



Meeting Agenda

Land Use & Environment Committee

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Information: 360.753.8244

Thursday, May 27, 2021

5:30 PM

Online and Via Phone

Special Meeting

Register to attend:

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Lw3He_t6Ruys4c44E-9W0g

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 [21-0546](#) Approval of Approval of April 15, 2021 Land Use & Environment Committee Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Minutes](#)

6. **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

6.A [21-0531](#) Olympia Housing Action Plan Update

Attachments: [Draft Olympia Housing Action Plan](#)

[Written Public Comments](#)

[Housing Survey Report](#)

[Link to Engage Olympia](#)

6.B [21-0533](#) Scope of Housing Feasibility Study

Attachments: [Draft Feasibility Study](#)

6.C [21-0532](#) Approach to Rental Housing Outreach

Attachments: [Code Changes Discussed in Other Cities](#)

6.D [21-0523](#) Future Development Agreements Process

Attachments: [MRSC Web Page](#)

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

Land Use & Environment Committee
Approval of Approval of April 15, 2021 Land
Use & Environment Committee Meeting
Minutes

Agenda Date: 5/27/2021
Agenda Item Number: 5.A
File Number:21-0546

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

Title

Approval of Approval of April 15, 2021 Land Use & Environment Committee Meeting Minutes



Meeting Minutes - Draft

Land Use & Environment Committee

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501
Information: 360.753.8244

Thursday, April 15, 2021

5:30 PM

Online and Via Phone

Technical Error - The meeting was not recorded

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Madrone called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: 3 - Chair Dani Madrone, Committee member Clark Gilman and Committee member Yến Huỳnh

OTHERS PRESENT

Community Planning and Development Staff:
Leonard Bauer, Director
Amy Buckler, Strategic Projects manager
Joyce Phillips, Principle Planner
Catherine McCoy, Associate Planner

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

The following people spoke: Judy Bardin, Elisa Lyles, Al Puntillo, Walter Jorgensen, Daniel Gakin, Thomas Kuljam, Roger Fierst, Susan Dolvin, Nick Wilcox and Jamie Seymour.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 5.A** [21-0366](#) Approval of March 18, 2021 Land Use & Environment Committee Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- 6.A** [21-0328](#) Briefing on Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Ordinances

Ms. Buckler, Mr. Green, Ms. Lee and Mr. Nowlin shared a briefing on Tenant Opportunity

to Purchase Ordinances.

The briefing was received.

6.B [21-0309](#) Shoreline Master Program Periodic Review

The motion was recommended for approval and referred to the full City Council.

6.C [21-0348](#) Short Term Rental Regulations

Mr. Bauer and Ms. McCoy shared a presentation on Short Term Rental Regulations.

Briefing only. No action requested.

7. REPORTS AND UPDATES

Mr. Bauer presented potential updates to Committee work program schedule.

The Committee requested an additional item be added to the May 27th, 2021 agenda, "Future Development Agreements Process".

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.



Land Use & Environment Committee

Olympia Housing Action Plan Update

Agenda Date: 5/27/2021
Agenda Item Number: 6.A
File Number:21-0531

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

Title

Olympia Housing Action Plan Update

Recommended Action

Committee Recommendation:

Hear a briefing from Planning Commission Chair Candi Millar on what was heard at the May 17, 2021 Planning Commission public hearing regarding the Olympia Housing Action Plan.

City Manager Recommendation:

Hear the briefing and discuss the plan, making any suggestions to improve the draft plan.

Report

Issue:

Whether to receive an update about Olympia's Housing Action Plan and the public comments received at the Planning Commission public hearing. The Housing Action Plan includes strategies and actions that promote more housing, more diverse housing types, affordability and stability.

Staff Contact:

Amy Buckler, Strategic Projects Manager, Community Planning & Development, 360.280.8947

Presenter(s):

Amy Buckler, Strategic Projects Manager
Candi Millar, Planning Commission Chair

Background and Analysis:

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the draft Olympia Housing Action Plan on May 17. At their next meeting, the Commission will complete a letter to City Council summarizing the public's comments. Planning Commission Chair Candi Millar will provide an update to the Committee about what was heard. Staff will also discuss highlights from the plan.

In 2019, the Washington State Legislature made grant funds available to cities to develop housing action plans that promote more housing, more diverse housing types and affordability. In recognition of our shared housing market and the cross-jurisdictional need for affordable housing, the Cities of Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater jointly applied for and received funds to collaborate on this effort.

With help from Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC), the cities completed several deliverables that provide necessary background information and identify strategies and potential actions the cities can take. These actions are available on the Engage Olympia page and include:

- A housing needs assessment, including a 25-year projection of housing affordable at different income levels.
- A landlord survey, to better understand what residents are paying for rent and how rents are changing.
- A draft regional housing action plan (menu of actions) cities can take to ensure housing stock adequate and affordable for current and future residents.

At this time, each city is conducting their own public review process to determine which actions to include as they adapt the regional draft into city-specific housing action plans. Each city will adopt their own housing action plan by June of 2021, in order to meet the requirements of the grant which funds this work.

The Housing Action Plan identifies seven housing needs/gaps to be addressed:

- **Affordability.** Reduce the cost of housing for low-income and cost burdened households.
- **Supply.** Increase the inventory of housing for all households.
- **Variety.** Increase the variety of housing sizes and types.
- **Seniors.** Increase the stock of housing options needed for aging seniors.
- **Improvements.** Maintain the existing housing stock, including improving energy efficiency and air quality.
- **Stability.** Increase household wealth by providing safe, stable options for rental housing and pathways to homeownership.
- **Supportive Housing.** Increase permanent housing options for those at risk of or experiencing homelessness and people with disabilities.

The Plan includes over 70 potential actions the City can take to help meet housing needs. The City of Olympia has already implemented approximately one third of these actions, at least partially. Tables in the draft plan include implementation status, current approach, recommended approach, city resources needed and recommended timeframe. The actions are organized around six strategies:

- 1) Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.
- 2) Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.
- 3) Expand overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.
- 4) Increase the variety of housing choices.
- 5) Continually build on resources, collaboration and public understanding to improve implementation of housing strategies.
- 6) Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.

Next Steps - Public Process

The Planning Commission has not been asked to make a formal recommendation on the plan, rather to write a letter to City Council summarizing what they heard at the public hearing. The Commission will complete the letter on June 7.

Staff will return to the Land Use and Environment Committee for a recommendation on June 17. The City Council will consider adoption on June 22.

Following adoption of the Housing Action Plan, public engagement and implementation of housing actions will be ongoing. The City will also hold a public process to update the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan between 2022-2025.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

Written public comments from the Planning Commission public hearing are attached. A report from the March 2021 housing survey is also attached.

Housing affordability and development are major issues of importance to the community. Olympia's recently developed One Community (homeless response) Plan identified building more housing of all types for all incomes as a key priority moving forward.

Options:

1. Following the briefing, make any suggestions to improve the plan.
2. Do not hear the briefing or make suggestions.
3. Hear the briefing and make suggestion at another time.

Financial Impact:

The Washington State Department of Commerce awarded Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater grants totaling \$300,000 for development of housing action plans. Under an interlocal agreement, \$150,000 will be directed to the Thurston Regional Planning Council for supportive tasks. Olympia will use its remaining \$50,000 to support staff work on the effort. Following adoption of the Housing Action Plan, implementation actions may need additional financial resources to complete.

Attachments:

Draft Olympia Housing Action Plan
Written Public Comments
Survey report
[Link to Engage Olympia Page](#)

PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT

City of Olympia

HOUSING ACTION PLAN



City of Olympia

PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT Housing Action Plan, May 7, 2021

Adopted XXXX, 2021 by Ordinance No. #

City of Olympia Staff

Amy Buckler, Strategic Projects Manager
Leonard Bauer, Director of Community Planning and Development
Keith Stahley, Assistant City Manager
Cary Retlin, Housing Manager
Tim Smith, Planning Manager
Joyce Phillips, Principal Planner
Mike Reid, Economic Development Director

Thurston Regional Planning Council Staff

Katrina Van Every	Project Manager, Senior Planner
Michael Ambrogi	Project Manager, Senior GIS Analyst
Karen Parkhurst	Planning and Policy Director
Lester Tobias	Planning Technician
Sarah Selstrom	Communications and Outreach Specialist II
Burlina Lucas	Administrative Assistant
Dorinda O’Sullivan	Office Specialist III
Veena Tabbutt	Deputy Director
Marc Daily	Executive Director

This plan was funded by the cities of Olympia, Lacey, and Tumwater through grants from the Washington State Department of Commerce.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary 4

Chapter 1. Introduction 7

 Sources of Actions..... 8

 Addressing Housing Gaps and Needs 9

 Equity in Housing Affordability 10

 Defining Terms Used..... 10

 Assumptions..... 11

Chapter 2. Actions..... 13

 Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income. 16

 Strategy 2: Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed. 27

 Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects. 34

 Strategy 4: Increase the variety of housing choices. 50

 Strategy 5: Continually build on resources, collaboration, and public understanding to improve implementation of housing strategies..... 56

 Strategy 6: Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing..... 60

Chapter 4. Legislative Needs 69

Appendix A. Action Details 71

 Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income. 72

 Strategy 2: Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed. 77

 Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects. 80

 Strategy 4: Increase the variety of housing choices. 88

 Strategy 5: Continually build on resources, collaboration, and public understanding to improve implementation of housing strategies..... 92

 Strategy 6: Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing..... 93

Appendix B. Considered Actions..... 98

LIST OF FIGURES Update page #'s

Figure 3-1. Household income in Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater combined by race and ethnicity, 2014-2018 average..... 17

Figure 3-2. Tenure by race and ethnicity in Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater combined, 2014-2018 average 27

Figure 3-3. Relationship between Housing Types, Price and Rent, Unit Size, and Residential Density 51

LIST OF TABLES Update page #'s

Table 1-1. Metrics for equity in housing 9

Table 3-1. Households making 80 percent or less of the area median income by jurisdiction, 2012-2016 estimate and 2045 projection..... 16

Table 3-2. Actions that increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income. 18

Table 3-3. Actions that make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed..... 28

Table 3-4. Actions that expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects. 35

Table 3-5. Actions that increase the variety of housing choices 52

Table 3-6. Actions that improve implementation of housing strategies through collaboration, public understanding, and continually building on resources..... 57

Table 3-7. Maximum affordable housing costs at various income levels, 2020..... 60

Table 3-8. Example of costs associated with developing an apartment complex..... 61

Table 3-9. Actions that establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing 63

Table A-1. Adopted SEPA Exemptions as of January 2021 85

Table A-2. Additional costs to households with a \$0.50 per \$1,000 property tax levy 96

Table A-3. Potential affordable housing funding from maximum property tax levy..... 97

Table A-4. Potential affordable housing funding from maximum affordable housing sales tax in 2019 ... 93

Executive Summary

The City of Olympia Housing Action Plan began as a collaborative effort between the Cities of Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater. Together with help from Thurston Regional Planning Council the cities developed a Regional Housing Needs Assessment and Housing Gap Analysis, a Landlord Survey, and a draft set of actions to address identified housing gaps.

