
P3	\$ 225	5	\$ 1,125	\$ 398	\$ 1,991	\$ 994	\$ 4,972
P4	\$ 250	51	\$ 12,750	\$ 443	\$ 22,568	\$ 1,105	\$ 56,354
P5	\$ 300	34	\$ 10,200	\$ 531	\$ 18,054	\$ 1,326	\$ 45,083
P6	\$ 375	2	\$ 750	\$ 664	\$ 1,328	\$ 1,657	\$ 3,315
P7	\$ 400	29	\$ 11,600	\$ 708	\$ 20,532	\$ 1,768	\$ 51,271
P8	\$ 500	12	\$ 6,000	\$ 885	\$ 10,620	\$ 2,210	\$ 26,519
P9	\$ 600	13	\$ 7,800	\$ 1,062	\$ 13,806	\$ 2,652	\$ 34,475
P0	\$ 750	10	\$ 7,500	\$ 1,328	\$ 13,275	\$ 3,315	\$ 33,149
		470	\$ 113,125		\$ 200,231		\$ 500,000

1) Increase residential assessments to be equitable with other uses

Another issue with downtown Olympia’s existing PBIA rates is that residential uses are assessed at very low rates. When the PBIA was launched in 2005, there was very little housing in downtown Olympia, and most of what was there was subsidized for residents with limited resources. Today there are hundreds of market rate apartments in downtown Olympia. As of 2024, the residential rates for the PBIA were \$200/year for hotels or apartment buildings with 30 rooms or less; \$300 for hotels or apartment buildings with 31–50 rooms; and \$400 for hotels or apartment buildings with 51 or more rooms. These numbers are very small in contrast to the \$100-\$200/year per unit assessed in other districts in the Puget Sound region.

Residents gain considerable benefit from place management services because a clean, safe, and vibrant district is as desirable to residents as it is to workers and visitors.

Some observers worry about PBIA assessments making housing less affordable. It is worth noting that these are annual assessment rates for apartments renting for something like \$2,000/month. As such, an annual assessment of \$100 is less than ½ of 1% of the rent. Some of Olympia’s downtown housing continues to be subsidized for lower-income residents, and the city may want to offer a discount for those residences. The most common discount for subsidized housing and other tax-exempt uses in the Puget Sound region is to assess those ratepayers at 25% the rate of for-profit ratepayers.

If assessments on residences were increased to rates comparable to similar districts in the region, it would impact the calculations in the previous table. The table below shows the resulting rates and total assessments for both residential and non-residential properties if a budget of \$500,000 were the goal and the 1,501 residential units were assessed at \$100/year.

Category	2005		2005 Totals	2024 CPI Adjusted		\$500k Budget		Residential Properties	Non-res. Ratepayers	\$500k w/Residential @ \$100	
	Rate	# of Ratepayers		Rate	2024 Totals	Rate	Budget			Rate	Budget Totals
P1	\$ 150	148	\$ 22,200	\$ 266	\$ 39,294	\$ 663	\$ 98,122		148	\$ 464	\$ 68,665
P2	\$ 200	166	\$ 33,200	\$ 354	\$ 58,764	\$ 884	\$ 146,740	26	140	\$ 619	\$ 102,689
P3	\$ 225	5	\$ 1,125	\$ 398	\$ 1,991	\$ 994	\$ 4,972		5	\$ 696	\$ 3,480
P4	\$ 250	51	\$ 12,750	\$ 443	\$ 22,568	\$ 1,105	\$ 56,354		51	\$ 773	\$ 39,436
P5	\$ 300	34	\$ 10,200	\$ 531	\$ 18,054	\$ 1,326	\$ 45,083	9	25	\$ 928	\$ 31,549
P6	\$ 375	2	\$ 750	\$ 664	\$ 1,328	\$ 1,657	\$ 3,315		2	\$ 1,160	\$ 2,320
P7	\$ 400	29	\$ 11,600	\$ 708	\$ 20,532	\$ 1,768	\$ 51,271	9	20	\$ 1,237	\$ 35,879
P8	\$ 500	12	\$ 6,000	\$ 885	\$ 10,620	\$ 2,210	\$ 26,519		12	\$ 1,547	\$ 18,558
P9	\$ 600	13	\$ 7,800	\$ 1,062	\$ 13,806	\$ 2,652	\$ 34,475		13	\$ 1,856	\$ 24,126
P0	\$ 750	10	\$ 7,500	\$ 1,328	\$ 13,275	\$ 3,315	\$ 33,149		10	\$ 2,320	\$ 23,198
		470	\$ 113,125		\$ 200,231		\$ 500,000	44	426		\$ 349,900
										Residential Units:	1,501
										Residential Rate:	\$ 100
										Residential Assessment:	\$ 150,100
											\$ 500,000

As an example, the table below highlights a “P2” ratepayer. This P2 ratepayer has been assessed at \$200/year since 2005. If rates were adjusted for CPI to 2024, a P2 ratepayer would pay \$354/year. If the total budget were set at \$500,000, a P2 ratepayer would pay \$884/year. If residential units were assessed at \$100/year each and the total budget was \$500,000, then a non-residential P2 ratepayer would be assessed at \$619/year.

Category	2005		2024 CPI Adjusted		\$500k Budget		Residential Properties	Non-res. Ratepayers	\$500k w/Residential @ \$100		
	Rate	# of Ratepayers	2005 Totals	Rate	2024 Totals	Rate			Budget	Rate	Budget Totals
P1	\$ 150	148	\$ 22,200	\$ 266	\$ 39,294	\$ 663	\$ 98,122		148	\$ 464	\$ 68,665
P2	\$ 200	166	\$ 33,200	\$ 354	\$ 58,764	\$ 884	\$ 146,740	26	140	\$ 619	\$ 102,689
P3	\$ 225	5	\$ 1,125	\$ 398	\$ 1,991	\$ 994	\$ 4,972		5	\$ 696	\$ 3,480
P4	\$ 250	51	\$ 12,750	\$ 443	\$ 22,568	\$ 1,105	\$ 56,354		51	\$ 773	\$ 39,436
P5	\$ 300	34	\$ 10,200	\$ 531	\$ 18,054	\$ 1,326	\$ 45,083	9	25	\$ 928	\$ 31,549
P6	\$ 375	2	\$ 750	\$ 664	\$ 1,328	\$ 1,657	\$ 3,315		2	\$ 1,160	\$ 2,320
P7	\$ 400	29	\$ 11,600	\$ 708	\$ 20,532	\$ 1,768	\$ 51,271	9	20	\$ 1,237	\$ 35,879
P8	\$ 500	12	\$ 6,000	\$ 885	\$ 10,620	\$ 2,210	\$ 26,519		12	\$ 1,547	\$ 18,558
P9	\$ 600	13	\$ 7,800	\$1,062	\$ 13,806	\$ 2,652	\$ 34,475		13	\$ 1,856	\$ 24,126
P0	\$ 750	10	\$ 7,500	\$1,328	\$ 13,275	\$ 3,315	\$ 33,149		10	\$ 2,320	\$ 23,198
		470	\$ 113,125		\$ 200,231		\$ 500,000	44	426		\$ 349,900
										Residential Units:	1,501
										Residential Rate: \$	100
										Residential Assessment:	<u>\$150,100</u>
											\$ 500,000

2) Use an easier metric to calculate assessments

There is nothing inappropriate with Olympia’s current practice of basing assessments on the number of employees for individual businesses, but it is very hard to establish an assessment roll and keep it up to date. The only real source of how many employees each business has is to ask the businesses themselves. Experience with many place management organizations (including reported experience in Olympia) shows that individual ratepayers often do not respond to requests for information, provide inaccurate information, and/or challenge their PBIA invoices.

The matrix of formulas used for Olympia’s PBIA have not changed since 2005 and no longer reflect the mix of uses in the district (as noted above regarding residential uses). Administrative burden has also been a significant challenge for city staff in administering the PBIA. Building square footage is a more transparent and predictable metric because overall building square footage is publicly available from the Thurston County Assessor, which provides a basis for estimating individual unit size. Those individual unit sizes will remain more consistent from year to year than the employee count.

According to the Thurston County Assessor, the buildings within the PBIA’s boundary collectively have approximately 4.3 million building square feet (BSF). \$500,000 divided 4.3 million BSF equals approximately 12¢ / BSF. That calculation assumes that ratepayers would be assessed for every building square foot in the district, which is not realistic. During ratepayer engagement and consensus building, there are certain to be many adjustments, which are likely to include non-leasable space (hallways, etc.), vacant space, storage space, certain uses (i.e., subsidized housing, places of worship, etc.), and others. As such, considering an initial rate of 15-20¢ / building square foot might be a good place to start.

