



Olympia Planning Commission (OPC) Final Deliberation Schedule

For 'Imagine Olympia' - Comprehensive Plan Update

January – March 2013



Explanation of Schedule:

The OPC Chair, along with Vice-Chair Bardin, Finance Subcommittee Chair Horn, and staff developed this schedule. The following were considered in establishing the order of topics:

- The Comprehensive Plan Update Charter
- City Council priorities (as reiterated by City Councilmember Langer at the December 17, 2012 meeting.)
- The Commission's priority order of topics
- Public interest
- Efficient use of meeting time

Staff is available to help sponsors prepare for topics.

Staff Contact Info:

Amy Buckler, 570-5847, abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us

Stacey Ray, 753-8046, sray@ci.olympia.wa.us

Jennifer Kenny, 753-8031, jkenny@ci.olympia.wa.us

Todd Stamm, 753-8597, tstamm@ci.olympia.wa.us

Sophie Stimson, 753-8497, [sstimson@ci.olympia.wa.us](mailto:ssimson@ci.olympia.wa.us)

In December of 2012, OPC established two lists of topics for final deliberations. One was a list of topics pulled off of the staff proposed Substantive Change list (OPC's "Non-Consent List.") The other was a list of 'Trends & Highlights' that arose from public comment and OPC initial deliberations.

January 14: See pg. 2. The Commission will deliberate on substantive changes not related to Trends & Highlights topics; followed by 'List B' items, if time.

January 28-March 4: Each night = One big topic, followed by as many 'List B' topics as possible:

- **January 28 – Connectivity; Vision & Values Statements** (two big topics this evening)
- **February 11 – High Density Corridors**
- **February 25 – Urban Agriculture**
- **March 4 – Views & Heights**

March 18: OPC will deliberate on any remaining 'List B' topics; Final Vote; Discussion of OPC Recommendation ("Transmittal") Letter to City Council.

List A – 'Big Topics': See Page 5. These topics are likely to be the most time-consuming policy discussions. These generate a lot of public interest, so it is important to schedule specific dates. These deliberations combine an OPC Trends & Highlights topic with one or more items from the Non-Consent List.


List B: See Pg. 12. These are all the remaining topics, which will be addressed – in the order listed – following the 'List A' topic for the night. OPC may not get through the entire list, depending on time. The order of the list gives first priority to Trends & Highlights topics that relate to substantive changes; next are Trends & Highlights topics that do not relate to substantive changes. Within that, they are in the order established by the Commission.

January 14, 2013: means OPC deliberated and voted on the topic, and the outcome is included.

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals. OUTCOME	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Roger Horn Judy James Jerry	Natural Environment: (New Policy) PN1.7: Limit hillside development to site designs that incorporate and conform to the existing topography.	Add, "and hydrology" to the end of the sentence. OUTCOME: Commissioner Tousley moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to recommend the following: "PN1.7: Limit hillside development to site designs that incorporate and conform to the existing topography, and minimize impacts to existing hydrology." The motion passed unanimously.	Non-C, #5	Stacey Ray	FSEIS, p. 55
2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Judy Bardin Roger Paul	Natural Environment: (New Policy) PN3.4: Evaluate the environmental benefits of the urban forest.	Add, "health, social and economic benefits." OUTCOME: Commissioner Tousley moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to recommend the following: "PN3.4: Evaluate the environmental, ecologic, health, social and economic benefits of the urban forest." The motion passed unanimously.	Non-C, #7	Stacey Ray	FESIS, p. 67
3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jerry Parker Paul Larry Roger	Land Use & Urban Design: (Revised Policy) PL6.1: Require highly visible development – such as commercial development adjacent to freeways and public streets, in urban corridors, downtown, and at the	Don't understand the WWII issue, and other concerns OUTCOME: Commissioner Tousley moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to recommend PL6.1A, as	Non-C, #14	Todd Stamm	FSEIS, p. 100