Grounded in data and strategies common across all three cities, Olympia's Housing Action Plan identifies specific actions the City of Olympia will take to address housing needs. This plan is also intended to inform the City's Comprehensive Plan policies and guide implementation of actions that help the City meet its housing needs and strategic objectives.

What's in the Housing Gap?

Seven housing gaps were identified through the Housing Needs Assessment, including the need to:

1. Reduce housing costs for low-income and cost-burdened households.
2. Increase the overall housing supply.
3. Increase the variety of housing sizes and types.
4. Increase senior housing options.
5. Maintain in good condition and improve the existing housing stock.
6. Provide safe, stable options for both renters and homeowners.
7. Increase permanent housing options for people with disabilities and those at risk of or experiencing homelessness.

COVID-19 Pandemic and the Housing Action Plan

In response to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, Governor Inslee issued a series of proclamations and declarations aimed at reducing the spread of the virus in Washington state, including requiring all non-essential workers to stay home and stay healthy and extending a moratorium on evictions to protect renters. As a result, significant changes in the Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater area occurred, affecting businesses and residents alike.

The cities will continue to monitor the impact of the pandemic on housing and develop plans for implementing appropriate actions whether included in this plan or not.

How to Create an Equitable Housing Market?

About one in four Thurston County residents is a person of color – those who are Hispanic or Latino of any race and those who are any race other than white alone. In our community, people of color generally have more people in their household, are less likely to own their own home, have a smaller household income, and are more likely to experience homelessness than white, non-Hispanic people. Increasing housing equity is not a single action but an overarching theme in this plan. Affordable housing opportunities cannot be created without also reducing housing-related inequities faced by people of color. Each strategy in this report includes a discussion of how it — and the actions associated with it — will reduce inequity in our community.

Taking Action Locally

The City of Olympia has been working on a number of actions to reduce homelessness, increase affordable housing, and collaborate with other jurisdictions and agencies to explore regional solutions to these issues. Examples include a voter-approved Home Fund to create permanent supportive housing, more flexible codes and preapproved plan sets to encourage accessory dwelling units, and championing the formation of an interjurisdictional Regional Housing Council that sets policy and funding priorities to advance equitable access to safe and affordable housing in Thurston County.

The Housing Action Plan builds on the affordable housing work the City has completed to date or that is underway. The Housing Action Plan is the next step in the process of identifying actions to increase the supply, diversity and affordability of housing in the City. This Plan consolidates housing action items into one document the City will use going forward to guide implementation of its housing programs. At the same time, the City will be open to new opportunities and actions that address housing gaps and strategies. While the City cannot control the housing market, it can influence it through its policies, regulations, investments and partnerships. The City also has a role to engage the public and stakeholders, as well as advocate for federal and state policies that advance its goals.

The City is actively implementing actions that remove barriers and encourage appropriate housing development. Of the actions considered in developing this plan, the City has already implemented 26 actions to some degree, including donating land and providing funding for low income housing development, increasing the types of housing allowed in low density neighborhoods, reducing setbacks and allowing deferral of impact fees. Some of these actions are ongoing, while others can be strengthened or extended to new areas.

In addition to the work the City has already implemented, this plan identifies a menu of 45 more actions the City can take to address housing gaps, needs, and equity. Actions that help:

- Increase the supply of permanent, income-restricted affordable housing.
- Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.
- Expand the overall housing supply.
- Increase housing variety.
- Maintain forward momentum in implementing housing strategies.
- Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.

Actions that were reviewed by the three cities as part of the initial development of a draft plan, but were not included in the final list of actions, may be found in Appendix B Considered Actions.

Setting a Legislative Agenda

While this plan outlines actions the City can take to address housing gaps, barriers also exist at the state and federal levels. By far, the largest barrier is a lack of funding for low-income and income-restricted housing – whether it is construction, improvement, rehabilitation, or rental subsidies. Other barriers include tariffs on construction materials imported to the United States, funding for homeownership programs and the impact of prevailing wage requirements tied to federal funding for small, non-profit housing developers. Chapter 4 Legislative Needs addresses this in more detail.

Chapter 1.

Introduction

Thurston County is one of the fastest growing counties in Washington State. The pressure to ensure all households have affordable access to housing is also growing and represents a significant challenge for all stakeholders. The challenge to provide sufficient affordable housing is complicated by insufficient inventory, rising construction costs, and a greater need for coordinated responses between jurisdictions.

In 2019, the Washington State Legislature passed HB 1923 encouraging cities planning under the state Growth Management Act to take actions to increase residential building capacity. These actions include developing a housing action plan “...to encourage construction of additional affordable and market rate housing in a greater variety of housing types and at prices that are accessible to a greater variety of incomes, including strategies aimed at the for-profit single-family home market” ([RCW 36.70A.600](#)).

In recognition of the cross-jurisdiction need for affordable housing, the Cities of Olympia, Lacey, and Tumwater chose to collaborate with Thurston Regional Planning Council to develop on this project. Funding was provided by the Washington State Department of Commerce. The project included four components:

- A regional housing needs assessment and gap analysis.
- A household income forecast to identify future housing needs over the next 25 years.
- A survey of landlords and rental property owners to better understand housing costs.
- A draft housing action plan identifying shared strategies and a menu of actions the cities could take to encourage development of a housing stock adequate and affordable for current and future residents.

Olympia’s Housing Action Plan builds off of this initial work and identifies actions for the City to consider in order to help increase housing supply, diversity and affordability/stability. This information will also be used by the City to update the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan and the Joint Plan with Thurston County covering the urban growth areas, as well as the implementing regulations.

Appendix A provides more detailed information on each action while Appendix B lists all actions considered by the three cities in developing the initial draft. Where appropriate, explanations as to why an action was not included is provided.

Sources of Actions

This plan combines data and action ideas from a range of sources. Key sources include:

- **Washington State Department of Commerce.** Actions identified in Commerce’s “Guidance for Developing a Housing Action Plan (public review draft)” were used as a starting point for the action list.
- **Comprehensive Plans.** Project staff reviewed housing elements in the City’s Comprehensive Plans for actions to include.
- **Development Codes.** Staff reviewed the City’s development code for actions to include.
- **Stakeholder Committee.** A stakeholder committee that included the Housing Authority of Thurston County, other low-income housing providers, real estate professionals, housing developers (low-income and market rate), and representatives of the Thurston Thrives Housing Action Team added to, and reviewed, the action list.
- **Staff from the Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater.** City staff provided feedback on actions that have already been completed or are underway, added actions that were local priorities, and removed actions that were outside of the cities’ authority.
- **Previous City Work on Affordable Housing.** City staff incorporated actions completed and underway.
- **City Elected and Advisory Bodies.** The Land Use and Environment Committee and Planning Commission reviewed, discussed, and proposed amendments to the Housing Action Plan before adoption.
- **Public Hearing and Feedback.** An online storymap, survey and two online events with question and answer periods to engage and gather feedback about local housing needs and actions under consideration. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 17, 2021, and a written comment period was open between April 7-May 17, 2021.
- **Other Sources.** Outreach was done to additional stakeholders, including Habitat for Humanity, the Low-Income Housing Institute, Northwest Cooperative Development Center, the Thurston Housing Land Trust, and others.

Addressing Housing Gaps and Needs

This Housing Action Plan was preceded by a regional Housing Needs Assessment. The Housing Needs Assessment reviewed data available on the region’s housing needs and the available housing stock to identify gaps. The most pressing needs identified were:



Affordability. Reduce the cost of housing for low-income and cost-burdened households.



Supply. Increase the inventory of housing for all households.



Variety. Increase the variety of housing sizes and types



Seniors. Increase the stock of housing options needed for aging seniors.



Improvements. Maintain the existing housing stock, including improving energy efficiency and air quality.



Stability. Increase household wealth by providing safe, stable options for rental housing and pathways to homeownership.



Supportive Housing. Increase permanent housing options for people with disabilities and those at risk of or experiencing homelessness.

Many actions included in this plan address multiple housing gaps/needs, and each action in this plan identifies which area of need it addresses.

Equity in Housing Affordability

Not all households have access to affordable housing. Across Thurston County, people of color — those identifying as Hispanic or a race other than white alone — have lower incomes, are less likely to own their own home, are more likely to be housing cost-burdened, and are more likely to be homeless (Table 1-1).

Table 1-1. Metrics for equity in housing

Metric	Person of Color	White, Non-Hispanic
Cost Burdened Households	37%	31%
Homeowners	52%	66%
People Experiencing Homelessness	~ 4.4 per 1,000	~2.4 per 1,000
Household with an Income Less than \$50,000	41%	33%

Across the United States – including Thurston County and its communities – policies have led to and reinforce housing inequities faced by people of color:

- **Redlining.** Neighborhoods with a large number of people of color were denied access to financing for home improvement and construction. This made it harder for people of color to build financial equity and stay or move out of poverty. While redlining is now illegal, people of color are still more likely to have mortgage applications denied or pay higher interest rates.
- **Zoning.** Zoning regulations explicitly barred racial and ethnic minorities. While this, too, is illegal, zoning regulations today may implicitly bar people of color by placing restrictions on the sizes and types of housing that are affordable and accessible to disadvantaged populations. Zoning that exclusively allows single-family neighborhoods — an estimated 75 percent of all residential-zoned land across major U.S. cities — perpetuates this legacy of barring racial and ethnic minorities.

- **Covenants.** Privately enforced housing covenants used to exclude racial and ethnic minorities from predominantly white neighborhoods. Racial covenants became more common after racial zoning ordinances were deemed unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The City can help reverse the disparities caused by these problems by creating more opportunities for affordable housing. The City is also responsible for ensuring new policies — not just around housing — do not exacerbate inequities. Resources like the Government Alliance on Race and Equity’s “Racial Equity Toolkit” can help cities incorporate equity considerations in policy making.