It is also worth noting that the arithmetic in the previous paragraph assumes that all uses pay the same rate. If rates are to be lower in zones 2 and 3, they will need be comparatively higher in zone 1. Similarly, if residential uses are assessed at a per-unit rate, that would have an impact on other rates if the total budget were the same. According to the Assessor, there are 1,501 residential units within the PBIA boundary, with about 1.6 million building square feet in residential properties. If those 1.6 million BSF were assessed at 12¢/BSF, it would equal \$192,000, which divided by 1,501 equals \$128/unit. If the per-unit rate were lower, then the rates on other uses would need to be a bit higher to achieve the same total budget.

Of course, all of these recommendations assume agreement among a majority of ratepayers that a more robust portfolio of PBIA services is something they want to invest in. The process for building that consensus is addressed in the Roadmap section.

Reconfigure PBIA administration and services for cost-efficiency and effectiveness

3) Designate an independent Program Manager to streamline PBIA operations and administration

Olympia needs both a Ratepayer Advisory Board and a Program Manager (operating entity). As described earlier, this aligns with regional and national industry standards and will be more efficient and cost-effective. Uncommon Bridges recommends that the Olympia Downtown Alliance be designated as the Program Manager for the PBIA. Of course, doing so is only feasible if the ODA agrees, and there should be robust conversations including the PBIA board, city staff, ODA staff, and ODA board. Everyone knows about this recommendation, and all parties appear willing to work out the details.

In its role as Program Manager, ODA should be expected to support the PBIA board, deliver or contract for PBIA services, and report progress regularly to the PBIA board and City Council. It is appropriate and recommended that ODA be paid an administrative fee in addition to the direct costs of these services because taking on these additional duties will place a meaningful administrative burden on the organization.

4) Have fewer PBIA meetings with better reporting

The PBIA board should meet 4-6 times a year, as well as hold an annual meeting for all ratepayers. The bi-monthly or quarterly board meetings should be limited to setting annual priorities, approving annual budgets, monitoring performance, and reporting results to ratepayers and the city council.

Based on recommendations from the Program Manager, the PBIA board should adopt a consistent set of clear performance metrics and expect consistent tracking and reporting by the Program Manager. These performance metrics should cover services performed, outcomes from those services, and the health of downtown.

5) Transfer day-to-day operations to a nonprofit program manager

In addition to supporting the PBIA board as described above, day-to-day operations should be executed by the Program Manager (i.e., Olympia Downtown Alliance). This will include professional staff to create and deploy marketing and communications strategies, contract for physical improvements and advertising, and supervise clean and safe programs. In addition to environmental design strategies (i.e., lighting) clean and safe programs are likely to include uniformed personnel to provide cleaning, maintenance, and ambassadorial services. These services may be deployed directly by employees of the Program manager and/or by paid contractors. A skilled Program Manager will be able to augment PBIA-funded services with complimentary services that are paid for by contracts with other public, private, and/or nonprofit funders. For example, the Olympia Downtown Alliance is already providing on-the-street services that are paid for from multiple sources.

ROADMAP

In Uncommon Bridges' experience, ratepayer input into new or reinvented districts is most effectively gained through an iterative process in which various scenarios for services and assessments are tested with influential ratepayers to find the right fit for local conditions and priorities. The recommendations provided here reflect regional and national best practices, as well as input from interviews, focus groups, and informal discussions with dozens of stakeholders in downtown Olympia. The next logical step is an iterative process to find agreement on what is best for Olympia at this time. The following roadmap outlines just such a process.

1) Final Presentations & Report (March 2026)

This Evaluation Report is being distributed to interested parties and presented to the City Council, PBIA Board, and Olympia Downtown Alliance Board in March 2026.

2) Agreement to Proceed (City; PBIA Board; ODA) (< 1 month)

The first step in updating the PBIA is agreement between the City of Olympia, PBIA Board, and Olympia Downtown Alliance that they are open to significant changes to the current program and willing to actively participate in designing and implementing a mutually agreeable structure and assessment mechanism.

3) Form a “Leadership Group” to Build Consensus (< 1 month)

The creation, renewal, expansion, and/or reinvention of place management districts is usually led by a small group of influential stakeholders who have the respect of those who will be expected to pay into the resulting assessment district. This group (6-10 people is ideal) should include some of the largest ratepayers, as well as others who have the respect of the various types of future ratepayers. The group should plan to meet half a dozen times and be prepared to do a fair amount of individual outreach to their peers.

4) Revenue & Services Budgets (3-6 months)

The first task of the Leadership Group is to agree on a program of services and assessment mechanism that they can get ratepayers to support. As noted earlier, this is best done through an iterative process of scenarios, one-on-one engagement with thought leaders, refinement, and agreement. This task should produce a specific assessment mechanism, a budget estimate, and a general idea of priority services and their costs.

5) Operations Plan with ODA (2 months, overlapping with tasks before and after)

Once there is general agreement on the desired services and budget, a detailed Operations Plan is needed to finalize the proposal to the City Council. This Operations Plan should include details about how, when, how much, and by whom services will be delivered. For example, if cleaning services are part of the proposal, how often will sidewalks be swept, how often will they be pressure washed, will graffiti be removed and how often, will these services be provided by employees of the Program Manager entity or by outside contractors, are all questions that will need to be answered in the Operations Plan. The same would apply to ambassadors, as well as marketing programs and physical improvements.

6) Community Open Houses (1 month)

Once the Leadership Group agrees that the Assessment Mechanism and Operations Plan are supported by key ratepayers and thought leaders, one or more Community Open Houses should share these plans with ratepayers, other stakeholders, and the public. The Leadership Group should be ready to answer questions and potentially make adjustments based on feedback.

7) ODA & PBIA Approval (< 1 month)

After final adjustments are made, the PBIA and ODA boards should formally endorse the proposal for approval by the Olympia City Council.

8) Council process on PBIA (2-3 months)

With PBIA and ODA endorsement, the city should proceed with a formal City Council process, which is likely to include one or more Council committee meetings and at least one public hearing before final approval.

9) Launch new PBIA assessment / collection / oversight / services

Once the City Council passes an ordinance updating the PBIA, the city administration will move forward with calculating assessments, sending invoices, and collecting payments. The city will likely benefit from the help of the Program Manager in building the assessment roll if this continues to be a tenant-based district. Concurrent with the city's collection effort, the Program Manager will proceed with ramping up and launching services, including hiring employees or entering into outside contracts, building service schedules, and so forth. It will also include updating the PBIA Board if needed and developing a meeting schedule.



Community Livability and Public Safety Committee

Approval of the Civilian Police Auditor 2026 Work Plan

Agenda Date: 3/25/2026
Agenda Item Number: 6.B
File Number:26-0233

Type: decision **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Approval of the Civilian Police Auditor 2026 Work Plan

Recommended Action

Committee Recommendation:

Not referred to a committee.

City Manager Recommendation:

Move to approve the Civilian Police Auditor 2026 work plan and forward to the full City Council for approval.

Report

Issue:

Whether to approve the Civilian Police Auditor 2026 work plan and forward to the full City Council for approval.

Staff Contact:

Margo Morales, Community Engagement Program Specialist, Organizational Development and Performance, 360.753.8150

Presenter(s):

Margo Morales, Community Engagement Program Specialist
Stephen Connolly, Civilian Police Auditor, OIR Group

Background and Analysis:

In July 2024, the City Council accepted recommendations from the Social Justice and Equity Commission on Community Oversight of Law Enforcement. From the recommendations the City established a new Community Policing Board, whose purpose is to ensure Olympia Police Department accountability and transparency, serve as community representatives and provide community perspectives on the work of the Civilian Police Auditor (Auditor).

The recommendations also included enhancements to the role of Auditor. The central role of the Auditor is to review certain types of investigations completed internally by the Olympia Police

Department and provide regular reports to the City Council which include recommendations for police department operations, policy and training based on the findings of their audit. One of the enhancements to the role of the Auditor is the requirement of an annual work plan to be approved by the City Council. The work plan should address policies, training, and other issues of interest that the Auditor intends to review that year.

This is the first year the Auditor was required to draft a work plan for the coming year based on findings from their 2025 draft annual report and that fall within their scope of work. On March 12, 2026, the Community Policing Board (Board) had an opportunity to review and discuss the draft work plan with the Auditor. Feedback from this discussion was considered by the Auditor for further refinement of their workplan. Highlights from the Board's discussion were captured in an attached comment letter for consideration.

The purpose of this agenda item is for the Community Livability and Public Safety Committee to review and discuss the Auditor's 2026 work plan and comments from the Board and consider forwarding the work plan to the full Council for approval.

Climate Analysis:

There is no climate concerns related to this item.