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals. OUTCOME	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
		Port, and all housing except detached homes on conventionally sized lots (5,000 sq. ft. or larger) outside areas developed before WWII – to be designed to maintain or improve the character and livability of each area or neighborhood.	<p>proposed: "PL6.1A: Require residential and commercial development adjacent to freeways and public streets be subject to a design review process." The motion passed by a 4-3 vote. Commissioners Tousley, Horn, Reddick and Parker voted yay. Commissioners Ingman, Bardin and Kizza voted nay.</p> <p>Commissioner Reddick moved, seconded by Commissioner Tousley, to recommend the following: "PL6.1B: The design review process should recognize differences in the City with the objective of maintaining or improving the character and livability of each area or neighborhood." The motion passed unanimously.</p>			
4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Roger Horn Judy Jerry	Land Use & Urban Design: (New Policy) PL17.5: Encourage development and public improvements consistent with healthy and active lifestyles.	<p>Too weak. Consider stating "Encourage or require ..." instead of just "encourage."</p> <p>OUTCOME: Commissioner Tousley moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to recommend the following: "PL17.5: Encourage or require development and public improvements be consistent with healthy and active lifestyles." The motion passed unanimously.</p>	Non-C, #18	Todd Stamm	FSEIS, p. 117

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals. OUTCOME	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Paul Ingman James Judy	Land Use & Urban Design: (New Policy) PL17.6: Discourage ‘fortress-style’ and unnecessarily secure designs that isolate developments and separate neighborhoods.	What types of specific issues is this policy addressing? Terms need better definition. OUTCOME: Commissioner Tousley moved, seconded by Commissioner Bardin, to recommend the following: "PL17.6: Prevent physical barriers from isolating and separating the integration and compatibility of new developments with existing neighborhoods." The motion passed unanimously.	Non-C, #19	Todd Stamm	FSEIS, p. 119
6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amy Tousley Jerry Judy	Utilities: (Modified Goal) GU16: Private Utilities are located underground to protect public health, safety and welfare, and to create a more reliable utility system. (Modified Policy) PU16.1: Place new private utility distribution lines underground wherever practical. This should be based on sound engineering judgment, on consideration of health and safety, and in accordance with the regulations and tariffs of the WUTC and the City’s Engineering Development and Design Standards. (Modified Policy) PU16.2: Encourage placing existing private utility distribution lines underground, in accordance with the regulations and tariffs of the WUTC. (Continued ...)	Not sure what the specific change is. Add terms, “public” and “aesthetics” throughout. OUTCOME: Chair Parker moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick to recommend the language as proposed, with the following changes: move the word "aesthetics" to the end of the series in each policy; for PU16.1, change the word "practical" to "practicable;"and for PU16.5, delete the word "PSE" and add an "s" to the end of the word "agreement." The motion passed unanimously. The recommendation is:	Non-C, #26	Liz Hoenig; Fran Eide	FSEIS, p. 130

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals. OUTCOME	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
		<p>(Modified Policy) PU16.3: Coordinate the undergrounding of both new and existing private utility lines consistent with policies PU 3.1 and PU 3.2.</p> <p>(Modified Policy) PU16.4: Apply utility undergrounding requirements to all public and private development projects.</p> <p>(Modified Policy) PU16.5: Develop and maintain a management plan, consistent with the Olympia Municipal Code and the Engineering Development and Design Standards, for underground and overhead utilities as part of the City's Franchise Agreement with PSE. OMC telecommunications Chapter 11 regarding permitting and leasing </p>	<p>GU16: Public and private utilities are located underground to protect public health, safety and welfare, and to create a more reliable and aesthetic utility system.</p> <p>PU16.1: Place new public and private utility distribution lines underground wherever practicable. This should be based on sound engineering judgment, on consideration of health, safety and aesthetics, and in accordance with the regulations and tariffs of the Washington Utilities Transportation Commission and the City's Engineering Development and Design Standards.</p> <p>PU16.2: Encourage placing existing public and private utility distribution lines underground, in accordance with the regulations and tariffs of the Washington Utilities Transportation Commission and the City's Engineering Development and Design Standards.</p> <p>PU16.3: Coordinate the undergrounding of both new and existing public and private utility lines consistent with policies PU 3.1 and PU</p>			

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals. OUTCOME	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
			<p>3.2.</p> <p>PU16.4: Apply utility undergrounding requirements to all public and private development projects.</p> <p>PU16.5: Develop and maintain a management plan, consistent with the Olympia Municipal Code and the Engineering Development and Design Standards, for underground and overhead utilities as part of the City's franchise agreements. The management plan will also address undergrounding of the City's aerial facilities as well as other franchise utilities. (See OMC telecommunications Chapter 11 regarding permitting and leasing <http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/olympia/.>)</p>			
<i>Potential for January 14, but not confirmed by sponsor ...</i>						
7	Agnieszka Kisza Judy Paul	Natural Environment: (New Policy) PN2.1: Prioritize acquiring and preserving land by a shared set of priorities that consider the environmental benefits of the land, such as stormwater management, wildlife habitat, and access to recreation opportunities.	Add, "health benefits." TOPIC TABLED	Non-C, #6	Stacey Ray	FSEIS, p. 60