Additional steps are being taken by the City of Olympia to address racism and racist structures inherent in our organization and community. The City’s first Equity and Inclusion Coordinator was hired in 2020, and a second was hired in 2021. Also, currently underway is the formation of a Social Justice & Equity Commission to advise the City Council on matters of policy, representation and engagement with underrepresented groups. The Commission’s work will be critical as we move forward with further planning and implementation of housing actions.

How is Equity Addressed in the Plan?

Because creating affordable housing opportunities goes hand-in-hand with reducing housing-related inequities faced by people of color, increasing equity is not a single action but an overarching theme in this plan. Each strategy in this plan includes a discussion of how it — and the actions associated with it — work to reduce inequity in our community.

An action that promotes affordable housing — especially for the most vulnerable in our community — is an action that will promote equity.

Defining Terms Used

The following terms are used in this plan.

Affordable Housing. Housing for which the household pays no more than 30 percent of its gross income for housing costs, including utilities.

Income Restricted Housing. Housing for which the occupancy of the units is restricted to households making 80 percent or less of the area median family income, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Low-Income Housing. Housing that is affordable for households making 80 percent or less of the area median family income, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Low-income housing can take the form of income-restricted housing units or subsidized housing — whether

the unit itself is subsidized or the household receives a housing voucher to subsidize market-rate rent conditions.

Manufactured Home Park. A site under single ownership where ground space is made available for mobile homes, manufactured homes, or a combination of the two. Mobile homes and manufactured homes are both factory-built and considered dwellings for habitation rather than vehicles (such as an RV). Mobile homes refer to those units factory-constructed prior to June 15, 1976, while manufactured homes are units factory-constructed after that date.

Permanent Supportive Housing. Permanent housing intended specifically for chronically homeless and permanently disabled individuals and families. Supportive services (medical, mental health, enrichment programs, etc.) and case management are available on site or closely coordinated to reduce barriers that inhibit households from accessing such services.

Assumptions

Three primary assumptions guided development of this plan:

Analysis before implementation. Most of the identified actions will require further analysis to determine how well it will respond to the specific need or gap a city attempts to fill. In some cases, including any updates to the development code, a public hearing will be required before the City Council can consider adoption.

Addressing emergency homeless response. This action plan addresses permanent housing solutions. The Thurston County Homeless Crisis Response Plan guides the region's emergency response to homelessness, which is bolstered by Olympia's One Community: Healthy, Housed and Safe plan.

Although there will be some overlap, this plan is limited to actions that result in or support the creation/preservation of affordable and low-income housing, including permanent supportive housing. Permanent housing is a fundamental part of solving the homelessness crisis our region is experiencing. Despite having a coordinated entry system designed to quickly connect people experiencing homelessness to housing, being responsive to needs is hampered by high housing costs and a lack of housing units.

The Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater also participate in the newly formed Regional Housing Council, created to leverage resources and partnerships to promote equitable access to safe and affordable housing in Thurston County. The Regional Housing Council looks at funding issues for responding to homelessness and housing affordability in the region.

Addressing household income. This plan does not address the income side of the housing equation. Attracting living wage jobs, increasing the minimum wage, and other actions impacting a household's

income could help make housing more affordable. Local economic development plans and the Thurston Economic Development Council guide the region's response to economic development, which has a direct impact on household incomes. Although there will be some overlap, this plan is limited to actions that result in or support the creation/preservation of affordable and low-income housing units.

Chapter 2.

Actions

Local Actions

This chapter discusses the specific local actions that the City of Olympia will implement or further consider as part of its Housing Action Plan.

The Cities of Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater identified six shared strategies for addressing housing needs within their communities:

1. Increase the supply of permanent, income-restricted affordable housing.
2. Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.
3. Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.
4. Increase the variety of housing choices.
5. Continually build on resources, collaboration, and public understanding to improve implementation of housing strategies.
6. Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.

Each city has developed a city-specific housing action plan outlining what actions they will take to carry out the strategies.

It is important to implement all of the six strategies in order to meet the housing needs of our growing and changing population.

The actions outlined for Olympia on the following tables are organized within each of the six strategies. Each action also fills one or more of the seven gaps identified in the Housing Needs Assessment:



Affordability. Reduce the cost of housing for low-income and cost-burdened households.



Supply. Increase the inventory of housing for all households.



Variety. Increase the variety of housing sizes and types



Seniors. Increase the stock of housing options needed for aging seniors.



Improvements. Maintain the existing housing stock, including improving energy efficiency and air quality.



Stability. Increase household wealth by providing safe, stable options for rental housing and pathways to homeownership.



Supportive Housing. Increase permanent housing options for people with disabilities and those at risk of or experiencing homelessness.

The table of actions associated with each strategy includes key information to know:

- Gaps or needs addressed by the action (as indicated by the above icons).
- Current approach in the City of Olympia
- Recommended approach for the City of Olympia
- City resources needed to implement the action
- Recommended timeframe for implementation
 - **Short Term:** consider/implement within 1-3 years from adoption of the plan
 - **Mid Term:** consider/implement within 6 years from adoption of the plan
 - **Long Term:** consider/implement within 10 years from adoption of the plan
- Implementation status in the city, as represented by the following symbols:
 - ✓ **The action is implemented** – the City has completed the work necessary to implement the action.



The action is in progress – The City has begun the work necessary to implement the action, but it is not yet fully implemented, or its use could be expanded.



The action will be considered – the City will consider the work necessary to implement the action, but the work has not been scheduled.



The action is not recommended to be implemented – the City will not implement the action for the reason specified in the table of action below.

More detailed information on each action is provided in Appendix A.

Neither the strategies nor the actions associated with them are in any kind of priority order.

Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.

Strategy 1 includes actions that increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for low-income households (those making 80 percent or less of the area median family income) and actions that support the providers of low-income housing.

Why is this strategy important?

Demand for housing is straining the limited supply of affordable options. For households with the lowest incomes – such as those headed by a retail clerk, a home health aide, or a childcare provider – market rate housing is unlikely to be an affordable option. For these households, even home maintenance costs – let alone rent or mortgage payment costs – can be unaffordable.

In addition, Thurston County faces a growing homelessness crisis. The 2021 Point in Time census counted 1,145 people experiencing homelessness, including 639 who were unsheltered, meaning they spent the night before in a place not meant for human habitation. While this plan does not address emergency homeless response actions, it does recognize that housing is the solution to homelessness. Thus, creating permanent housing options for these members of our community is a priority.

How do these actions reduce housing costs?

These actions increase the supply of housing where costs are kept permanently affordable to those earning the lowest incomes in our community. The need is great: according to the Housing Needs Assessment, about 20,200 households in Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater have an income of 80 percent or less of the median family income (Table 3-1). Another 13,800 households in the same category are anticipated over the next 25 years.

Table 2-1. Households making 80 percent or less of the area median income by jurisdiction, 2012-2016 estimate and 2045 projection

	Households with an Income* of:			TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS
	<= 30% of area median	30% to 50% of area median	50% to 80% of area median	
2012-2016 Estimate				
Lacey	1,800	1,900	3,600	7,200
Olympia	3,300	2,700	3,500	9,500
Tumwater	1,200	900	1,400	3,500
Cities Combined	6,200	5,500	8,500	20,200
2045 Projection				
Lacey	2,200	3,000	5,500	10,700
Olympia	5,200	5,200	6,500	16,900
Tumwater	1,900	1,700	2,800	6,400
Cities Combined	9,300	9,900	14,800	34,000

**Household income as a percent of the area median family income. Excludes people experiencing homelessness and other group quarters populations. Estimates are only for current city limits and do not include unincorporated UGAs. Source: Thurston Regional Planning Council*


Reducing the cost of renting and owning a home are both part of the solution. For households looking toward homeownership, the up-front costs associated with purchasing a home can put this option out of reach. Low-income households, however, can benefit from the stabilization in housing costs owning a home offers – in general, monthly mortgage payments stay the same over 30 years while monthly rent payments increase.

These actions also address the need for permanent supportive housing. For people moving out of emergency housing situations – such as a homeless shelter – permanent supportive housing provides not only affordable housing but also access to health and social services. These services build stability and decrease the likelihood residents will experience homelessness again.

How do these actions address equity?

People of color (Figure 3-1) disproportionately head the lowest income households in Thurston County. They are also more likely to experience homelessness than people who are white and non-Hispanic. Permanent, income restricted housing directly benefits both these populations by providing affordable, stable housing options. Housing affordable to households with the lowest incomes can be rental or owner units, both of which help stabilize households. Programs that expand homeownership opportunities can significantly improve a household’s wealth; this is especially important to addressing inequities for households of color stemming from historical policies like redlining and restrictive zoning.











Figure 2-1. Household income in Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater combined by race and ethnicity, 2014-2018 average







Note: In the figure above, householders who are Latino or Hispanic are only represented in “Hispanic of Any Race.”

Source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey.





Table 2-2. Actions that increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.

Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.		Implementation Status	Current approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
1.a.	<p>Donate or lease surplus or underutilized jurisdiction-owned land to developers that provide low-income housing.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p>  		City has donated land for permanent low income housing projects, including Billie Frank Jr Place and 2828 Martin Way, as well as for emergency homeless response facilities.	This is an impactful action. Continue to assess city-owned properties for low-income housing opportunities, including when developing property for other strategic objectives, such as a parking structure or art facility. As resources allow, be proactive in purchasing land for partnerships with low income housing providers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to identify and assess properties for potential use & purchase, and to negotiate with partner(s) • Time for City Council to consider purchase & sale • Funding allocation for land purchase 	Ongoing
1.b.	<p>Fund development projects that increase low-income housing through grants or loans.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p>      		City makes an annual Home Fund award, which is seed money to help projects leverage other funding sources. E.g., donated \$1.1m for 2828 Martin Way and \$1m for Family Support Center housing project.	Continue to provide an annual Home Fund award, with priority for permanent supportive housing (PSH). Keep working toward target to help build 300 units of permanent supportive and low-income affordable housing between 2020-2025. The trigger for reassessing funding priority is when it becomes difficult for new PSH facilities to find subsidies for operating costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing time for the Home Fund Advisory Board to review, and the City Council to review and approve annual awards • Ongoing time for staff to manage the program • Annual funding through the Home Fund sales tax 	Ongoing