Equity Analysis:

Community groups, especially those most impacted by policing, and underrepresented community groups have requested community involvement and oversight in law enforcement. The development of an Auditor annual work plan is responsive to that community request and further guides the work of the Auditor, ensuring that it is responsive to community concerns and is guided by findings from recent audit cycles.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

There's broad community interest in community involvement in law enforcement, including the role work of the Auditor. The updated requirement of the Auditor to submit an annual work plan will help community members to be more informed about the work of the Auditor, and how findings from past reports are guiding future policy and procedural recommendations.

Financial Impact:

The City contracted with OIR Group for Civilian Police Auditor services for an initial one-year term beginning on May 7, 2025, valued at \$105,000.

Options:

1. Move to approve the Civilian Police Auditor 2026 work plan and forward to the full City Council for approval.
2. Move to approve the Civilian Police Auditor 2026 work plan, based on feedback from the Committee and forward to the full City Council for approval.
3. Do not approve the Civilian Police Auditor 2026 workplan and reschedule for a future meeting.

Attachments:

Civilian Police Auditor 2026 Work Plan
Community Policing Board Comment Letter



6510 Spring Street #613
Long Beach, CA 90815
OIRGroup.com

2026-27 Work Plan for Civilian Police Auditor, City of Olympia WA

CPA Role: Contribute to the City's model of police oversight by providing outside scrutiny of designated categories of internal investigation by the Olympia Police Department ("OPD"), and by responding to feedback and input from the Community Policing Board, City officials, and community stakeholders.

OIR Group: Based in southern California (and with a Seattle resident as part of the Olympia CPA team), OIR Group has twenty-five years of experience in providing independent oversight of law enforcement agencies in dozens of jurisdictions. It was selected as the City's current IPA in the spring of 2025.

Work Product:

1. Mid-Year and End of Year Reporting re Audits of OPD Investigations

Timeline: Q4 and Q2

A. After completing audit of OPD investigations into force incidents and allegations of misconduct, share draft reports regarding findings and recommendations with the Community Policing Board for feedback and community perspectives

B. Present final reports at agendaized presentation to the full City Council

2. Further Review of specific systemic issues identified in previous reporting period

Timeline: Concurrent with regular reporting cycle

Topic: Review integration between OPD and CRU during calls for service involving persons experiencing a mental health crisis. Auditor will select a random sampling of incidents involving integrated response and work with OPD to obtain reports and recordings. These materials, as well as discussions with knowledgeable agency personnel, will form the basis for an evaluation of protocols, policies, and "in-field" dynamics. Auditor findings and recommendations about the program will be included as part of a public reporting cycle.

3. Community Engagement

Timeline: Q1 and Q3, to follow public reporting cycle

Strategy: Collaborate with Community Policing Board and City staff on alternative ways to engage with the community and promote awareness of our work while receiving stakeholder feedback. (Examples may include listening sessions, online data sharing)



March 12, 2026

Olympia City Council

Honorable Mayor Payne and City of Olympia Councilmembers,

One of the duties of the Community Policing Board is to meet regularly with the Civilian Police Auditor to provide feedback and community perspectives on their work, including their annual work plan. On March 12, 2026 the Community Policing Board had the opportunity to meet with the Civilian Police Auditor and discuss their draft work plan for the coming year. This letter is intended to share with you the Community Policing Board's conversation.

The Community Policing Board discussed the draft work plan with the Civilian Police Auditor and had the opportunity to ask questions. Community Policing Board members had the following comments related to the Auditor's draft work plan:

- Board members appreciated the structure and layout of the report, with narrative and recommendations.
- Board members expressed support for looking at the Crisis Response Unit in the 2026-2027 work plan.
- Board discussed how they want to work with the Auditor on further community engagement, and discuss at future meetings how to collaborate on this effort.
- Board members discussed the desire to engage with the community around collection of demographic data as highlighted in recommendation 22 in the 2025 annual report.

We thank the City Council for the opportunity to review and comment on the auditor's annual report.

Best Regards,

Sarah Nagy
Chair, Community Policing Board

sn:mm



Community Livability and Public Safety Committee

Approval of City Council Appointed Advisory Body 2026 Work Plans

Agenda Date: 3/25/2026
Agenda Item Number: 6.C
File Number:26-0232

Type: decision **Version:** 1 **Status:** In Committee

Title

Approval of City Council Appointed Advisory Body 2026 Work Plans

Recommended Action

Committee Recommendation:

Not referred to a committee.

City Manager Recommendation:

Move to approve the City Council appointed advisory body 2026 work plans for 2026 and forward to the full City Council for approval.

Report

Issue:

Whether to approve the City Council appointed advisory body 2026 work plans for 2026 and forward to the full City Council for approval.

Staff Contact:

Stacey Ray, Assistant City Manager, City Manager's Office, 360.753.8046

Presenter(s):

Stacey Ray, Assistant City Manager

Background and Analysis:

The Community Livability and Public Safety (CLPS) Committee annually reviews the proposed work plans of City Council appointed advisory committees, boards and commissions and then forwards the Committee's approved recommendations to the full City Council.

The purpose of this agenda item is for CLPS to review and discuss work plans from the applicable advisory bodies. Not all advisory bodies appointed by the City Council develop an annual work plan due to the nature of their work (e.g. Lodging Tax Advisory Committee and Salary Commission). While the newly established Community Policing Board does not have a work plan, the Civilian Police Auditor does, which will be reviewed and recommended by the Committee as a separate business item. Although, the Olympia Metropolitan Park District Advisory Committee submits a work plan to the

Olympia Metropolitan Park District Board, CLPS supports this process by reviewing the work plan and interviewing advisory body candidates.

Advisory body work plans typically contain annual, routine work that is largely consistent each year. They also may include new or different work items that are of interest to the advisory body, referred to the body by the City Council and/or staff, or are related to a timely issue or topic in the community. Attachment A includes all of the proposed 2026 advisory body work plans.

For purposes of this agenda item, the presentation by staff will highlight new and substantive work in the proposed advisory body works plan for 2026; showing how those work items align with the City Council's annual work plan, and the Comprehensive Plan six focus areas: Public Safety, Community Livability, Environmental Stewardship, Economy, Organizational Excellence, and Well-Planned City.

Climate Analysis:

No climate impacts were evident.

Equity Analysis:

The advisory body recruitment process is an opportunity to reduce disparities in participation among marginalized communities, and ensure diverse perspectives are included in policy decisions and Council decision-making. Subsequently, proposed work plans are intended to align strongly with community priorities and interests, as identified by members.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

The Olympia community has a high interest in participating in local government decision making. Advisory bodies provide opportunities for more direct City Council engagement with the community around policy decisions and City Council decision-making. Members often have significant influence in developing their work plans, which can include topics of interest and priority to the communities for which the advisory bodies are most intended to represent.

Financial Impact:

There is no cost associated with the action. To reduce barriers to community member participation, the City offers stipends of \$25 per advisory body meeting attended to eligible members. Those members who certify as low income are eligible to receive stipends of \$50 per meeting attended. Advisory body members may waive the stipend. In 2025, the total cost of stipends was \$11,425.

Options:

1. Move to approve the City Council appointed advisory body 2026 work plans for 2026 and forward to the full City Council for approval.
2. Move to approve the City Council appointed advisory body 2026 work based on feedback from the Committee and forward to the full City Council for approval.
3. Do not approve the 2026 City Council appointed advisory body works plans and reschedule for a future meeting.

Attachments:

Advisory Body 2026 Work Plans

Arts Commission

ARTS COMMISSION - 2026/27 Work Plan

During 2026/27, the Arts Commission will hold full meetings on the second Thursday of each month. In addition to full committee meetings, project-specific subcommittees may meet at other times.

Section 1 - 2026/27 Policy and Program Recommendations to City Council

Consistent with past practice, committee recommendations are forwarded to the Community Livability and Public Safety Committee and/or full Council as part of the staff report for relevant Council agenda items, as an attached memo authored by the Chair or committee and/or presentation by the Chair at a Council meeting. Staff estimates that there is sufficient professional and administrative staff time to accomplish the policy recommendation staff support to the committee in 2026/27.

Professional staff liaison for the Arts Commission is Stephanie Johnson.