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals. OUTCOME	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
8 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Judy Bardin Paul Agnieszka	<p>Public Participation & Partners:</p> <p>(New Policy) PP1.1: Engage partners with development and regular updating of an implementation strategy (or action plan) to fulfill Comprehensive Plan goals. This strategy will include a monitoring and reporting process.</p>	<p>The term "partners" needs to be better defined.</p> <p>OUTCOME: Commissioner Tousley moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to recommend the following:</p> <p>"PP1.1: The City Council and the Planning Commission, with the support of City staff, is to identify the elements to include in the action (implementation) plan. The action plan should reflect City advisory groups' priorities. The public shall be engaged by doing outreach to neighborhoods, the business community, environmental and other public interest groups and citizens. This strategy will include an updating, monitoring and reporting process."</p> <p>"PP1.2: A committee established by the City Council will on a yearly basis review the progress of the action plan and make a report to the City Council, Planning Commission, staff and citizens. The committee should include members from the Planning Commission, neighborhoods, business community, environmental and other public interest groups and citizens."</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>	Non-C, #3	Amy Buckler	FSEIS, p. 46

List A**January 28, 2013:**

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See Jan 14 OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
A1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jerry Parker Roger Paul	Connectivity – Decatur, Park Heights Proposal(s) regarding the topic, including: Non-Consent Item #23- Transportation Chapter: (New Policy) PT4.21: Pursue all street connections. If a street connection is opposed, analyze how not making the street connection will impact the street network. At a minimum, this evaluation will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on directness of travel for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists • Impacts on directness of travel for emergency-, public-, and commercial-service vehicles • An assessment of travel patterns of the larger neighborhood area • An assessment of traffic volumes at the connection and at major intersections in the larger neighborhood area • Identification of major topographical barriers or environmental constraints that make a connection infeasible • Identification of potential mitigation measures for the new connection 	Whether or not to plan for Decatur and Park Heights street connections, as outlined in Appendix B of the Transportation Chapter in the July Draft. Whether or not to add new street connectivity policy PT4.21 as proposed in July Draft. OUTCOME: See below	T&H, R1, #2 Comb. w/ Non-C, #23	Sophie Stimson	FSEIS, p. 121 Memo in 10/15/12 OPC Packet Info Request Doc. in 12/3/12 Packet

OUTCOME OF CONNECTIVITY TOPIC 1/28/13:

Commissioner Leveen made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tousley, to approve revised PT4.21 with points #2, #7 and #9 from the 1994 Plan, with #2 amended to include bicyclists. Commissioner Kiswa made a friendly amendment to include noise impacts and air pollution on another line, and the amendment was accepted. Commissioner Bardin requested a friendly amendment to change the word, "pursue" to "consider," and the amendment was not accepted. The main motion passed by 6 votes, with Commissioners Tousley, Reddick, Horn, Leveen, Richards and Parker voting in favor. Commissioners Ingman, Bardin and Kiswa voted nay. The following is the language that passed:

"PT 4.21 Pursue all street connections. When a street connection is proposed, the developer, City, or County will analyze how not making the street connection will impact the street network. This information will be shared with the neighborhood and other stakeholders before any final decision is made. At a minimum, this evaluation will include:

- Impact on directness of travel for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists
- Impact on directness of travel for emergency - public, - and commercial-service vehicles
- An assessment of travel patterns of the larger neighborhood area
- An assessment of traffic volumes at the connection and at major intersections in the larger neighborhood area
- Identification of major topographical barriers or environmental constraints that make a connection infeasible
- Involve the neighborhood and other stakeholders in the identification of potential mitigation measures for the new connection
- Bicycle and pedestrian safety
- Noise impacts and air pollution
- Likelihood of diverting significant cross-town arterial traffic onto local neighborhood streets
- Effectiveness of proposed traffic-calming measures."

Commissioner Horn moved, seconded by Commissioner Ingman, to strike the paragraph in Appendix A of the Transportation Chapter on page 40 of the July Draft [under the title "Decatur Street and 16th Avenue Connections"] that starts with "The majority of users ..." The motion passed with 6 votes, with Commissioners Ingman, Parker, Horn, Reddick, Richards and Bardin voting in favor. Commissioner Leveen and Kiswa voted nay. Commissioner Tousley abstained.