 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.		Implementation Status	Current approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
1.c.	<p>Offer and/or expand fee waivers for low-income housing developments.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>City Council may grant an 80% impact fee exemption for projects that are 100% low income. E.g., Merritt Manor used this incentive. (15.04.060D, RCW 82.02.060)</p>	<p>Continue offering this incentive for low income housing.</p> <p>The City should consider allowing this to be administratively approved when specific criteria is met; purpose would be to reduce time and uncertainty in the development process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and City Council to review and approve amendment to ordinance • Ongoing time for staff to review applications and manage the program 	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Amend = Mid Term</p>
1.d.	<p>Offer density bonuses for low-income housing.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City allows 1 additional residential unit for each low income unit provided, up to a 20% bonus (18.04.080A.4.d).</p>	<p>This action has been implemented.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further action needed 	<p>Done</p>





 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.	Implementation Status	Current approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>1.e. Define income-restricted housing as a different use from other forms of housing in the zoning code.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City Code defines “affordable housing” in 18.02, and includes thresholds for what is considered affordable and low income housing for multifamily tax exemption (5.86.10) and impact fee exemption programs (15.04.060D).</p>	<p>Re-examine definitions and consider new definition of “affordable housing” provided in the Growth Management Act (36.70A.030). The City may want to have a specific definition of housing restricted for low income households so that it can establish development regulations/ incentives specific to these, particularly as we plan for the high density neighborhood areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop ordinance updating development code • Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve and ordinance • Included in dept’s annual base budget 	<p>Short-Mid Term</p>
<p>1.f. Encourage the LOTT Clean Water Alliance to discuss lower hook-up fees and other incentives for low income affordable housing as part of their cost of service study.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The single largest per unit fee charged for new development is the LOTT capacity development charge (\$6,417 in 2021). LOTT’s scope for the study includes discussion of measures the organization could take to further partners’ interests in affordable housing.</p>	<p>LOTT will be engaging local jurisdictions in this work. The regional housing needs assessment and actions plans of each jurisdiction support measures to encourage development of and decrease costs for low income affordable housing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to engage with LOTT during the cost of service study • City Council members can encourage this 	<p>Short Term</p>





 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.	Implementation Status	Current approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>1.g. Partner with low-income housing developers to expand homeownership opportunities.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p>  		<p>The City has worked with partners to develop low income and market rate apartment complexes, but hasn't focused as much on projects involving home ownership.</p>	<p>Regional approach would be best (Regional Housing Council).</p> <p>Consider where this fits within priority for regional funding as part of comprehensive funding strategy (#6.d.)</p> <p>As resources allow, the City should also seek a partnership opportunity for a low income housing project that includes homeownership.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff and Councilmember to participate in Regional Housing Council • Time for staff to identify and assess partnership opportunities • Time for City Council to consider approval • Regional or City funding allocation for project(s) 	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>1.h. Provide funding for non-profit organizations to buy income-restricted units proposed to be converted to market rate housing.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p>  		<p>Various government subsidies have affordability time limits, such as the City's multi-family tax exemption (8 or 12 years), State low income housing tax credits (30 years), etc.</p>	<p>Regional approach would be best (Regional Housing Council).</p> <p>Consider where this fits within priority for regional funding as part of comprehensive funding strategy (#6.d)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff and Councilmember to participate in Regional Housing Council • Time for staff to identify and assess partnership opportunities • Regional funding allocation for project(s) 	<p>Ongoing</p>







 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.	Implementation Status	Current approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>1.i. Provide funding for low-income and special needs residents to purchase housing through community land trusts.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City has not yet been involved in activities related to housing land trusts.</p>	<p>Regional approach would be best (Regional Housing Council).</p> <p>Consider where this fits within priority for regional funding as part of comprehensive funding strategy (#6.d).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff and Councilmember to participate in Regional Housing Council • Time for staff to identify and assess partnership opportunities • Regional funding allocation for project(s) 	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>1.j. Provide funding for renovating and maintaining existing housing that serves low-income households or residents with disabilities.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City has used Community Development Block Grant funds for this in the past, but it is not a priority for funding at this time.</p>	<p>Regional approach would be best (Regional Housing Council.)</p> <p>Consider where this fits within priority for regional funding as part of comprehensive funding strategy (#6.d)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff and Councilmember to participate in Regional Housing Council • Time for staff to identify and assess partnership opportunities • Regional funding allocation for project(s) 	<p>Ongoing</p>



 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.	Implementation Status	Current approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>1.k. As part of comprehensive plan and development code changes, include an evaluation of the impact such changes will have on housing affordability, especially for low-income households.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City does not currently have a formal approach to such evaluation.</p> <p>Development regulations, impact fees, certain climate mitigation actions and other provisions that regularly come before the City Council may impact the cost of housing.</p>	<p>The City should proactively evaluate the impacts of comprehensive plan, policies and development code changes on housing affordability. Consider including this analysis as part of relevant staff recommendations/reports.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to include such reviews during the preparation of amendments to the Comp Plan and development code – part of base budget • Potentially could require assistance from an on-call consultant to assess cost impacts – which would require additional funding allocation 	<p>Short Term</p> <p>Then Ongoing</p>
<p>1.l. Require low-income housing units as part of new developments.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Not currently addressed. We've learned from other cities that if not properly applied this tool can have the unintended consequence of suppressing both low income and market rate housing development.</p>	<p>The first step is to analyze whether incentives are sufficient enough to offset the affordability requirements. Start with an analysis and restructuring of the 12-year multifamily tax exemption to determine if that incentive alongside others are sufficient enough to encourage affordable units.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to develop an RFQ and contract for consultant services • Time for staff to manage contract, review results • Time for City Council to review the results • Funding allocation (Council set aside \$50k for a feasibility analysis in 2021) 	<p>Analysis = Short Term</p>


 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.		Implementation Status	Current approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
1.m.	<p>Adopt a “Notice of Intent to Sell” ordinance for multifamily developments.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		Not currently addressed	At a minimum, the City should require this in contracts when developments receive City subsidies for low income housing. Such contract action does not require an ordinance. Such an ordinance is unlikely to produce wide results. This could be considered alongside tenant option to purchase (#2.d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop ordinance updating development code • Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve and ordinance • Included in dept’s annual base budget 	Mid Term
1.n.	<p>Allow mobile or manufactured home parks (MHP’S) in multifamily and commercial areas.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p>   		New parks are already allowed in multifamily zones (MR10-18, RM18, RM24, MHP.) Existing parks are allowed in some commercial (GC, PO/RM, MS, HCD-1.)	City could consider allowing new MHP’s in some commercial zones. However, this is unlikely to result in new MHP’s so it is a low priority. Given land prices and return on investment is highly unlikely property owners will seek to develop new MHP’s in urban commercial areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop ordinance updating development code • Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve and ordinance • Included in dept’s annual base budget 	Mid Term

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.		Implementation Status	Current approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
1.o.	<p>Require Planned Residential Developments (PRDs)/Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) for low-density development and include standards for including low-income housing.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 	X	Not currently addressed	Not recommended - PRD's/PUD's create even more complexity and thus are unlikely to result in significant low income housing development	Not recommended	N/A
1.p.	<p>Establish a program to preserve and maintain healthy and viable manufactured home parks.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 	X	The City of Olympia has a manufactured home park zone, but not all of the approximately 8 manufactured home communities in Olympia are zoned as such.	Not recommended at this time. Instead, consider a tenant opportunity to purchase ordinance (2.d) which is a tool that has been used in other cities to help preserve MHP's. Tumwater may do something more expansive, which may provide additional ideas for Olympia.	Not recommended	N/A

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.		Implementation Status	Current approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
1.q.	<p>Enhance enforcement of property maintenance codes to keep housing in good repair.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 	X	Olympia responds to code enforcement issues on a complaint basis.	Not recommended at this time. This action would require additional resources that are competing for higher priorities. Rather than code compliance, consider contracting with a local organization to assist low income housing owners with maintaining their units.	Not recommended	N/A

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 2: Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.

Strategy 2 actions address housing stability by preventing evictions and displacement and creating opportunities to build financial equity through homeownership.

Why is this important?

Housing stability is an important component of housing affordability. When households face housing insecurity due to income or other issues, there can be a fine line between being housed and being homeless. Evictions and foreclosures are both destabilizing and can lead to long-term poverty. These events also make it more likely a household will experience homelessness.


How do these actions reduce housing costs?

For housing service providers, preventing homelessness in the first place is more cost-effective than housing someone already experiencing homelessness. Households that can avoid evictions and foreclosures also avoid likely increases in their monthly housing costs – if they are even able to find a new home to live in. For renters, this can also include application fees, deposits, and other costs often associated with finding new rental housing.

How do these actions address equity?

People of color are more likely to rent (Figure 3-2) and more likely to have lower incomes than their white, non-Hispanic counterparts. This makes them particularly vulnerable to eviction when rent increases exceed their ability to pay. This concern is reflected in the population experiencing homelessness, which is also disproportionately people of color.





Figure 2-2. Tenure by race and ethnicity in Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater combined, 2014-2018 average






Source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey.

Homeownership is an important way for a household to build financial equity, move people out of poverty, and create generational wealth. Creating these opportunities for people of color – who were historically denied access to mortgages and loans – is particularly important.



Table 2-3. Actions that make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.