Estimated Percent of Overall Committee Effort: 52%

Title Description	Committee Lead & Commitment	Staff Commitment	Schedule	Budget Implications
	<i>Committee hours, not individuals.</i>	<i>Hours reflect working with the committee, not total project staff time.</i>	<i>Estimated completion.</i>	
<p>1.1 2026 Municipal Art Plan to City Council Description: As part of the 2026 Work Plan process, recommend plan for 2026 \$1 per capita funds and any potential capital projects where 1% for Art funds might apply. Deliverable: Recommend 2026 Municipal Art Plan to City Council, along with 2026 Work Plan.</p>	2 hours	2 hours	March	Municipal Art Fund

<p>1.2 Commission Retreat/Work Session Description: Spring retreat to welcome new members, and fall retreat for work plan review and development. Deliverable: Complete the retreats</p>	4 hours	4 hours	June/October	None
<p>1.3 Public Art Projects Individual and ongoing projects seeking Council approval as described more fully in the Municipal Art Plan, including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percival Plinth Project • Olympia Art Crossings • Murals in Parks Pilot • Traffic Box Wraps • Squaxin Island Tribal Representation • Poet Laureate • Artist in Residence Program • Grass Lake Nature Park • Kaiser Woods Park • Daley Arts Center Public Art • Gifts of Art <p>Deliverable: Engage the community through the arts around transformative topics. Strive to address City issues such as equity and climate engagement through the arts and/or through the public art process.</p>	6 hours	6 hours	Ongoing	See Municipal Art Plan

Section 2 - 2026/27 Arts Program Support

Arts Commission members provide valuable volunteer assistance to accomplish the City’s annual arts program. Also, as programs are implemented and administrative procedures developed, staff often consults with Commissioners for their input and perspective. Input from the Commission is considered by staff in implementing the program or policy.

Unless noted under “Budget Implications,” there is sufficient staff time/resource available in 2026/27 to accomplish or advance these items.

Estimated Percent of Overall Committee Effort: 26%

<i>Title Description</i>	Committee Lead and Commitment	Staff Commitment	Schedule	Budget Implications
	<i>Committee hours, not individuals.</i>	<i>Hours reflect working with the committee, not total project staff time.</i>	<i>Estimated completion.</i>	
2.1 Arts Walk Spring and Fall 2026 Description: Provide ongoing support for Arts Walk event. Support efforts to include arts and artists in the downtown strategy area. Making spaces for art available to all people by encouraging development of community relationships to make space accessible to the creative community. Deliverable: Provide feedback and assistance as required. Approve Arts Walk cover artist recommendations.	2 hours	2 hours	April and October	General Fund and Municipal Art Fund - \$2000

<p>2.2 Music Out Loud Description: Honoring past musicians and celebrating today’s performing artists, this project pairs sidewalk mosaics in downtown Olympia with performances in association with LoveOly. Deliverable: Summer 2026 performances.</p>	1 hour	1 hour	TBD	Municipal Art Fund - \$3,000
<p>2.3 Park Development Public Art Support Description: For identified large design/build projects when a public artist is included in the design team, provide feedback on developing public art components for projects such as Yelm Highway Community Park, West Bay Park, Rebecca Howard Park and Percival Landing. Per the Municipal Art Plan, funds stay in the project budgets, and the public art components move along with the entire development process, including community meetings and Council approval. Deliverable: Provide feedback and assistance as required.</p>	3 hours	3 hours	Ongoing	1% for the Arts project funding

Section 3 - 2026/27 ARCH Support

The Olympia Arts Commission works to support the City’s efforts to strengthen the Arts, Cultures and Heritage (ARCH) components of our community.

Unless noted under “Budget Implications,” there is sufficient staff time/resource available in 2026/27 to accomplish or advance these items.

Estimated Percent of Overall Committee Effort: 22%

<i>Title Description</i>	Committee Lead and Commitment	Staff Commitment	Schedule	Budget Implications
	<i>Committee hours, not individuals.</i>	<i>Hours reflect working with the committee, not total project staff time.</i>	<i>Estimated completion.</i>	
3.1 ARCH Overview and Update Description: Update on general staff Arts, Cultures & Heritage efforts. Update on Creative District and Indie Music History project efforts. Deliverable: Provide greater understanding of Arts, Cultures & Heritage support across the City and follow projects as they move into the community.	2+ hours	2+ hours	Ongoing	None
3.2 Daley Arts Center Description: Support City in development of the Daley Arts Center. Deliverable: Provide feedback and assistance as requested.	1 hours	1 hours	Ongoing	None

<p>3.4 Inspire Olympia Description: Support public funding that sustains a healthy, visible, welcoming, and inclusive nonprofit cultural and science sector, making creative cultural experiences accessible for everyone in Olympia. Deliverable: Provide feedback and assistance as requested.</p>	1 hour	1 hour	Ongoing	None
---	--------	--------	---------	------

Arts Commission

Municipal Art

A Five-Year Municipal Art Plan for the City of Olympia

Introduction: Mission and Goals of the Olympia Arts Commission

1. The Municipal Art Plan: What and Why
2. Planning for Public Art
3. Project List for 2025
4. Planning Context
5. Other Activities
6. Summary Spreadsheet



Caption: Students from Thurgood Marshall Middle School Citizen Science Institute (CSI) Program with Teacher Tom Condon, visiting **Recomposing** by Abe Singer at Grass Lake Nature Park. CSI students participated in the development of the public art concept for the park.

The Olympia Arts Commission advises City Council on the art experiences of diverse communities of this region, through programs and opportunities that pro-actively foster arts and cultural activity for every segment of the community.

The Commission’s purpose is to promote and encourage public programs that further development, public awareness, and interest in fine, literary and performing arts and cultural heritage, and to advise City Council in connection with these. The Olympia Arts Commission (OAC) was created to provide expertise regarding the visual and performing arts and cultural heritage, and to reach out within and beyond the community to expand artistic and cultural programs and services for the community members of the Olympia area. (Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) 2.100.100, 2.100.110)

Supported by City staff, the OAC pursues this mission through a public art program that includes programming and events, services, outreach, education and networking, and the purchase, placement and maintenance of works of art in the community.

1. Municipal Arts Plan (MAP): What and Why

The MAP is the annual budget and spending plan for the Municipal Arts Fund, and it provides direction and accountability for the use of public resources in support of the arts.

City Ordinance calls for the OAC to “prepare and recommend to the City Council for approval a plan and guidelines to carry out the City’s art program,” (OMC 2.100.140) and notes that a municipal arts plan should prescribe the projects to be funded from the municipal arts fund. “*Municipal Arts Plan* means a plan outlining the City expenditures of designated funds for public art projects for a one-year period.” (OMC 2.100.160)

Olympia’s public art programs and purchases are funded through two sources: a \$1 per capita allocation from the City’s General Fund that was initiated in 1990, and a 1% for Art set-aside for new City construction projects over \$500,000 in value. Funds from these sources are deposited in a Municipal Arts Fund (MAF). The MAP establishes budgets for public art projects undertaken by the City, whether in conjunction with new capital projects or independent of them. Projects range from small (less than \$15k) to major (over \$50k) installations involving design teams, and may include visual, literary and performing arts.

2. Planning for Public Art

The OAC develops an Annual Work Plan that details program initiatives and activities of the City’s art program to promote the work of local artists and the arts within our community, and for the purchase of public art (including paid performances) to enhance and enliven the community. These public art investments are the focus of the MAP.

To develop funding projections for the MAP and budgets for individual projects, City Arts staff work with Parks and Public Works staff to identify projects that trigger the 1% for Art set-aside. These projects and their locations, impacts, and estimated public art budgets are reviewed and considered by the Arts Commission. The Commission generates a complete project list that includes planned capital-funded purchases as well as other projects identified in the Commission’s Annual Work Plan.

This project list forms the core of the Municipal Art Plan, which the Commission then recommends to City Council for approval.

In developing plans for public art projects, a number of conditions and values are considered to determine the best use of available resources for the benefit of the arts and the community. As a starting point, capital project-generated funds are considered for art projects at or near the site of the construction to enhance the public improvement, or to mitigate for the impact of the improvements. For large design/build projects, staff has piloted a process where the consultant has been required to bring a public artist into the design team. This approach eliminates redundancies in the process and ensures the participation of a public artist at the ground floor of complex design/build projects. The 1% for Art Funds are maintained and used for public art in those specific design/build projects. The Arts Commission reviews and provides comment on the developing art component as part of the general project community outreach, and City Council approves the art design as a seamless part of the overall construction design. Current design/build projects include West Bay Park, Jolene Unsoeld Community Park, Rebecca Howard Park and Percival Landing.