Continued ...

Commissioner Ingman moved, seconded by Commissioner Richards, to adopt the language on the screen [changes to Appendix A of the Transportation Chapter in the July Draft, pages 41-42 under the title, "Kaiser Road and Black Lake Boulevard Area Connections. "] The motion passed by 8 votes, with Commissioner Reddick abstaining. The following is the language that passed:

"New street connections are expected to occur as more growth occurs in the area of Black Lake, Kaiser Road and US-101. A connection from Kaiser Road to Black Lake Boulevard is planned, south of US-101, creating a new north-south corridor parallel to Black Lake Boulevard. Consistent with standards, this new 2-lane major collector will include bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips, street trees, and lighting and will be designed with curves to slow vehicle speeds.

~~A neighborhood collector street connection is also planned between Kaiser Road and Park Drive. Both connections will add needed connectivity to the area, serving different functions in the street network. Both connections should be pursued and may be built independent of one another. The connection between Kaiser Road to Park Drive will not be a substitute for the connection between Kaiser Road and Black Lake Boulevard.~~

If at some future time Kaiser Road is extended to Black Lake Boulevard, extension of Park Drive to Kaiser Road may be considered in order to provide access for bicycles, pedestrians, and emergency vehicles."

Commissioner Leveen moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to edit Appendix B [on page 46 of the Transportation Chapter in the July Draft] to include the 16th Ave SW & Fern St connection, and add a footnote in Appendix A that these connections would be made contingent upon completion of Phase 2 of the Olympia West Access study. The motion passed by a vote of 8, with Commissioner Kizza abstaining.

A2	Sub-Committee Jerry Roger Paul	Vision & Values Statements Proposal(s) on the Topic, including: Non-Consent Item #1 - Olympia’s Vision Chapter (Revised Goal) GO1: Olympia is recognized as a model sustainable city through the leadership of the City and other partners.” Non-Consent Item #2 - Olympia’s Vision Chapter: (New Policy) PO1.1: Evaluate environmental, economic and social factors, and compare and prioritize relative costs and benefits when making major policy decisions and capital investments.	The Subcommittee was charged with drafting new Vision & Values statements for the Plan. They shared draft language with the Commission on December 17; it was decided the Subcommittee needed to meet again to finalize a proposal. TOPIC TABLED UNTIL MARCH 4	Non-C #1, #2	Amy Buckler	FSEIS p. 39
	Agnieszka Kiswa Judy Paul	Natural Environment: (New Policy) PN2.1: Prioritize acquiring and preserving land by a shared set of priorities that consider the environmental benefits of the land, such as stormwater management, wildlife habitat, and access to recreation opportunities.	Add, “health benefits.” TOPIC TABLED	Non-C, #6	Stacey Ray	FSEIS, p. 60
Followed by ‘List B’ Items						

February 11, 2013:

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See Feb 11 OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
A3	<p>Rob Richards (a)</p> <p>Roger Horn (b)(c)</p> <p>Paul Ingman (d)</p> <p>Jerry James</p>	<p>High Density/Urban Corridors</p> <p>Proposal (s) regarding the topic, including:</p> <p>(a) Non-Consent Item #10 – Land Use Chapter (Revised Map) Future Land Use Map: amended to consolidate 34 categories into 14 with less definite boundaries.</p> <p>(b) Non-Consent Item #11 – Land Use Chapter Revised Future Land Use Map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-Rise Multi-family category within Heritage Park deleted. • South Bay Road area proposed to change from Light Industrial to Auto Services. • Capitol Campus proposed to change from Cap Campus/Comm. Srvs. High Density (CC/CSHD) to Planned Development. • Henderson Park to change from CC/CSHD to General Commercial. • Two Professional Office blocks near City Justice Center changing to City Center. • LOTT treatment plant changing from Industry to Urban Waterfront. • Text description of “Auto Services” added. <p>(c) Non-Consent Item #22- Land Use & Urban Design Chapter: Revised Transportation Corridors Map</p>	<p>(a) Whether or not to remove neighborhoods south of I-5 (Carlyon, Governor Stevens, and Wildwood.) These are within the Urban Corridor designation on the proposed Future Land Use Map in the July Draft.</p> <p>(b) In light of item above, a recommendation on the Future Land Use Map should not be made until issue is further reviewed.</p> <p>(c) As sponsor of the Non-Consent Item, Commissioner Horn does not propose to change PL12.1. However, PL12.4 relates to urban corridor nodes. More information is needed about this proposed policy: why the specificity? Where did the language come from? Is this what we want these areas to look like? What criteria should be established for nodes? Also, language is not clear regarding boundaries of Lilly Rd/Pacific/I-5 focus area.</p>	<p>T&H, R1, #3</p> <p>Comb. w/</p> <p>Non-C, #10, #11, #22, #24</p>	<p>Sophie Stimson, Amy Buckler, Todd Stamm</p>	<p>(a) FSEIS, p. 86</p> <p>(b) FSEIS, p. 88</p> <p>(c) FSEIS, p. 106</p> <p>(d) FSEIS, p. 126</p> <p>Memo in 10/15/12 OPC Packet</p> <p>More info will be emailed week of 1/14/13</p>