Strategy 2: Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
2.a. Identify and implement appropriate tenant protections that improve household stability. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i>   		<p>This is underway. The process began in 2020 and was put on hold due to COVID. Engagement with renters and landlords will resume in summer/fall 2021.</p> <p>HB 1236 recently passed the WA State legislature and was sent to the Governor for signature. The bill specifies exclusive causes for eviction, refusal to renew, and ending a tenancy under the Residential Landlord-Tenant Act and makes other changes to rights and remedies.</p>	<p>Stay the course and complete the process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to carry out the process and develop a recommended ordinance. • Time for the Land Use Committee to make a recommendation and City Council to review and approve the ordinance. • Funding for consultant to assist with public process (previously allocated) 	<p>Short Term</p> <p>Underway</p>





 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 2: Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
2.b. Adopt short-term rental regulations to minimize impacts on long-term housing availability. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i>  		Process is underway and expected to wrap up in 2021. Staff recommendation includes the following limits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only 2 short term rentals per property owner - No ADU can be a short term rental - Each multifamily building can have 1 unit or up to 3%, whichever is greater - Tracking thru permitting process 	Stay the course and complete the process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop an ordinance updating the development code • Time for the Planning Commission and Land Use Committee to make a recommendation and City Council to review and approve the ordinance • Included in dept’s base budget 	<p>Short Term</p> <p>Under-way</p>








 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 2: Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>2.c. Provide displaced tenants with relocation assistance.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>No formal policy or program has been established.</p> <p>However, in the past the City has used CDBG funds (Angelus Apartments, 2019) and a development agreement (Union Ave, 2000) to secure financial assistance for displaced tenants.</p>	<p>An established tenant relocation assistance program with clear parameters would be a better approach than trying to address displacement concerns on an ad hoc basis. City should consider how such a program could be used, under what circumstances, and with what funding.</p> <p>The City should also consider developing a method for assessing and understanding risk of displacement, especially with regard to the High Density Neighborhood areas where it wants to encourage significant residential development.</p> <p>Could potentially be explored as a regional effort with Tumwater, Lacey and Thurston County - may be more financing and management options.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop a recommendation (it will take some time to formulate and work through this kind of major new program before putting in place.) • Time for the Land Use Committee to review and the City Council to review and approve an ordinance • Ongoing time for staff to develop and manage such a program • Funding allocation to support the program 	<p>Short-Term = start background work</p>

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 2: Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>2.d. Consider a Tenant Opportunity to Purchase (TOPO) Ordinance</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Not currently addressed.</p>	<p>Consider TOPO as a tool for preservation of manufactured home parks, and perhaps certain multifamily uses such those with an existing affordability requirement. Not recommended for application to single family rentals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop ordinance updating development code • Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve and ordinance • Included in dept’s annual base budget 	<p>Mid Term</p>
<p>2.e. Partner with local trade schools to provide renovation and retrofit services for low-income households as part of on-the-job-training.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City has partnered with local trade schools in the past. Recently, microhomes for the individuals experiencing homelessness at the Mitigation Site were built by Earth Homes and by the Community Youth Service’s YouthBuild program at New Market Skills Center.</p>	<p>Regional approach would be best.</p>	<p>This action would best be addressed as a regional effort involving jurisdictions and economic development partners.</p>	<p>Mid-Term</p>

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 2: Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
2.f. Explore barriers and policies that can increase access to housing for incarcerated individuals. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i>  		Not currently addressed.	This action would best be addressed as a regional effort. A next step for Olympia would be to explore what other cities have done to mitigate this issue and what might be the right approach for Olympia.	Best as a regional effort. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop a recommendation • Time for the Land Use Committee to review and the City Council to review and approve an approach. • Included as part of dept’s base budget 	Long Term
2.g. Establish a down payment assistance program. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i>  	X	The Washington State Finance Commission has a program, but this is not currently addressed by the City.	This action is not recommended. The City of Olympia does not have the resources to manage such a program, and it would be better as a state or regional program.	Not recommended	N/A
2.h. Adopt a “right to return” policy. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i>  	X	Not addressed.	This action is not recommended, as it goes hand in hand with a down payment assistance program which the City does not have the resources to manage (2.e.)	Not recommended	N/A

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 2: Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
2.i. Rezone manufactured home parks to a manufactured home park zone to promote their preservation. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i>  	X	The City has a Manufactured Home Park Zone, but not all of our existing manufactured home parks are zoned as such.	This action is not recommended because rezoning is not likely to result in increased preservation. It is more likely to increase disinvestment in these properties. Alternatively, the City should consider tenant opportunity to purchase (#2.d)	Not recommended	N/A

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.

Strategy 3 includes actions that streamline the development and construction of market rate housing — both owner and renter-occupied homes.

Why is this important?

Between 2020 and 2045, the population of Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater and their urban growth areas is projected to increase by over 60,000 people. This growth will require nearly 30,000 new housing units. When demand for housing is high – as it is now – but supply remains low, housing costs increase, reducing affordability. The increase in costs affects both renters and potential buyers.

How do these actions reduce housing costs?

The Housing Needs Assessment showed that we will likely see a growth of households in all income categories, from the lowest earning ones to those earning well above the median income. This will require the construction of housing affordable to a wide range of incomes.

Expanding the housing supply also means people can find housing better suited their needs. For example: high prices for condos and rentals means empty nesters who want to downsize are more likely to stay in their single-family home. A young family looking to buy their first home may continue to rent or pay more than 30 percent of their household income on a mortgage if home sale prices are too high.



How do these actions address equity?

When demand for housing is high but supply remains low, housing costs rise across the board, which decreases affordability. Those with the lowest incomes, who are disproportionately people of color, are most affected.



Rising rents are correlated with increased evictions and homelessness. Rising home prices mean homeownership – a way for disadvantaged households to build equity – becomes more difficult. Increasing costs can also lead to cultural displacement as people move to new neighborhoods that lack the businesses and institutions important to their community. While this process may be voluntary, it can be destabilizing for communities of color. When higher income households – those that can afford to rent or purchase at market rates – find housing that better meets their needs and budgets, more units are freed up that lower income households can afford. Expanding the overall housing stock also slows the rent/housing price increases that disproportionately affect people of color.

Increasing the supply of market rate housing is part of the affordability solution, but it alone will not address the needs of the most disadvantaged populations. That is why Strategy 1 includes actions to increase the supply of housing for the lowest-income households while Strategy 2 includes actions to make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.







Table 2-4. Actions that expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.		Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
3.a	<p>Lower transportation impact fees for multifamily developments near frequent transit service routes.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 	✓	Previous impact fee study has shown less impact on main corridors so as a result the City has established lower impact fees within downtown.	Maintain lower impact fees in downtown. Lowering transportation impact fees in other high density neighborhoods not recommended at this time due to importance of these funds for creating multimodal opportunities which positively influence the vision for active mixed use and multimodal urban neighborhoods.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed Ongoing time for staff to manage the impact fee program 	Done
3.b	<p>Allow deferral of impact fee payments for desired unit types.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 	✓	In Olympia impact fees can be deferred to final inspection.	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done






 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.		Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
3.c	Reduce setbacks & increase lot coverage/ impervious area standards <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i> 	✓	Olympia has pushed this about as far as we can, and recently made adjustments in relation to impervious surface area requirements.	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done
3.d	Reduce minimum lot sizes. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i> 	✗	Recent Housing Options Code Amendments resulted in only one minimum lot size for each residential zone (except RLI) where you can build any allowed housing type in the zone as long as you meet underlying code requirements (setbacks, lot coverage, design review, etc.)	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done



 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.		Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
3.e	<p>Relax ground floor retail requirements to allow residential uses</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p>  		<p>Olympia has implemented this action. The Pedestrian Overlay in Downtown includes certain streets in the core where ground floor retail is required to help activate the street. These requirements were relaxed with the recent Design Review Code update.</p>	<p>Stay the course in downtown.</p> <p>When establishing any new design standards in the other two high density neighborhoods be mindful not to over supply ground floor retail or excessively limit residential uses on the ground floor.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done
3.f	<p>Require minimum residential densities</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p>  		<p>Olympia has implemented this action in residential zones.</p>	<p>Consider establishing a minimum residential density for new residential construction in the high density neighborhood overlay (the Comprehensive Plan calls for at least 25 units per acre for new residential construction in these areas).</p> <p>Assess as part of scope for Capital Mall HDN subarea plan (#3r).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time for staff to review and develop ordinance updating development code Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve and ordinance Included in dept’s annual base budget, or larger budget for subarea plan 	Mid Term

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.		Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
3.g	<p>Allow third-party review of building permits for development projects</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		Olympia has implemented this action.	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done
3.h	<p>Simplify land use designation maps in the comprehensive plan to help streamline the permitting process.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p>  		Olympia has implemented this action. The land use map was simplified with the 2014 Comprehensive Plan periodic update.	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done



 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>3.i Reduce parking requirements for residential uses, including for multifamily developments near frequent transit routes.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The recent Housing Code options code changes removed the requirement for an additional parking spot for ADU's. Currently underway is consideration to expand the downtown parking exemption area and a code change for consistency with HB1923 which requires cities to relax parking minimums for low income and special needs housing within a certain distance from transit. (RCW 36.70A.620)</p>	<p>Reducing parking requirements is one of the most impactful things the City can do to increase achievable density and reduce construction costs.</p> <p>Following the current changes under consideration, the City should prioritize reviewing parking requirements along corridors and in the High Density Neighborhood areas.</p> <p>Include as part of the Capital Mall HDN subarea plan (#3r)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop ordinance updating development code • Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve and ordinance • Included in dept's annual base budget 	<p>Short Term</p> <p>Initial steps underway</p>



 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>3.j Expand the multifamily tax exemption to make it available in all transit corridors.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Currently underway on the staff and Land Use Committee work plan is consideration of expanding the 12-year multifamily tax exemption, which includes an affordability requirement.</p> <p>The 2021 State Legislative Session just passed SB 5287, which would authorize a 12-year extension of existing 8-year and 12-year Multi-Family Property Tax Exemptions (MFTEs) that are set to expire if they meet certain affordability requirements. The bill would also establish a new 20-year property tax exemption for the creation of permanently affordable homes. At the time of this report the bill is headed to the Governor for his signature.</p>	<p>As a first step to restructuring the program, conduct a feasibility analysis to determine how to maximize use of this program to encourage more affordable units and overall residential development in the high density neighborhood areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to develop a recommended ordinance. • Funding for consultant to assist with feasibility analysis (Council has set aside \$50k for a feasibility analysis in 2021) 	<p>Short Term Underway</p>



 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>3.k Review fees/regulations to identify housing cost reductions.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Phase 1 currently underway as a staff and Land Use Committee work plan item.</p> <p>Phase 1: street connectivity, frontage improvement thresholds, downtown sidewalk standards, private streets in manufactured home parks.</p> <p>Phase 2: Increase flexibility in the permit process; street classification standards; definitions of change of use or density.</p> <p>Phase 3: regional stormwater approaches and retrofit requirements.</p>	<p>Stay the course.</p> <p>Continue to identify and review areas of the development code that may be creating a barrier to housing construction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to develop recommended ordinances. • Time for the Planning Commission (in some cases) and the Land Use Committee to make a recommendation and City Council to review and approve the ordinance. 	<p>Phase 1 Underway</p> <p>2 = Short Term</p> <p>3 = Mid to Long Term</p>





 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>3.1 Consult with Washington State Department of Transportation as part of the SEPA review process to reduce appeals based on impacts to the transportation element for residential, multifamily, or mixed-use projects.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Underway.</p>	<p>Stay the course.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to coordinate with DOT 	<p>Underway</p>



 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.		Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
3.m	<p>Explore allowing medium density zoning around Neighborhood Centers.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		Currently on the Planning Commission's work plan. Underway in 2021	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time for staff and the Planning Commission to review and develop an ordinance updating the development code Time for City Council to review and approve ordinance Included in dept's annual base budget, including assistance from a consultant 	Short Term
3.n	<p>Process short plat administratively</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		The City processes short plats up to 9 lots administratively.	This action has been implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done