The funding for art generated by small capital projects is often too small to be very effective. In these cases, funds from multiple projects may be combined, or \$1 per capita funds added when available, to create a viable public art project budget. Balancing opportunities for multiple small projects versus fewer, more significant projects is an important planning consideration. Combining funds can bring a significant installation of public art to a capital improvement project that is too small to generate funds on its own, but which may be desirable because of location or community access. Until complete, priority for smaller projects or transportation related project funds will be directed toward completion of the eight projects that make up the Art Crossings Project. In selecting projects, programs and works of art, the OAC will consider how proposals accomplish the following:

- **Contribute to broad distribution of public art throughout Olympia.**
Commissioners will consider the relative representation of art among City neighborhoods, and seek to distribute public art broadly throughout the community.
- **Provide for diverse forms of art within the public collection.**
A wide range of style, media, subjects and viewpoints will offer perspective and interest for everyone.
- **Bring new ideas, innovation, or thinking to the community.** Encourage community conversation with focus on broader art experiences and culture and heritage focus.
- **Achieve a balanced City collection that includes a strong local base but also has regional and national reach.**
- **Ensure artwork is maintainable and safe.**
- **Ensure artwork is well-suited to chosen site or venue.**

3. Equity, Inclusion and Belonging

As an organization, the City of Olympia understands the power and influence government has to impact the daily lives of our residents, and the power to shape policies and practices that reduce inequities stemming from institutional and structural racism and oppression. In addition, the Parks, Arts and Recreation Department is committed to deepening engagement with underrepresented community members through creativity, innovation and relationship building to better provide a

parks, arts and recreation system where all Olympians feel they belong. For the public art program, this includes:

- Building jury panels where members bring diverse perspectives and/or life experience.
- Continuing to provide opportunities for any member of the public to help select artwork through community voting on Traffic Box Wraps and through the Percival Plinth Project.
- Pursuing additional outreach to underserved communities in public art planning processes, including most recently, Arts Crossing #3 and the Grass Lake Nature Park Project.
- Providing projects at multiple skill levels, so artists can grow into more complex projects.

4. Project List for 2026

The following slate of projects is diverse in arts disciplines and are located throughout Olympia. These investments in the arts support current and future endeavors, care for the collection we have and offer opportunities for local and regional artists, from youth through professional, to benefit the community and shared built environment. Together, this slate of initiatives will contribute to the creative and cultural arts in Olympia in the following ways:

- Expanding a diversity of the arts deeper into our neighborhoods and beyond the downtown core,
- Investing in the future of the arts and artists in our community, and showcasing their talent,
- Continuing with successful programs that are embraced by the community.

Squaxin Island Tribe Representation - \$36,000 - “Mother of Restoration” Həʔapus̓sqʷəbay” (Ha-push Squay-bay) by Andrea Wilbur Sigo was approved by City Council in 2024, and will be installed in downtown Olympia following site improvements to the location in 2026.

Traffic Box Wraps - \$18,000 - In 2025, 10 new traffic wraps were installed in Olympia, with 10 more planned for 2026.

Music Out Loud - \$3,000 - Funding for 9 street performances during the summer months. These originally were tied to three sidewalk mosaics in downtown Olympia, and have evolved into a partnership with the Olympia Downtown Alliance’s LoveOly event, keeping all three performances in their festival area.

Percival Plinth Project - \$42,000 - This ongoing project hosts loaned sculpture (up to 18) for an exhibition of one year along Percival Landing. During the month of July, the public is invited to vote for the sculpture they wish for the City to purchase. Following the exhibition, that sculpture moves to City Hall for one year and then into a City park or facility.

Olympia Art Crossings - Sited at key “gateway” locations surrounding the downtown, creative works of art that reflect Olympia’s neighborhoods and community, and mark passage between downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. This budget launches project #4 in 2026, which will complete half of the eight total locations in the project. Acceptance of an NEA matching grant applied for in 2025 would allow for Art Crossing #5 to be developed at the same time.

Poet Laureate - \$3,400 - Biennial Poet Laureate program, to promote poetry as an art form, expand access to the literary arts, connect the community to poetry, and promote poetry as a community voice that contributes to a sense of place. Funds cover an annual honoraria and small fund for

insurance, materials and supplies. Increased funds proposed for 2025 provides a small increase for reimbursable expenses of \$250 a year, and a stipend increase of \$400 a year.

Artist-In-Residence Program - \$4,950 - Increased budget covers 3, three month drumming workshops over the course of a year, by three different instructors, to serve residents of Drexel House, Lotus Court and Unity Commons. Program to move forward in partnership with the PARC Foundation.

Murals in Parks Pilot Project - \$10,000 - First pilot projects to take place at Yauger Park and Sunrise Park.

City Hall Exhibitions - \$500 - This line item remains open to respond to costs for community exhibitions that arise. Recent exhibitions include Hummingbird Studios Quilt Exhibition, Welcome Blanket Project and Rebecca Howard portrait and planning documents. Staff have been approached by the Washington State University Extension office about a United Nations International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralists planned in 2026.

Arts Walk Cover Art - \$2000 - Via competitive process, artists are selected each year to create a new artwork for use in marketing materials for spring and summer Arts Walk. The framed artwork becomes part of the City's public art collection. Budget increase would bring compensation for each image to \$1000.

Kaiser Woods - \$30,000 - This park is currently undeveloped but is slated to be Olympia's first park to have dedicated mountain biking trails. Project to engage youth of the Squaxin Island Tribe working under a master carver to create cedar sculptures interspersed throughout the site.

Daley Arts Center - The Armory Building is undergoing renovation for energy efficiency and public safety, 2025-2027. Renovation does not qualify for 1% for Art funding, so staff will apply for grants to develop public art on the site, as available.

4. Planning Context

Beginning in 2015 the OAC adopted a five-year budget planning horizon to allow a longer look ahead, facilitating planning for prospective capital projects that will be phased over several years, and for ongoing costs associated with others.

Taken together with the efforts described in the 2026 Work Plan, this 2026 budget and MAP reflect a continuing effort to build supportive social and practical infrastructure for the arts and artists in Olympia, supporting the creative energy that the arts bring to our community.

5. Other Activities

Maintenance and conservation efforts are necessary to preserve the integrity of the City's collection for the benefit of the community. 2025 saw major cleaning and resealing of "Walking on Land by Water" on West Bay Drive. Vehicular accidents caused damage to "Triumph of the Vegetables" and "Crossroads of Connection: Fruits" (Art Crossing #3), and in 2025 insurance and contracting processes began for repair and replacement, which will be completed in 2026. Two contracted foundation/pedestals are planned for 2025. Annual art cleaning/maintenance is completed with assistance of a part-time parks seasonal staff person.

Budget Summary and 5-Year Prospective (for Planning Purposes)

FIVE YEAR MUNICIPAL ART PLAN	2025 Actual	2026 Budget	2027 Budget	2028 Budget	2029 Budget	2030 Budget
Available Fund Balance	352,724	337,738	93,986	91,606	71,226	50,846
Revenue Total	94,443	111,470	57,970	57,970	57,970	57,970
Interest Earnings	11,137					
\$1 per Olympian	56,900	57,970	57,970	57,970	57,970	57,970
LBA Field 2 Renovation (1% for Art)	6,182					
Blvd Road Trail Crossing (1% for Art)	6,179					
Kaiser Woods (1% for Art)	14,045					
Art Crossing #3 (Restitution)		53,500				
Triumph of the Vegetables (Restitution)						
Expense Total	110,553	355,222	60,350	78,350	78,350	60,350
Admin/Maintenance Expenses	6,383	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Project Costs	104,170	351,222	56,350	74,350	74,350	56,350
Squaxin Island Tribe Representation	8,000	36,000				
Murals in Parks		10,000				
Traffic Box Wrap (Fabricator search in 2024, 2027)	15,423	18,000		18,000	18,000	
Music Out Loud	1,100	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Percival Plinth Project	37,209	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000
Olympia Art Crossings		110,000				
City Hall Rotating Exhibition		500	500	500	500	500
Arts Walk Cover Purchase	1,500	1,500	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Poet Laureate	2,750	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400
Artist in Residence	1,088	4,950	4,950	4,950	4,950	4,950
Kaiser Woods Park Improvements		30,000				
Grass Lake Nature Park	22,000					
Contracted Conservation/Construction	13,476	91,372				
Insurance	500	500	500	500	500	500
Revenue - Expense	(14,986)	(243,752)	(2,380)	(20,380)	(20,380)	(2,380)

Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

BPAC 2026-2027 Draft Work Plan

The BPAC participates in the development of plans and policies to make Olympia easier to walk, roll, and bike in. It meets six times per year. The dates and time needed for each item may change. Should a plan or project arise for which BPAC feedback is requested, that topic may be added.