		<p>(Revision) PL12.1: Maximize the potential of the Capital Mall area as a regional shopping center by encouraging development that caters to a regional market, by providing pedestrian walkways between businesses and areas; by increasing shopper-convenience and reducing traffic by supporting transit service linked to downtown; by encouraging redevelopment of parking areas with buildings and parking structures; and by encouraging the integration of multifamily housing. Sponsor proposes no change – fine as is.</p> <p>(Revision) PL12.4: Plan for redevelopment of the Stoll Road area and that area bounded by Lilly Road, Pacific Avenue and I-5 as 'focus areas' adjacent to the Pacific Avenue and Martin Way urban corridors to include retail, office, personal and professional services and high density housing with a minimum residential density of about 15 units per acre; planning for these areas should encompass consideration of redevelopment and improvement of nearby portions of the urban corridor.</p> <p>(d) Non-Consent Item #24- Transportation Chapter: (New goal) T16: Bus corridors have high-quality transit service allowing people to ride the bus spontaneously, and easily replace car trips with trips by bus.</p> <p>(New Policy) PT16.4: Coordinate with Intercity Transit to implement signal priority, bypass lanes, exclusive transit lanes, and other transit priority measures where needed for transit speed and priority.</p> <p>(New Policy) PT16.7: Reduce parking requirements along bus corridors.</p>	<p>(d) Planning for density <u>along</u> the Corridors, vs. nodes only, may not be the right or necessary approach for our community. Are we too focused on this as a Transportation issue, rather than a Land Use issue? Is density really needed along the corridors to support transit service?</p> <p>OUTCOME: FORMED A SUBCOMMITTEE TO BRING BACK A REVISED PROPOSAL - TOPIC TABLED UNTIL MARCH 4</p> <p>PL12.1 – FORMAL MOTION ON CONSENT ITEM PL12.1 STILL NEEDED</p> <p>MOTION PASSED TO REVISE PL12.4: PL12.4: Plan for redevelopment of the Stoll Road area and that area bounded by Lilly Road, Pacific Avenue and I-5 as 'focus areas' adjacent to the Pacific Avenue and Martin Way urban corridors to include retail, office, personal and professional services and high density housing with a minimum residential density of about 15 units per acre; planning for these areas should encompass consideration of redevelopment and improvement of nearby portions of the urban corridor.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Followed by 'List B' Items (See Pg. 12)
--	--

February 25, 2013:

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See Feb 25 OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
A4	Larry Leveen Roger Paul	Urban Agriculture Proposal(s) regarding the topic, including: Non-Consent Item #17- Land Use & Urban Design Chapter: (Revised Policy) PL17.4: Support local food production including urban agriculture, and provide for a food store with a transit stop within one-half mile of all residents.	The one policy PL17.4 proposed in the July Draft is not adequate. Plan needs more treatment of Urban Agriculture.	T&H, R1, #3 Comb. w/ Non-C, #17	Jennifer Kenny	FSEIS, p. 115 Info Request Doc. in 10/29/12 OPC Packet.
Followed by 'List B' Items (See Pg. 12)						

March 4, 2013:

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See March 4 OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
A5	Judy Bardin Paul Roger	Views, Heights Proposal(s) regarding the topic, including (a) Non-Consent Item #15 - Land Use & Urban Design Chapter: (Revised Policy) PL6.10: Identify and designate significant public- viewpoints and – with consideration of trees and other enhancing landscaping—protect, preserve and enhance particular views of the Capitol Campus, Budd Inlet, Downtown Skyline, Mt. Rainier, the Black Hills, Capitol Lake and surrounding treed slopes, and the Olympic Mts., such as:	Olympia's views make it unique both nationally and within Washington. Views should be preserved for the people of Olympia and Washington and for Olympia's visitors. Using specified viewpoints may have untoward consequences of eliminating views. Use of visualization software will enhance accuracy in planning building heights so that they do not obstruct views.	T&H, R3, #1 Comb. w/ Non-C, #15, #16	Todd Stamm	(A) FSEIS, p. 96 (B) FSEIS, p. 96 Memo in 10/8/12 OPC Packet Info Request