 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>3.o Offer developers density and/or height incentives for desired unit types.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Olympia offers a residential height bonus in the downtown and in the HDC-4 zone. There is also a density bonus in residential zones for cottage (20%), townhouses (15% in zones R4-8, R6-12), and low income (up to a 20% bonus). There is no maximum density in commercial zones.</p>	<p>Examine height requirements and the height bonus as part of the Capital Mall subarea plan. It is not clear at this time whether that would be appropriate or impactful. Heights in that area vary from 35'-75' depending on conditions.</p> <p>Include as part of Capital Mall HDN subarea plan (#3r)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop ordinance updating development code • Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve and ordinance • Included in dept's annual base budget 	<p>Mid Term</p>
<p>3.p Fix development code so that Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) bonus in R4-8 is a bonus and not a restriction.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Underway</p>	<p>Stay the course</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop ordinance updating development code • Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve and ordinance • Included in dept's annual base budget 	<p>Short Term</p> <p>Underway</p>





 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>3.q Maximize use of SEPA threshold exemptions for residential and infill development.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City passed a SEPA Infill Exemption Area for downtown in 2016.</p>	<p>A. Explore raising SEPA threshold exemptions</p> <p>B. Complete a SEPA planned action/subarea plan for the Capital Mall HDN (#3.r)</p>	<p>See #3.r for planned action resources needed. To raise thresholds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop ordinance • Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve ordinance • Included in dept’s annual base budget 	<p>Short Term</p>




 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>3.r Complete a subarea plan for the Capital Mall High Density Neighborhood area.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The Comprehensive Plan identifies 3 areas for higher density residential development (referred to as High Density Neighborhood Areas). This includes: Downtown, The Capital Mall area, and the Pacific/Martin Way Triangle area. The City has taken initial steps to implement this vision by completing a Downtown Strategy. Further work is needed in the other two areas.</p>	<p>Scope this process in 2022, and begin the process in 2023.</p> <p>Several of the potential actions in the Housing Action Plan should be considered as part of this process, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revising regulations and incentives to encourage housing that is affordable for a range of incomes, including low income households (various) - Strategic infrastructure investments (#3.u) - A SEPA planned action (#3q) - Plan for adaptive reuse of commercial space (#3s) - Reduced parking requirements (#3.1) - Form based code (#4.i) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to carry out a public process, research and develop recommendations. • Involves staff from several departments over 1-1.5 years. • Involves advisory boards, and possibly a special stakeholder committee • Time for the Land Use Committee and City Council to periodically review progress, for LUEC to make a recommendation, and for Council to approve a final planned action. • Funding allocation for consultant contract. 	<p>Short Term</p>






 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>3.s Develop a plan for adapting vacant commercial space into housing.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Almost all commercial zoning districts in Olympia allow apartments and other housing types. Vacant office and some retail spaces may be permitted to convert into residential units. In fact, a recent project converting an office building to residential units was completed near downtown (Campus Lofts on 12th Ave.)</p>	<p>Explore what we can do to support such conversions along the corridors, and especially in the High Density Neighborhoods identified in our Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Include as part of Capital Mall HDN subarea plan (#3r).</p>	<p>Include as part of scope for Capital Mall HDN subarea plan (see 3#r)</p>	<p>Short-Mid Term</p>
<p>3.t Expand allowance of residential tenant improvements without triggering land use requirements.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Single family to multifamily uses with 5 units or more trigger full land use review.</p>	<p>Explore this item further.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop ordinance • Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve ordinance • Included in dept’s annual base budget 	<p>Mid Term</p>

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>3.u Identify strategically placed but underdeveloped properties and determine what barriers exist to developing desired housing types.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p>  		<p>The City does not have a proactive program of making infrastructure investments to spur housing development.</p> <p>While the City’s long-standing approach has been that growth pays for growth, we are finding that certain areas are unlikely to be developed without upfront public investment in required sewer and transportation infrastructure.</p>	<p>Identify areas where infrastructure investment is needed to spur housing development.</p> <p>To fully embrace this approach, the City should develop a master plan identifying where and what type of investments are needed to achieve planned residential growth, along with a method for prioritization. Subsequently, there should also be a separate chapter of the Capital Facilities Plan devoted to such investments. However, the City might start with a pilot project or two as part of developing this approach.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to identify areas where such investment is needed • Time for staff to develop a pilot project proposal and for City Council to review and approve it • Eventually staff time to develop a master plan and subsequent program • Time for City Council to review and approve a master plan • Funding needs to be identified (would not be utility or transportation funds) 	<p>Short-Term = Pilot</p> <p>Mid-Term = master plan</p>

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.		Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
3.v	Increase minimum residential densities. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i> 	X	Residential zones have established minimum densities.	This action is not recommended in residential zones because this is the not currently a barrier to housing development in Olympia.	Not recommended.	N/A
3.w	Integrate or adjust floor area ratio standards. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i>    	X	Floor area ratio standards are only applied in one small zoning district in Olympia.	This action is not recommended because it is not currently an issue in Olympia.	Not recommended	N/A

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 4: Increase the variety of housing choices.

Strategy 4 actions address ways to increase the variety of housing options, including duplexes, triplexes, accessory dwellings, and other housing forms that are not as common the Cities of Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater.

Why is this important?


Household sizes in Thurston County have gotten smaller – reaching an average of 2.5 people per household today. Average household size is even smaller in Olympia at 2.2 people per household. There are more single-parent families, householders living alone and households consisting on non-family members. As household formation and composition have changed over time, so have housing needs. Increasing the variety of housing types allows more choices for households and creates a dynamic housing market better able to meet the needs of people living in our area.

How do these actions reduce housing costs?

“Middle density” housing – a small part of our region’s current housing stock – is an important part of an affordable housing strategy. Middle density housing includes small multifamily housing (duplexes and triplexes), attached townhomes, cottage housing, and accessory dwellings. Per-unit costs tend to be lower than single family homes because the homes are smaller, and developers can benefit from economies of scale. Per-unit costs are also less than high-density multifamily because they are stick built (they don’t require structured parking or other concrete and steel structures) and are typically in neighborhoods with existing infrastructure. This leads to lower costs both for homeowners and renters (Figure 3-3).

Diversifying the housing stock also recognizes that households are unique and have a wide range of housing needs. This is particularly true as our population ages. Middle density housing provides seniors a way to downsize while remaining in the neighborhoods they love.

Figure 2-3. Relationship between Housing Types, Price and Rent, Unit Size, and Residential Density



Source: Washington State Department of Commerce, *Housing Memorandum: Issues Affecting Housing Availability and Affordability* (2019), p. 85. <https://deptofcommerce.app.box.com/s/npwem3s3rvcsya15nylbroj18e794yk7>.

How do these actions address equity?




Increasing the variety of housing options provides more affordable housing options for low-income households, who are disproportionately people of color. Middle density housing can be both rental and owner-occupied. Affordable owner-occupied units would be a potential way to build financial equity.

Middle density housing also expands the housing options available in predominantly single-family neighborhoods, leading to a mix of household incomes. This allows low-income households to access some of the resources – such as better school districts or healthier neighborhoods – available to higher-income households.






Table 2-5. Actions that increase the variety of housing choices

Strategy 4: Increase the variety of housing choices.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
4.a Allow accessory dwelling units (ADU's) in all residential zones <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i> 	✓	City has implemented this action.	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done
4.b Simplify ADU requirements <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i> 	✓	City recently implemented this action through the Housing Code Options update: increased max size and height, relaxed sprinkler rules and no longer require additional parking space or for the owner to live onsite.	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done
4.c Provide pre-approved plan sets for ADU's <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i> 	✓	City now has preapproved plan sets at the front counter.	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done







 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 4: Increase the variety of housing choices.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
4.d Allow group homes in all residential zones and commercial zones that allow residential units <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i> 	✓	City has implemented this action. Group homes with less than 6 people are a permitted use, and more than 6 people a conditional use (requires a public hearing by the Hearing Examiner.)	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done
4.e Recognize modular/ manufactured housing as a viable form of housing construction <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i> 	✓	City has implemented this action.	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done
4.f. Increase the types of housing allowed in low-density residential zones (duplexes, triplexes, etc.). <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i> 	✓	City recently implemented this action through the Housing Code Options update - Providing more flexibility for duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, sixplexes and courtyard apartments in residential zones.	Stay the course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action needed 	Done

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 4: Increase the variety of housing choices.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>4.g. Allow more housing types in commercial zones.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>City currently allows single family, townhomes, duplexes and apartments in commercial zones.</p>	<p>Include as part of Capital Mall HDN subarea plan (#3.r)</p> <p>Consider allowing uses such as triplex, fourplex, courtyard apartments, and single room occupancy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop ordinance updating development code • Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve and ordinance • Included in dept’s annual base budget 	<p>Mid Term</p>
<p>4.h. Allow single-room occupancy (SRO) housing in all multifamily zones.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Currently allowed in a few commercial zones, but code isn’t clear about residential.</p>	<p>Make it clear that single room occupancy is an allowed use in multifamily zones.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop ordinance updating development code • Time for the Planning Commission to review and the City Council to review and approve and ordinance • Included in dept’s annual base budget 	<p>Mid Term</p>
<p>4.i. Adopt a form-based code for mixed-use zones to allow more housing types and protect the integrity</p>		<p>City’s current design standards incorporate some elements of a form based code, where the focus is on</p>	<p>Include as part of Capital Mall HDN subarea plan (#3r)</p>	<p>Include as part of scope for Capital Mall HDN subarea plan (see 3#r)</p>	<p>Mid Term</p>

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 4: Increase the variety of housing choices.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
of existing residential neighborhoods. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i>   		building forms and relationships between buildings and the street.			
4.j. Strategically allow live/work units in nonresidential zones. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i>   	X	The City allows home occupations in residential zones. Most zoning districts within the High Density Neighborhoods allow a mix of commercial and residential uses.	This action is not recommended at this time. If public interest grows in allowing slightly more intensive nonresidential components (size, traffic generation, employees on site) than current home occupation rules allow then the City may consider this in the future.	Not recommended	N/A

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 5: Continually build on resources, collaboration, and public understanding to improve implementation of housing strategies.

Strategy 5 actions recognize the need for the City of Olympia to engage with the community and establish strong partnerships with affordable housing providers to address housing affordability.

Why is this important?

While the City does not alone build or manage low-income housing, the policies it enacts can affect how much housing can be built and at what cost.

How do these actions reduce housing costs?