Date	Item	Type	Deliverable
5/20/2026	New member orientation (5pm)		
	Sidewalk repair policy	Briefing	Feedback to staff
	Engineering Design and Development Standards Updates	Discussion	Possible subcommittee
7/15/2026	Capital Facilities Plan	Briefing	Decision on approach to reviewing the CFP
	Grants	Briefing	
	Street Safety Plan	Briefing	
9/16/2026	Capital Facilities Plan	Discussion	Possible memo to Council
	Speed enforcement cameras	Briefing	Feedback to staff
	New member application questions	Decision	
11/18/2026	New member applications process	Decision	Decision on approach to reviewing new member applications
	Review BPAC's enabling ordinance	Decision	Possible subcommittee
	Officer elections	Decision	Committee officers elected for 2027
1/20/2027	New member applications recommendation	Decision	Recommendation to City Council
	Overview of upcoming capital projects	Briefing	
	2027-2028 work plan	Decision	Work plan to City Council
3/17/2027	Martin Way Corridor Project Scoping	Briefing	Feedback to staff

As needed, BPAC committee members may research the following topics:

- Experiencing new infrastructure/feedback on completed projects
- Places that haven't had city investment/network gaps
- Other municipalities' sidewalk repair policies
- Accessibility
- West Olympia Access Project

Recommended by BPAC 1/21/26

Cultural Access Advisory Board

Cultural Access Advisory Board 2026 Annual Work Plan - FINAL

CAAB Purpose

Deliver Program Goals. Advise City Council concerning processes, procedures, and criteria for carrying out the goals of the Cultural Access Program including goals regarding equity and access to cultural programs for all residents of the City.

Accountability. Ensure that expenditures of Olympia Cultural Access Program dollars follow the priorities and commitments made to voters by the City of Olympia.

Education. Support public communications and outreach.

Regular Meetings and Annual Board Activities

Meetings	☆ Council Deliverable	CAAB Activity
JANUARY 8		Finalize 2026 Workplan. Preview 12-month program calendar. Review public program highlights of quarterly reporting from programs. Receive program updates.
APRIL <i>Review Panels</i>		<i>Review Panels will not include a quorum of CAAB members. CAAB members serve as panelists to read, discuss, and score applications.</i>
MAY 20	☆	Prepare annual funding recommendation for City Council consideration, based on available funding and scored applications.
JULY 9 Board Retreat	☆	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous Improvement analysis • Recommend program revisions: funding goals, guidelines, requirements, granting framework (odd years)
OCTOBER 8	☆	Review: Draft Annual Report; Work Plan for coming year; Highlights of current cohort quarterly reporting.

2026 Focus Areas and Benchmarks

- 1. Review effectiveness toward achieving program funding goals including equity and access** by engaging in a Continuous Improvement analysis of the second Inspire Olympia cohort and their public programs. Recommend adjustments as needed to support equitable distribution of services within the community.
Benchmarks: Analysis of funded cohort and public programs provided, examining who is funded and who is served, who may be missing or experiencing barriers, whether program funding goals are being addressed, and strategies for improvement.
- 2. Support community outreach and accessibility of Inspire Olympia program for local nonprofits, and growth & development of funded cohort.**
Benchmarks: # of new applicants; # of fiscally sponsored and new organizations; diversity of applicants; feedback from participating organizations program adjustments to facilitate participation. Capacity building offerings, participation numbers, and feedback from Inspire cohort. Program visibility in the community as a measure of public engagement and the effectiveness of program communications.
- 3. Support Cultural Access Programs in Schools.**
Benchmarks: # of IO organizations offering CAPS programs; # of students served; # of field trips provided; # of bus trips funded; # of in-school programs; growth in variety and types of experiences offered; targeted training opportunities for Inspire organizations, for educators. Feedback from teachers and district staff.

Board Organization

Officers

Melissa Meade, Chair
Anne Larsen, Vice Chair

Meetings

4 Quarterly Meetings including a Board Retreat
6-8 Review Panel Mtgs, Mar-Apr (no quorum)
Ad Hoc Committee meetings as called (no quorum)

City Council Interaction

May - June Annually: Funding Recommendations – Briefing for CLPS followed by Council Consideration
July - August Odd years only: Adjustments to Funding Goals and Granting Structure, if needed – Briefing for CLPS followed by Council Consideration
Oct - Nov Annual Report – Submit to City Manager and City Council; publish on Inspire webpage.

Design Review Board

Design Review Board Work Plan 2026:

Meetings: occur twice a month on an as needed basis.

- Subcommittee meetings and special meetings will be scheduled as needed.

Staff Liaison: Jackson Ewing, Senior Planner: (360) 570-3776: jewing@ci.olympia.wa.us

Work Product / Deliverable	Schedule	Board /Staff Commitment	Budget Implications
<p>Project Review: Review of project design for compliance with adopted design criteria through: Concept, Detail, or Combined review.</p> <p>Make recommendation on compliance to the review authority.</p>	Regularly Occurring – every meeting.	<p>Board Members: Should spent several hours evaluating code criteria and design features per project prior to the meeting.</p> <p>Staff: Provides helpful guidance to Board in the way of code review analysis and suggested conditions of approval if applicable. Staff should aim to spend less than 20 hours on documenting /presenting / preparing for the Board meeting.</p>	Included in base budget. Application fees should result in 80% or better for staff time spent on preparing documents for the Board. Currently recovery is below the goals. While not relevant to the general fund, efforts are being made to improve cost recovery through improving efficiency and coordination.
<p>Study Sessions/ Work Sessions: Staff and Board work together to find opportunities to schedule and learn about code applicability. Aim to hone skills, improve meeting flow, and efficiency. Evaluate past projects and recommendations against the end result of the constructed building.</p>	1 to 2 times per year / as needed. Given high volume of new members, possibly more this year.	<p>Board: 2-hour meetings and OPMA / PRA training requirements.</p> <p>Staff: Prep. for educational meetings – no more than 5 hours per event.</p>	Included in base budget. With limited staff time, careful consideration of work priorities is needed.
<p>Annual Retreat: Staff and Board work together to determine agenda. Retreat aims to celebrate successes, and include fun/ interesting presenters on various design topics.</p>	End of calendar year.	<p>Board: 10-15 hrs. of Board prep + 4 hrs. at the retreat</p> <p>Staff: 10-15 hrs. of prep and time at the retreat.</p>	\$20 per person for lunch, if applicable.

Work Product / Deliverable	Schedule	Board /Staff Commitment	Budget Implications
<p>Design Featurettes: Short narratives on design topics with graphics to illustrate themes and concepts to be posted on the DRB Website and other medias as appropriate.</p>	<p>As time permits. One per member per year if desired.</p>	<p>Board: 4 hours per featurette, plus full board review. Staff: 1-2 hours per featurette: editing, uploading to web, distribution etc.</p>	<p>Included in base budget. With limited staff time, careful consideration of work priorities is needed. Printed materials would represent a minor expense if needed.</p>
<p>Awards of Merit: One or more Board members photograph completed and occupied projects. Staff assembles a review for Board, Board reviews and votes, Board members create an award and present the award(s) to recipients at City Council recognition meeting. Deliverable(s): Award Presentation at City Council, and possible additional exposure in an outreach campaign.</p>	<p>Three-year basis. At Board discretion. The process begins Oct 1; wraps up Nov 30, end of year City Council recognition mtg.</p>	<p>Board: 4 hours per award plus full board review. Staff: 1-2 hours per award: editing, uploading to web, distribution etc.</p>	<p>Minor staff time and board time required to complete.</p>

Heritage Commission

Olympia Heritage Commission

2026 WORKPLAN



Mission:

“Identify and actively encourage the preservation of Olympia’s historic resources by maintaining, updating, and expanding the Olympia Heritage Register and reviewing proposed changes to Heritage Register properties; to raise community awareness of Olympia’s history and historic resources; and to serve as the City’s primary resource in matters of history, historic planning and preservation.” **(OMC 18.12.055)**

Core Strategies:



- Heritage Month
- Recognition Awards
- Explore and encourage incentives
- Special programs, events, tabling, tours
- Build trust with owners, developers, contractors, realtors, & community

- ARCH
- Community & Educational Org’s
- Heritage Org’s
- Local Businesses
- Build relationships with Tribes & BIPOC community

- Input to City Planning efforts
- Diversity, Equity & Inclusion
- Heritage Commission Development
- Research and Interpretation

- Timely review w/in permit process
- Guidance for homeowners and contractors
- Special Tax Valuation
- Individual listings
- District listings

Committees:



Marketing & Outreach



All Committees



Policy, Ordinance & Guidance



Heritage Review

Heritage Commission 2026 Projects



2026 Meeting Schedule: 5:30pm on 4th Wednesdays: Jan 28, Feb 25, March 25, April 22, May 27, July 22, Aug 26, Sept 23, Oct 28, November and December dates TBD