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capitol Group views of the Olympic Mountains • West Bay Park views of Capitol Group • Existing West Bay Park views of Olympic Mountains • Olympic Way sidewalk and Fourth Avenue bridge viewpoint views of the Capitol Group • Existing Fourth Avenue bridge views of the Olympic Mountains • Upper Sunrise Park views of Mount Rainier • Pacific Avenue sidewalk views of Mount Rainier from Boulevard Road to Steele Street • Priest Point Park views of Capitol Group and Olympic Mountains • East Bay Waterfront Park views of Olympic Mountains • Existing Brawne and Foote intersection view of Budd Inlet • Upper Madison Scenic Park views of Capitol Campus and downtown • Capitol Boulevard west sidewalk views of Capitol Lake • Percival Landing views of Capitol Group and Olympic Mountains <p>(b) Non-Consent Item #16 – Land Use & Urban Design Chapter:</p> <p>(Revised Policy) PL6.9: Preserve and enhance water vistas by retaining public rights-of-way that abut or are within one block of water bodies and by not siting public buildings within associated view corridors.</p>				<p>Doc. in 11/19/12 OPC Packet</p>
<p>Followed by 'List B' Items (See Pg. 12)</p>						

March 18, 2013:

	Remaining 'List B' Items (See Pg. 11)
	Final Vote & Discussion about Transmittal (Recommendation) Letter to City Council

List B**January 28, 2013-March 18***As many 'List B' items as possible will be addressed following the 'List A' Item each night, in order as listed below:*

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
B1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Judy Bardin	<p>Retention of green space maximum distance from housing OUTCOME: MOTION PASSED TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING BE ADDED TO THE LAND USE CHAPTER: <i>GOAL: Urban green space is available to the public and located throughout the community and incorporates natural environments into the urban setting, which are easily accessible and viewable so that people can experience nature daily and nearby.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <i>Provide urban green spaces in which to spend time. Include such elements as trees, garden spaces, variety of vegetation, water features, green walls and roofs and seating.</i> 2) <i>Provide urban green spaces that are in people's immediate vicinity and can be enjoyed or viewed from a variety of perspectives.</i> 3) <i>Establish a maximum distance to urban green space for all community members.</i> 4) <i>Increase the area per capita of urban green space and the tree canopy- to- area ratio within each neighborhood.</i> 5) <i>Establish urban green space between transportation corridors and adjacent areas.</i> 	Green space should be planned in the immediate vicinity of where people live.	T&H, R1, #1	Stacey Ray	

B2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amy Tousley	<p>Low Impact Development- Cluster Subdivision</p> <p><i>(Brought to top of list because item was ready)</i></p> <p>OUTCOME: MOTION PASSED TO RECOMMEND PL13.3 BE REVISED TO: PL13.3: Encourage Allow 'clustering' of housing compatible with the adjacent neighborhood to preserve and protect environmentally sensitive areas.</p>		T&H, R1, #5	Todd Stamm	(a) FSEIS, p. 55
---	----------------	---	--	----------------	---------------	---------------------