By establishing partnerships and collaborations with organizations who serve low-income households, the City can ensure it is directing its resources and enacting policies that best serve low-income households.

For some community members, changes brought on by growth and new development in their established neighborhoods can be threatening. As a result, residents may voice support for more affordable housing while at the same time seek to prevent actions needed to increase affordable options. By engaging with the community, the City can also build a shared understanding of the challenges faced by low-income households and develop informed consent around the strategies needed to increase housing affordability.

How do these actions address equity?

Building public understanding around the challenges faced by low-income households includes recognizing the historical reasons why they are disproportionately people of color.



The people who typically engage in public review processes – especially land use processes – are often white and of higher income. Developing relationships with people of color as well as organizations that work with or represent communities of color and disadvantaged groups can help the City better:

- Identify who benefits or is burdened by an action.
- Examine potential unintended consequences of taking an action.
- Mitigate unintended negative consequences of taking an action.
- Build in strategies to advance racial equity.





Proactive efforts to ensure engagement in decision-making processes are broadly inclusive and grounded in achieving equity are necessary. With broader input representative of the whole community, decisions are better balanced and actions the cities take can be more successfully implemented in an equitable fashion.

Inviting and bringing in people of all walks of life into the community conversation provides the most direct way to get feedback. Collaborating with community leaders and trusted representatives among disadvantaged populations can help make this happen and ensure government action does not increase inequities faced by people of color.


Table 2-6. Actions that improve implementation of housing strategies through collaboration, public understanding, and continually building on resources

Strategy 5: Continually build on resources, collaboration, and public understanding to improve implementation of housing strategies.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>5.a. Identify and develop partnerships with organizations that provide or support low-income, workforce, and senior housing as well as other populations with unique housing needs.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City has begun this work, and staff regularly meet with partners and potential partners – both local and beyond. Examples include partnerships with the Low Income Housing Institute and Interfaith Works to develop housing and shelter for people experiencing homelessness at 2828 Martin Way, and contracting with the local food bank and senior center to provide food and meals during COVID.</p>	<p>Providing support to partner organizations that provide housing and related services is one of the best ways the City can make a difference. Constrained resources are a challenge, but continuing to work with the Regional Housing Council to identify new funding and set priorities is the right path. In addition, the City itself should continue to seek new resources and opportunities and engage potential partners – both local and from outside – that can help meet our housing objectives.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff time to regularly coordinate and support the Regional Housing Council, and connect with partners and potential new partners. • Funding for various contracts. • Staff time to manage contracts 	<p>Ongoing</p>

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 5: Continually build on resources, collaboration, and public understanding to improve implementation of housing strategies.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>5.b. Fund Housing Navigators to assist households, renters, homeowners, and landlords with housing issues.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City funded housing navigators from Homes First to assist with the Merritt Manor project.</p>	<p>Continue to fund navigators as needed through the Regional Housing Council and City Housing Program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff time to regularly coordinate and support the Regional Housing Council, and connect with partners and potential new partners. • Funding for various contracts. • Staff time to manage contracts 	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>5.c. Establish a rental registration program to improve access to data and share information with landlords.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>This action is included in the scope for Tenant Protections, currently underway (#2a)</p>	<p>Complete the process to identify and adopt tenant protections.</p>	<p>See #2.a</p>	<p>Short Term Underway</p>

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 5: Continually build on resources, collaboration, and public understanding to improve implementation of housing strategies.		Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
5.d	<p>Conduct education and outreach around city programs that support affordable housing.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The Housing Action Plan process engaged the public and stakeholders about the City’s current programs and anticipated actions. Staff from the housing program have started conducting outreach to low income housing developers about available programs.</p>	<p>Adoption of a Housing Action Plan and the upcoming process to update the Comprehensive Plan Housing Element provide a great opportunity to continue sharing the City’s programs and approach with the community. Moving forward, as the City further develops its toolbox of affordable housing strategies, a specific campaign to ensure prospective partners know about Olympia’s goals, programs and incentives will help.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to conduct public outreach and connect with prospective partners • Time for Communications Team to develop content that tells our story 	Ongoing

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 6: Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.

Strategy 6 actions address the need to increase funding for low-income housing and to provide a regional strategy for distributing funds.

Why is this important?

While the private sector will build most of the housing needed to meet demand in the Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater area, a significant portion of households earn less than 80 percent of the median area income. Paying market rate rents or mortgages may not be affordable for them (Table 3-7).

Table 2-7. Maximum affordable housing costs at various income levels, 2020

HUD Income Limit* for a:	Yearly Income	Hourly Wage (Full Time)**	Maximum Monthly Affordable Rent or Mortgage Payment
<i>2-Person Family</i>			
Extremely Low Income (30%)	\$20,800	\$10.00	\$500
Very Low Income (50%)	\$34,700	\$16.70	\$900
Low Income (80%)	\$55,500	\$26.70	\$1,400
<i>4-Person Family</i>			
Extremely Low Income (30%)	\$26,200	\$12.60	\$700
Very Low Income (50%)	\$43,350	\$20.80	\$1,100
Low Income (80%)	\$69,350	\$33.30	\$1,700

*For 2020, Housing and Economic Development (HUD) income limits are based on a median family income of \$86,700 for Thurston County.

**Assumes one household member works full time at 40 hours per week.

Source: Thurston Regional Planning Council.

Whether the developer is a nonprofit or a for-profit organization, there are real costs to consider in making a development project feasible. Table 3-8 provides an example of the monthly costs associated with developing a 100-unit apartment complex. This example is intended to give readers an idea of the costs associated with multifamily development; actual numbers for a real project will vary based on a variety of factors.

In this example, each apartment unit costs \$250,000 to develop, a total that includes acquiring land, engineering and architectural fees, environmental review, appraisals, city fees, construction costs, etc. Most developers do not have the cash to develop a project without financing. Some may not have funds for even a down payment to qualify for a development loan. Developers must also consider the ongoing costs once the development is up and running – such as costs for managing the property, taxes and insurance, and reserving funds for basic and more extensive repairs. In this example, monthly costs per unit would need to be \$1,695 just to cover the financing and ongoing operating costs; this does not take into account any profit – only the cost to break even on the project and ensure the developer does not lose any money.

Table 2-8. Example of costs associated with developing an apartment complex

	Per Unit Cost – Not Grant Funded	Per Unit Cost – 25% Grant Funded	Per Unit Cost – 100% Grant Funded
Total Cost of Development <i>Covers the total cost of development including land acquisition, engineering and architectural fees, environmental reports, appraisals, city fees, construction, etc.</i>	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Monthly Cost for Down Payment Financing <i>approximately 25% of overall development cost. Assumes 5.8% return on investment.</i>	\$300	\$0	\$0
Monthly Cost for Loan Payment <i>approximately 75% of overall development cost. Assumes 4% interest rate.</i>	\$895	\$895	\$0
Monthly Cost for Ongoing Operating Costs and Reserves* <i>Covers property taxes and insurance; utilities; landscaping and general maintenance; basic repairs; property management; and maintenance reserves for painting, new roofs, appliance replacements, etc.</i>	\$500	\$500	\$500
TOTAL Cost per month over 30-year loan term	\$1,695	\$1,395	\$500

*Per the Housing Authority of Thurston County, \$500 per unit is likely a modest amount for well-maintained properties.

Note: This example is intended to give readers an idea of the costs associated with development; actual numbers for a real project will vary.

Source: Housing Authority of Thurston County.

If a non-profit developer has the down payment covered through grant funding (about 25 percent of the total project cost), the cost per unit can be reduced to \$1,395 per month. If the non-profit developer is able to obtain grant funding for the total cost of development, the developer would still need about \$500 per unit per month to cover maintenance and operation costs. For households with extremely low incomes - making less than \$21,000 per year – this may still be a hard ask.

How do these actions reduce housing costs?

Providing affordable housing for the lowest income households and those experiencing homelessness requires significant resources. Right now, those resources are scarce, leaving many households unable to afford a decent and affordable place to live. Many of the actions identified in this plan will not be possible without more funding. The Cities of Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater can play a significant role in leveraging local, state, and federal dollars for low-income housing. The cities also recognize the need to collaborate regionally on a funding strategy so that funds are used efficiently and distributed to the



areas of greatest need. With more funding, housing units become more affordable for households when costs for developing and maintaining units are reduced.

While the cities have some capacity to increase funding, Chapter 4 recognizes the need for action at the state and federal level to increase funding for affordable housing.

How do these actions address equity?

People of color are disproportionately low-income, at risk of experiencing homelessness, or homeless. However, many of the actions in this plan to address these issues will be impossible to implement without additional funding.


Table 2-9. Actions that establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing

Strategy 6: Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>6.a. Establish an affordable housing sales tax.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City adopted a Home Fund in 2018. The fund provides approximately \$2.3m annually to support local housing needs.</p>	<p>Stay the course.</p> <p>Support establishment of a countywide home fund, ultimately to provide more resources to meet the objectives and priorities of the Regional Housing Council.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for the Home Fund Advisory Board to review, and the City Council to review and approve the award • Time for staff to manage the program • Funding through the Home Fund sales tax • City Councilmembers can encourage the County Commissioners to enact a countywide home fund. 	<p>Ongoing</p>





 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 6: Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>6.b. Take advantage of the local revenue sharing program established by HB1406 (portion of State sales tax that can be used for affordable housing.)</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City has implemented this action. The fund provides approximately \$325,000 annually, which is pooled with Lacey and Tumwater’s 1406 dollars and directed by the Regional Housing Council.</p>	<p>Stay the course.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff and Councilmember time to regularly coordinate and support the Regional Housing Council 	<p>Ongoing</p>




 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 6: Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>6.c. Use Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Section 108 loans and other federal resources for affordable housing.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The City receives annual CDBG funds from the Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, which it can direct to housing, economic development or social services that support low income households. Prior to COVID, the City started prioritizing CDBG more for housing related projects, but in 2020-2021 funds were directed to address various needs related to the COVID emergency. The City also used to provide Section 108 loans for maintenance of low income housing, but isn't doing so currently. In addition, both the County and City will receive funding from the federal American Recovery Plan, some of which will be directed to housing programs.</p>	<p>Prioritize housing programs and projects when allocating CDBG funding.</p> <p>Consider reinstating the Section 108 loan program – this is a complicated program to manage and it ultimately reduces the City's annual CDBG allocation, so requires careful thought.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff time to develop and manage contracts, and administer the program • Time for staff to prepare and City Council to review and approve annual allocations 	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Section 108 = Mid Term</p>