Activity	Task Detail for 2026	Schedule	Budget
Educate and Inspire: <i>Marketing & Outreach Committee</i>			
Heritage Month May 2026	Explore partnerships; A+H Awards and event	January to October	-0-
Community Engagement/Partnerships Events	OHC presence at Arts Walk, Arts+ Heritage Week, Walking tours, Neighborhood engagement	Ongoing	\$50
Educational Workshop Series	Informational sessions on topics such as: Cyclical maintenance for historic homes, What is the Olympia Heritage Register, etc	Ongoing goal to host 3 sessions through 2026	As needed
Picnic Social	Build relationships and welcome new commissioners	Summer 2026	-0-
Integrate Preservation Best Practices in Good Government: <i>Policy, Ordinance and Guidance Committee</i>			
Heritage Commission Training	Plan new member orientation, 2026 retreat and development training for OHC including Climate initiatives, building materials, and board trainings	Schedule Retreat and training	\$50 + Grant funds
Olympia Municipal Code (OMC) Ordinance Update	Participate in Staff update to OMC re: Historic Preservation and Cultural Resource Management	Ongoing through 2026	-0-
Equity in Historic Preservation Discussions	Equity training discussion on preservation, including intangible heritage assets and cultural landscapes	Ongoing	Grant required
Review and Permitting: <i>Heritage Review Committee</i>			
2026 Special Tax Valuation Applications	Review and recommend approval to City Council	Fall 2026	-0-
Explore National listings that should be listed in the Olympia Heritage Register	Talk with property owners, research properties and possible district boundaries, advocate to list districts and individual properties	March through December	CPED administration fund for plaques
Promote new listings	Advocate to list key properties around Olympia	April through December	-0-
Provide design guidance	Continue design consultations for historic properties, Evaluate OMC design guidelines and best practices for code updates as needed	Ongoing through 2026	-0-

Olympia
Metropolitan Parks
District Board
Advisory Committee

2026 OMPD Board and Advisory Committee Work Plans

Updated February 9, 2026

BOARD: Tuesday, April 14, 2026, 5:30 PM, Council Chambers (Special Meeting)

- Annual elections for president and vice-president
- Approve 2026 Advisory Committee Work Plan
- Appoint New Community Advisory Committee Members

ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Wednesday, May 6, 2026, 6:00 PM, City Hall Room 207

- Welcome new advisory committee members
- Election of officers
- Prepare draft annual report to OMPD Board & City Council on compliance of 2025 funding levels.
- Watch OPMA video

POST ANNUAL REPORT FOR PUBLIC COMMENT (AUGUST)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Wednesday, October 7, 2026, 6:00 PM, City Hall Room 207

- Review public feedback on draft annual report and finalize report
- 2027 Preliminary Budget Preview - Draft letter to be presented at October OMPD Board meeting regarding OPARD's proposed operating and capital budgets' compliance with the Interlocal Agreement

BOARD: Tuesday, October 27, 2026, 5:30 PM, Council Chambers (Special Meeting)

- Presentation of the Advisory Committee's letter regarding 2025 Annual Report
- Presentation of 2027 preliminary OMPD budget
- Public Hearing on 2027 preliminary budget
- Public Hearing on 2027 Ad Valorem Tax

BOARD: Tuesday, November 17, 2026, 5:30 PM, Council Chambers

- Approval of Resolution Setting the 2027 Ad Valorem Tax
- Approval of Resolution adopting the 2027 budget

November 30, 2026 – County deadline to receive 2027 Ad Valorem Tax resolution and budget

Planning Commission

DRAFT - - Olympia Planning Commission - 2026 Work Plan (April 1, 2026 to March 31, 2027)

The Planning Commission (OPC) is expected to hold approximately 21 regular meetings and may conduct an optional retreat during this period. Special meetings may be held and subcommittees may be formed. The staff liaison is Casey Schaufler, Associate Planner, cschaufl@ci.olympia.wa.us, 360.753.8254.

Section 1: Policy Issues			
Commission recommendations on many of these items are forwarded to the City Council. Recommendations may be conveyed in writing, directly by the Commission chair or a delegate, or by City staff. Approximately 75% of commission effort.			
#	Title and Description	Anticipated Outcome from OPC	Schedule (Estimated start & completion)
1.1	2025 Olympia Municipal Code Amendments	Minor code updates	Briefing, Public Hearing, and Deliberations. Est. Feb-Mar.
1.2	Review Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Review the Preliminary CFP, hold a public hearing, and identify whether proposals comply with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.	Public hearing and comment letter to City Council.	Est. 1-2 full OPC mtgs + 3 subcommittee mtgs: Aug - Oct
1.3	Zoning Map and Development Code Text Amendments (if proposed) Review of privately proposed, staff-initiated, or Council-initiated amendments to the City's development regulations not referenced above.	Public hearing and recommendation to City Council.	TBD
1.4	Subdivision Code Update Review of proposed ordinance to implement Middle Housing changes.	Public hearing and recommendation to City Council.	March/April
1.5	Sidewalk Repair & Maintenance Policy	Comment letter, possible public hearing and recommendation.	May
1.6	Commercial Minimum Parking Standards Review of proposed ordinance to implement statewide changes to parking standards.	Public hearing and recommendation to City Council.	May
1.7	Critical Areas Ordinance Update Review of proposed ordinance to reflect current state law and best available science practices..	Public hearing and recommendation to City Council.	May

1.8	SEPA Categorical Exemptions Review of proposed ordinance to reflect current state law and best available science practices.	Public hearing and recommendation to City Council.	May
1.9	Manufactured Home Communities Preservation Review of proposed ordinance.	Public hearing and recommendation to City Council.	September

SECTION 2: Optional Program Implementation and/or Input to Council or Staff			
As programs are developed and implemented and code amendment proposals and administrative procedures refined, staff often consults with the Commission for their input and perspective. These items comprise approximately 5% percent of commission work effort.			
#	Title and Description	Anticipated Outcome from OPC	Schedule
2.1	Subarea/Neighborhood Plan <i>(if proposed)</i> Review of draft Subarea Plan if any initiated by City Council	Comments to staff and neighborhood work group; optional recommendation to Council	TBD
2.2	Urban Forest Management Plan	Comments and recommendations to staff	TBD

SECTION 3: Administrative Activities		
In addition to its role in providing input on policy and program implementation, the Commission reviews and approves its work plan on an annual basis. Other activities may include an annual retreat and meeting with other organizations. These items comprise approx. 5 % percent of commission work effort.		
#	Title and Description	Schedule
3.1	Organizational Retreat <i>(optional)</i> Focus on improving Commissioner relationships, procedures, or on topics of interest that allow more time for discussion	May/June
3.2	Preparation of 2027 - 2028 Work Plan Time allotted for proposing and discussing work items for following year	TBD

SECTION 4: Informational Briefings

The Commission seeks to be a well-informed and effective advisory body. The activities below are intended to improve Commission information and knowledge necessary to fulfill its role. These items comprise approximately 10% percent of commission work effort. The Commission may not complete all of the briefings, as they are the first items to be displaced when time is needed for higher priority work items. Briefings are generally 30 minutes per topic.

#	Title and Description	Dept.
4.1	Street Conditions Update	Public Works
4.2	Land Use as Climate and Housing Action - explore different scenarios of missing middle housing development to meet housing needs and address climate challenges	OPC – G. Quetin
4.3	Downtown Parking and Parking Garages - Update regarding parking in Olympia’s downtown (Downtown Parking Strategy) and strategies to evaluate how best to use the valuable space on public curbs. Additionally, Planning Commission-led discussion of the pros/cons of parking garages and providing regulations to help make them adaptable under different future use scenarios	PW, G. Quetin
4.4	Planning for Disability - How the built environment interacts with planning and design decisions	D. Garcia
4.5	Planning for Safety - In Olympia, 1% of lane miles downtown account for 15% of pedestrian accidents and fatalities. Road deaths in Washington reached a 33-year high in 2023. Statewide, 810 people were killed in crashes involving a motor vehicle in 2023, a 33-year high. That’s up from 743 in 2022, and nearly double from 2014, when 462 people were killed in traffic.	D. Garcia
4.6	Alleys and Reuse - Provide a briefing on how other downtowns have reused their alleys for more productive uses.	PW, D. Garcia
4.7	Multi Family Tax Exemption briefing - Briefing on how other similarly sized cities have used the MFTE	CPED, D. Garcia
4.8	Why other cities ditched their parking minimums - Recently, many other WA cities have ditched their parking mandates. What can Olympia learn from what other cities are doing? Examples: Port Townsend, Spokane, Bellingham, Shoreline.	D. Garcia
4.9	ADA Street Parking Update. If possible, include InterCity Transit on ADA options and planning.	CPED, PW
4.10	Week Without Driving/Commute Trip Reduction/Transportation Master Plan Updates	Community, PW, TRPC
4.11	InterCity Transit – System Update	IT, PW

Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee

DRAFT-- Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee Work Plan -- April 2026 through March 2027