B3	<p>Judy Bardin (a)(b)(d)</p> <p>Jerry Parker (C)</p> <p>Roger James</p>	<p>Adaption and Planning for Natural Disasters – sea level rise, drought, decrease energy availability PER COMMISSIONER BARDIN, DISCUSS PROPOSAL RE: SEA LEVEL RISE ON FEBRAURY 25 – OTHER TOPICS MAY NEED TO BE A FUTURE WORK PLAN ITEM.</p> <p>(A) Proposal(s) regarding the topic, including:</p> <p>(B) Non-Consent Item #8 - Natural Environment Chapter: (New Policy) PN4.4: Protect Olympia from the potential impacts of sea-level rise.</p> <p>(C) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Consent Item #9 - Natural Environment Chapter: (Revised Policy) PN6.5: Retain and restore floodways in a natural condition to the extent necessary for flood insurance.</p> <p>OUTCOME: MOTION PASSED TO RECOMMEND PN6.5 BE REVISED TO: PN6.5: Retain and restore floodways in a natural condition.</p> <p>(D) Non-Consent Item #25 - Utilities Chapter: (New Goal) GU 11: Olympia’s downtown is protected from future impacts of sea-level rise.</p> <p>(New Policy) PU 11.2: Coordinate with other key stakeholders, such as downtown businesses, LOTT Clean Water Alliance and the Port of Olympia.</p> <p>(New Policy) PU 11.3: Incorporate flexibility and resiliency into public and private infrastructure in areas predicted to be affected.</p> <p>(New Policy) PU 11.4: Maintain public control of downtown shorelines that may be needed to serve flood management functions.</p>	<p>(A)(B)(D) A number of natural disasters are may occur in Olympia including: earthquakes with associated liquefaction, sea level rise, flooding, landslides, excessive heat events, drought, wildfires, and decreased fuel supply (peak oil). Planning should be done to mitigate and lessen the impacts of these possible occurrences.</p> <p>(C) Needs more language to explain the ‘flood insurance’ angle.</p>	<p>T&H, R2, #1</p> <p>Comb. w/</p> <p>Non-C, #8, #9, #25</p>	<p>Stacey Ray</p>	<p>(B) FSEIS, p. 72</p> <p>(C) FSEIS, p. 76</p> <p>(D) FSEIS, p. 72</p> <p>Memo in 9/24/12 OPC Packet</p> <p>Info Request Doc. in 10/29/12 OPC Packet</p>
----	---	--	--	--	-------------------	---

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
B4	Rob Richards Paul Roger James Jerry	Downtown Planning Proposal(s) regarding the topic, including: Non-Consent Item # 20 - Land Use & Urban Design Chapter: (New Direction) PL14.1: Adopt a Downtown Master Plan addressing – at minimum – housing, public spaces, parking management, rehabilitation and redevelopment, architecture and cultural resources, building skyline and views, and relationships to the Port peninsula and Capitol Campus. Proposed Content: Proposed Draft Downtown Master Plan TO BE DISCUSSED MARCH 4	Is the right framework in place for a Downtown Master Plan? Concern about 'Master Plans' being static.	T&H, R2, #3 Comb. w/ Non-C, #20	Todd Stamm	FSEIS, p.49 Memo in 10/9/12 OPC Packet

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
B5	<p>Paul Ingman</p> <p>Jerry Roger Judy James</p>	<p>Protect and Preserve Olympia's Single-Family Residential Neighborhoods PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN: INCORPORATE INTO HIGH DENSITY CORRIDOR DISCUSSION – NOT A SEPARATE DISCUSSION</p> <p>Proposal(s) regarding the topic, including:</p> <p>(a) Non-Consent Item #12 – Land Use & Urban Design Chapter: (Revised Definition) Appendix A: Low-Density Housing. This designation provides for low-density residential development—primarily single-family detached housing—in densities ranging from eight units per acre to one unit per five acres depending on environmental sensitivity of the area. Where environmental constraints are significant, to achieve minimum densities extraordinary clustering may be allowed when combined with environmental protection. Barring environmental constraints, densities of at least four units per acre should be achieved. Supportive land uses and other types of housing, including townhomes and small apartment buildings, may be permitted. Specific zoning and densities are to be based on the unique characteristics of each area with special attention to stormwater drainage and aquatic habitat. Clustered development to provide future urbanization opportunities will be required where urban utilities are not readily available.</p> <p>(b) Non-Consent Item #13- Land Use & Urban Design Chapter: (Revised Policy) PL13.9: In all residential areas, allow small cottages and townhouses, and one accessory housing unit per home—all subject to siting, design and parking requirements that ensure neighborhood character is maintained.</p>		<p>T&H, R2, #9</p> <p>Comb. w/</p> <p>Non-C, #12, #13</p>	<p>Todd Stamm</p>	<p>(a) FSEIS, p. 55</p> <p>(b) FSEIS, p. 109</p>