Month	Title/Description	Staff	Time Needed	PRAC Action
4/16/26	OPARD 2025 Performance Metrics	Sylvana Niehuser	30 minutes	Briefing and Feedback to Staff
	Parks, Arts & Recreation Plan- Public Engagement Plan	Laura Keehan	30 minutes	Briefing and Feedback to Staff
5/21/26	Letters of Support for RCO Grant Projects	Sarah Giannobile	30 minutes	Letters of Support
	OPARD Equity, Inclusion & Belonging Program Update	Olivia Salazar de Breaux	20 minutes	Briefing and Feedback to Staff
	OPARD Staff-driven Projects	John Wolfe	25 minutes	Briefing and Feedback to Staff
6/18/26	Park Ranger Program Briefing	Amy Stull	20 minutes	Briefing and Feedback to Staff
	Japanese Garden Relocation Project	Laura Keehan	30 minutes	Briefing and Feedback to Staff
JULY 2026 - NO MEETING				
8/20/26	Capital Facilities Plan (CFP)	Tammy LeDoux	20 minutes	Briefing and Feedback to Staff
	Capital Asset Management Program (CAMP)	Melissa McFadden	20 minutes	Briefing and Feedback to Staff
9/17/26	Capital Facilities Plan	Tammy LeDoux	15 minutes	Recommendation to Council
	Capital Asset Management Program (CAMP)	Melissa McFadden	15 minutes	Recommendation to Council

10/15/26	Olympia Downtown Waterfront Vision (Percival Landing) Briefing	Sylvana Niehuser	30 minutes	Briefing and Feedback to Staff
NOVEMBER & DECEMBER 2026 - NO MEETINGS				
1/21/27	Screening New PRAC Member Applications	Laura Keehan	30 minutes	Recommend Interviewees to Council CLPS Committee
	PRAC Workplan Review	Laura Keehan	15 minutes	Review draft workplan and forward to Council CLPS Committee
	Chair, Vice-chair and OMPC Advisory Committee Appointments	Laura Keehan	15 minutes	PRAC Members Vote
FEBRUARY 2027 - NO MEETING				
3/18/27	Parks, Arts & Recreation Plan Update	Laura Keehan	30 minutes	Briefing and Feedback to Staff
As Needed	Participation in groundbreakings and dedications	N/A	45 minutes	Attendance is Optional

Social Justice and Equity Commission



2026-2027 Work Plan

Staff Liaison: Margo Morales, Community Engagement Program Specialist

Work Location: City Hall – 4th Floor

Social Justice & Equity Commission Purpose: Eliminate racism and fulfill human rights for a just and equitable Olympia for all people.

Introduction: At the Commission’s 2025 retreat they identified four main action areas with five strategies for responding to the data collected in the Experiences of Discrimination report. Those focus areas and strategies related to the Experiences of Discrimination report have informed the priorities of this workplan.

Work Plan Items

1. **What: Reimagining Public Safety**

Description: In 2022 Council formally accepted a list of goals and recommendations around the City’s municipal public safety system. Since then several recommended actions have been taken by the various departments within the system, but have not been effectively tracked or reported to the council or community. In 2026 staff will be working on updates for City Council on what progress has been made toward the identified goals of the Reimagining Public Safety recommendations, and what identified actions have been carried out by the various parts of the municipal public safety system. Staff will brief the Commission on what has already been completed and seek their community member perspectives on prioritization of remaining action items identified in the Reimagining Public Safety recommendations. Staff would also like to enlist support of the commission in community education efforts about Reimagining Public Safety.

Timeframe: Q2 / Q3

Deliverables:

- Recommendations for prioritization of remaining actions identified by the Reimagining Public Safety work group.
- Community engagement – Individual and group conversations around the community impact and experiences of reimagining public safety.

2. What: Community Engagement

The City contracted with a consultant to provide recommendations on community engagement and ways to improve the use of advisory bodies to inform the City's work. As the Consultant provides their recommendations, the Commission will assist with this work by providing community perspectives on how we ensure diverse representation through our public engagement, reach people where they are at, and invest in relational engagement and build trust.

Timeframe: Q2 / Q3

Deliverable: Input on City's engagement guidance for staff. More definition around the commission's role in engagement. Commission taking a more active role in strengthening relationships with community.

3. What: Experiences of Discrimination

Description: The Commission worked with a consultant team to assess experiences of discrimination in Olympia. The report shares insights into what kinds of discrimination are occurring in our city, how often, and how that may look to different marginalized groups. The Commission will build upon discussions from their 2025 retreat and the findings of the report to continue their work on this topic in 2026.

Timeframe: Q4

Deliverables: Scoping what is City's role in responding and what is the commission's role. Scoping includes identifying what the city is already doing and where there are gaps.

4. Council Referrals

The Commission will hold space in their annual work plan for items referred to them by the City Council. In the Commission's experience thus far, the most meaningful referred items have been those in which the following applies:

- There is a clearly defined problem the Commission is being asked to address.
- There is a clearly defined timeline and scope for the Commission.
- The Commission can make a meaningful contribution to a systems level change through leveraging of Commissioner depth of knowledge, lived experience, and diversity of perspectives to solve problems.
- When possible, the Commission is involved in the work item from beginning to end.

Commission Meeting Schedule



Social Justice & Equity Commission

The Social Justice & Equity Commission will use an alternative approach to establishing a meeting schedule for the 2026-2027 work plan.

Commission’s meeting schedule will be co-created with Commissioners to accommodate a more focused work plan and align with criteria established in their guiding framework.

DRAFT

Utility Advisory Committee

City of Olympia
Utility Advisory Committee (UAC) 2026-2027 Work Plan

NOTE: Meetings are first Thursday of the month unless otherwise noted on the UAC's webpage.

Month	Request/Description	Staff	Time Needed	UAC Action
April 2026	Consultant Financial Rate Study - Scope of Work (wet utilities)	Susan Clark	45 minutes	Briefing
May 2026	Climate Change/Sea Level Rise Update	Climate Program Staff	30 minutes	Briefing
	Tour of City Maintenance Center	PW Staff	45 minutes	None
June 2026	LOTT - State of Utility	LOTT Staff	45 minutes	Briefing
	City - State of the Utilities	Utility Staff	45 minutes	Briefing
	Financial Rate Study Update (wet utilities)	Consultant/Susan Clark	45 Minutes	Briefing
No Meetings July and August				
September 2026	Preliminary Discussion on 2027 Utility Operating Budgets, Rates, and General Facility Charges	Utility Directors	45 minutes	Briefing
	Capital Facilities Plan	Susan Clark/Mike Vessey	45 minutes	Briefing
October 2026	Drainage Manual Update	James Patton	30 Minutes	Briefing
	2027 Utility Operating Budgets, Capital Facility Plan, Rates, and General Facility Charges	Utility Directors	60 minutes	Review and provide feedback to Council in budget/rate letter
November 2026	National Pollutant Discharge & Elimination System (NPDES) Reporting & Stormwater Management Action Plan (SMAP)	Susan McCleary/Kym Foley	45 minutes	Briefing
	Urban Forestry Management Plan Update	Kym Foley/Leanne Wells	20 Minutes	Briefing
	UAC Officer Elections	UAC Liaison	15 minutes	Motion to elect officers
No Meetings December and January				
February 2027	Drainage Manual	James Patton	45 minutes	Recommendation
	Initial Discussion on UAC Work Plan 2027-2028	UAC Liaison	40 minutes	Review and provide feedback to staff
March 2027	Financial Rate Study Update (wet utilities)	Consultant/Susan Clark	45 Minutes	Briefing
	Finalize UAC 2027-2028 Work Plan	UAC Liaison	20 minutes	Review and approve. Submit to Council's Community Livability and Public Safety Committee (CLPS)

To be covered during Announcements (as updates are available)

PFAS (Per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances) and other contaminants of emerging concern for drinking water.

Yellow shading indicates items that require UAC action.



March 12, 2026

Olympia City Council

Honorable Mayor Payne and City of Olympia Councilmembers,

One of the duties of the Community Policing Board is to meet regularly with the Civilian Police Auditor to provide feedback and community perspectives on their work, including their annual work plan. On March 12, 2026 the Community Policing Board had the opportunity to meet with the Civilian Police Auditor and discuss their draft work plan for the coming year. This letter is intended to share with you the Community Policing Board's conversation.

The Community Policing Board discussed the draft work plan with the Civilian Police Auditor and had the opportunity to ask questions. Community Policing Board members had the following comments related to the Auditor's draft work plan:

- Board members appreciated the structure and layout of the report, with narrative and recommendations.
- Board members expressed support for looking at the Crisis Response Unit in the 2026-2027 work plan.
- Board discussed how they want to work with the Auditor on further community engagement, and discuss at future meetings how to collaborate on this effort.
- Board members discussed the desire to engage with the community around collection of demographic data as highlighted in recommendation 22 in the 2025 annual report.

We thank the City Council for the opportunity to review and comment on the auditor's annual report.

Best Regards,

Sarah Nagy
Chair, Community Policing Board

sn:mm