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
B6	Roger Horn Judy	<p>Public Participation</p> <p>Proposal(s) regarding the topic, including:</p> <p>☑ OUTCOME: MOTION PASSED TO ADD UNDERLINED WORDS: Non-Consent Item #4 – Public Participation & Partners (New Policy) PP3.3: Provide opportunities for citizens, neighborhoods, and other interested parties to get involved early in the land use decision-making processes. Encourage <u>or require</u> applicants to meet with affected community members and organizations.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL POLICY PROPOSAL TABLED TO FEBRUARY 25.</p>	Address Peter Guttchen’s public comments regarding this topic.	T&H, R3, #5 Comb. w/ Non-C, #4	Amy Buckler	FSEIS, p. 46
B7	Agnieszka Kiswa Jerry Paul	<p>Port of Olympia</p> <p>Proposal(s) regarding the topic, including:</p> <p>Non-Consent Item #21 – Land Use & Urban Design Chapter: (Revision) – Port Plan Removed. See ‘Focus Areas’ text preceding Goal 12.</p>	The Comprehensive Plan needs a chapter on the Port of Olympia.	T&H, R3, #6 Comb. w/ Non-C, #21	Todd Stamm	FSEIS, p. 106
B8	James Reddick	Affordable Housing		T&H, R1, #6	Jennifer Kenny	
B9	Roger Horn	Earthquake Preparedness & Liquefaction	Address public comments regarding the need for more robust policies.	T&H, R1, #7	Stacey Ray	Info Request Doc. in 10/29/12 OPC Packet

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
B10	Agnieszka Kiswa	Index	The Comprehensive Plan Update needs an index.	T&H, R1, #8	Amy Buckler	
B11	Paul Ingman	How many and where will Olympia people live? PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN: INCORPORATE INTO HIGH DENSITY CORRIDOR DISCUSSION – NOT A SEPARATE DISCUSSION	The Plan should include more information about the target number of people who are expected to live in certain areas of the City (i.e., each sub-area, downtown, along urban corridors.)	T&H, R1, #9	Todd Stamm, Amy Buckler	Info. Request Docs. in 10/29/12 and 11/19/12 OPC Packet More info to come wk of 1/14
B12	Jerry Parker	Graphics, Visual Images	The illustrations in the July Draft are not adequate.	T&H, R2, #2	Stacey Ray	
B13	Larry Leveen & Roger Horn	Stronger Language in Whole Plan Transportation Chapter, as an example	Since there is not time to provide stronger language for the whole plan at this time, consider including the idea in the transmittal letter and use Transportation Chapter as an example.	T&H, R2, #4; T&H, R2, #7	Sophie Stimson, Amy Buckler	

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
B14	Amy Tousley	Neighborhood Plans - Framework	Do we have the right policy framework in place for this topic?	T&H, R2, #5	Jennifer Kenny	FSEIS, p. 49 Memo in 10/1/12 OPC Packet
B15	James Reddick	Shoreline Master Program, Restoration Plan		T&H, R2, #6	Todd Stamm	
B16	Agnieszka Kizza	Environmental Protection – Restoration, Day-lighting creeks, Corridors		T&H, R2, #8	Stacey Ray	Memo in 9/24/12 OPC Packet
B17	Amy Tousley	Capital Facilities Element, 20-year Accommodation of Growth	This element needs to be updated as part of the periodic update.	T&H, R3, #3	Amy Buckler	
B18	James Reddick	Action Plan (Implementation Strategy):		T&H, R3, #4	Amy Buckler	FSEIS, p. 46
B19	Paul Ingman	Gateways to the City, Civic Boulevards PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN: INCORPORATE INTO HIGH DENSITY CORRIDOR DISCUSSION – NOT A SEPARATE DISCUSSION	Do we have the right policies in place for this topic?	T&H, R3, #7	Todd Stamm	
B20	Judy Bardin	Historic Preservation	Do we have the right policies in place for this topic?	T&H, R4, #1	Jennifer Kenny	
B21	Jerry Parker	Revisions to the Economy Chapter	Address public concerns about the value of this chapter and the City's role.	T&H, R4, #2	Amy Buckler (Stephanie Johnson)	

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
B22	Roger Horn	Artist Live/Work Space	Do we have the right policies in place to ensure public interest in this concept can be explored in the future?	T&H, R4, #3	Amy Buckler, (Stephanie Johnson)	
B23	Agnieszka Kiswa	Measurable Goals	The Plan needs performance measures.	T&H, R4, #4	Stacey Ray	Memo in 1/14/13 OPC Packet
B24	Paul Ingman	Reduction of Cars & Trucks in Downtown/Environmental Stressors/Health Impacts PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN: INCORPORATE INTO HIGH DENSITY CORRIDOR DISCUSSION – NOT A SEPARATE DISCUSSION		T&H, R4, #5	Sophie Stimson, Stacey Ray	