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 6: Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>6.d. Develop a (regional) comprehensive funding strategy for affordable housing that addresses both sources of funding and how the funds should be spent.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>The newly formed Regional Housing Council (RHC) will consider issues specifically related to funding a regional response to homelessness and affordable housing, and how to better coordinate existing funding programs. Work is needed through the RHC and other regional forums to determine overall allocation goals for permanent low income housing and emergency homeless response efforts.</p>	<p>Once the Cities of Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater have adopted their Housing Action Plans, staff that supports the Regional Housing Council (RHC) should scope this conversation and bring it forward to the RHC elected policy board.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff and Councilmember time to participate in the Regional Housing Council 	<p>Short Term</p>
<p>6.e. Use tax increment financing to capture the value of city investments that increase private investment in neighborhoods, especially in areas with planned or existing transit.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Up until recently local governments have not had the authority to use tax increment financing (TIF) in Washington. However, HB 1189 would authorize TIF's for local governments. At the time of this report, the bill heads to the Governor for signature.</p>	<p>Consider the work necessary to implement the action.</p> <p>A focus on housing development, including affordable housing, in Olympia's High Density Neighborhoods would be a good use for this tool.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and prepare a TIF program for Olympia • Time for City Council to review and approve program • Time for staff to develop and manage such a program 	<p>Short-Mid term</p>

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 6: Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
<p>6.f. Establish an affordable housing loan program.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 		<p>Not currently addressed.</p>	<p>Consider in the future. More research is needed on what would be involved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time for staff to review and develop an ordinance establishing such a program • Time for City Council to review and approve the ordinance • Staff time to manage such a program • A dedicated source of funding 	<p>Long Term</p>
<p>6.g. Establish a regional housing trust fund to provide dedicated funding for low-income housing.</p> <p><i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i></p> 	<p>X</p>	<p>Not currently addressed.</p>	<p>This action is not recommended to be implemented by the City.</p>	<p>Not recommended</p>	<p>N/A</p>

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Strategy 6: Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.	Implementation Status	Current Approach	Recommended Approach	City Resources Needed	Recommended Timing
6.h. Establish an affordable housing property tax levy to finance affordable housing for very low-income households. <i>Gaps/Needs Addressed:</i>  	X	Not currently addressed for housing. In 2019 the City passed a property tax levy for public safety.	This action is not recommended since we adopted a property tax levy for public safety and a sales tax levy for affordable housing in 2018	Not recommended	N/A

 = Affordability
  = Supply
  = Variety
  = Seniors
  = Improvements
  = Stability
  = Supportive Housing

Chapter 3.

Legislative Needs

The regional Housing Action Plan identified a number of barriers to affordable housing that need to be addressed at the state or federal level. Cities the size of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater are not the best suited to leverage sufficient funding to meet the needs identified in this plan. They need state and federal government relief to fill the gap. Loss of funding at either the state or federal level can have severe impacts at the local level. A joint legislative agenda developed by the Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater will be necessary to address these issues.

Many of the actions in this plan require funding — especially actions to create affordable housing for the lowest income households and people moving out of emergency and temporary housing situations. Therefore, an important part of this legislative agenda is the need for funding for the construction and maintenance of low-income housing and permanent supportive housing.

State Legislative Agenda

- Increase funding for low-income housing construction.
- Increase funding for permanent supportive housing for those recently experiencing homelessness and moving out of emergency/transitional housing.
- Increase funding for renovating low-income housing to address accessibility upgrades, energy efficiency retrofits, and indoor health (e.g. lead and mold).
- Reform Washington’s condo liability laws.
- Amend the Manufactured/Mobile Home Landlord-Tenant Act — such as in [HB2610](#) — to provide protections for tenants in the event of a sale.

- Allow tax increment financing.
- Require a portion of the Washington State Housing Trust Fund to be used for affordable homeownership projects.
- Update the multifamily tax exemption program to include projects that support homeownership opportunities.

Federal Legislative Agenda

- Reduce tariffs that raise housing construction costs, making it more expensive to build housing. Example: the cost of softwoods (heavily used in construction) from Canada are up by about 25 percent.
- Increase federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding for affordable housing, including housing vouchers and funding for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, the Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program (SHOP), and the Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME).
- Examine the effect of Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements on small, non-profit housing developers.
- Increase funding for down payment assistance. This could include providing tax credits for first-time home buyers with low-income, targeted down payment assistance for disadvantaged populations and communities of color, and increased funding for homeownership savings programs like Assets for Independence and the Family Self-Sufficiency initiative.
- Support the Neighborhood Homes Improvement Act tax credit, which would make it economically feasible to rehabilitate distressed homes for homeownership and expand affordable homeownership opportunities for local residents.

Appendix A.

Action Details

This appendix includes a fuller description of what each action included in this plan entails. Where appropriate, the appendix includes applicable information on what the Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater can or have done as well as resources with more information. The actions are grouped into their strategy categories:

1. Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.
2. Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.
3. Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.
4. Increase the variety of housing choices.
5. Continually build on resources, collaboration, and public understanding to improve implementation of housing strategies.
6. Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.

Strategy 1: Increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80 percent or less of the area median income.

1.a. Donate or lease surplus or underutilized jurisdiction-owned land to developers that provide low-income housing.

In areas with high land costs, acquiring suitable land can add significant expense to an affordable housing project. Public lands can be donated or leased to affordable housing developers, thereby reducing the cost of development. In this case, affordable housing means housing for households with incomes 80 percent or less of the area median income.

When a jurisdiction does not own land appropriate for housing development, purchasing such land may be an appropriate measure. The land can then be donated or leased to developers that provide low-income housing.

For more information on donating public lands, see [RCW 39.33.015](#).

1.b. Fund development projects that increase low-income housing through grants or loans.

Cities can provide funding directly to low-income and permanent supportive housing providers through grants or loans. This recognizes the need for public funding to build low-income housing beyond what market-driven incentives can provide. This action can be best implemented for projects located close to transit and with good access to organizations and agencies that serve low-income households.

1.c. Offer and/or expand fee waivers for low-income housing developments.

Impact fees, utility connection fees, project review fees, and other fees increase the cost of housing construction. Reducing or waiving fees for low-income housing developments reduces their development costs and acknowledges that providing low-income housing has a positive impact on a community by:

- Ensuring vulnerable households can afford a home.
- Preventing individuals and families from becoming homeless.
- Reducing the cost of providing social services for households in crisis.

In most cases, the costs for such offsets must be made up elsewhere. According to the Washington State Department of Commerce, reducing or waiving impact fees are most effective when paired with other housing affordability incentives.

The Washington State Legislature has authorized municipalities to grant an exemption of eighty percent (80%) of the impact fees for qualified low-income housing developments. The City of Olympia offers this program to multifamily developments with over 4 units and when all the units will be affordable to those with incomes of 80% or less of area median family income for 20 years or longer. The Legislature allows this with no requirement to identify public funds to pay the exempted portion of the fees. In these cases, no money is collected from these projects to pay for the impacts to roads, schools and streets, in lieu of the provision of low-income affordable housing.

For more information on fee waivers for low-income housing, see:

- [RCW 82.02.060](#) for exempting impact fees for low-income housing.
- [RCW 35.92.380](#) and [RCW 35.92.020](#) for waiving utility connection and other utility fees for low-income persons.
- [RCW 36.70A.540](#) for waiving or exempting fees for affordable housing.

See also Action 3.b regarding deferral of impact fee payments, and 1.f regarding LOTT's hook up fees

1.d. Offer density bonuses for low-income housing.

Density bonuses allow developers to build more housing units than typically allowed if a certain percentage of units are low-income or income restricted. This policy is best implemented in coordination with low-income housing providers. Density bonuses are viable in areas where there is market demand for higher-density housing but do not pencil out where the demand is weak.

1.e. Define income-restricted housing as a different use from other forms of housing in the zoning code.

Defining income-restricted housing as a specific use allows cities to explicitly identify income-restricted housing as a permitted use in residential zones. It also allows cities to establish development regulations specific to low-income housing to streamline its design and permitting, making it a more attractive type of development for developers.

1.f. Support LOTT's discussion about lower hook-up fees for affordable housing.

The LOTT Clean Water Alliance provides wastewater management services for the urban area of north Thurston County, Washington. LOTT is a non-profit corporation, formed by four government partners – Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater, and Thurston County. Beginning in 2021, LOTT is conducting a cost of service study, and the scope includes discussion of measures the organization could take to further partners' interests in affordable housing.

Currently LOTT offers a rebate of 50% to 75% off the LOTT connection fee for property owners that are converting from an on-site septic system to the public sewer system. Property owners converting from septic to sewer are eligible for a rebate of 50% of the LOTT connection fee. Owners who meet criteria for hardship status, as defined by the city that will provide utility service, may qualify for an additional rebate of 25% of the LOTT connection fee. This program is in effect from 2019-2024, and is subject to available funds.

1.g. Partner with low-income housing developers to expand homeownership opportunities.

Affordable homeownership opportunities allow low-income households to build stability and wealth. Local jurisdictions can go beyond their own capabilities to encourage affordable homeownership opportunities by partnering with local housing groups and non-profit developers. This may include

providing funding, gifting publicly owned property, supporting grant applications, providing assistance to property owners, and other programs that increase affordable homeownership opportunities.

See also Action 1.a. regarding donation of land.

1.h. Provide funding for non-profit organizations to buy income-restricted units proposed to be converted to market rate housing.

Income-restricted housing units developed or rehabilitated with federal money may in the future be converted to market-rate units as affordability requirements expire. Partnering with The Housing Authority of Thurston County (HATC) and other nonprofit organizations to purchase such units can help preserve long-term housing options for low-income households.

See also 1.m requiring a notice of intent to sell, and 2.d regarding tenant opportunity to purchase.

1.i. Provide funding for low-income and special needs residents to purchase housing through community land trusts.

Community land trusts provide permanently affordable housing opportunities by holding land on behalf of a place-based community. A non-profit organization, housing land trusts help make homeownership both possible and affordable for low-income households. Locally, the Thurston Housing Land Trust serves all of Thurston County.

See also action 1.g regarding partnerships with low income housing developers.

1.j. Provide funding for renovating and maintaining existing housing that serves low-income households or residents with disabilities.

Low-income households and landlords that serve such households may not be able to afford costs for improving housing units that require renovation or rehabilitation. Need-based assistance to make home repairs, weatherization improvements, energy efficiency upgrades, and safety upgrades can ensure existing housing affordable to low-income households remains healthy for inhabitants, affordable, and in good repair. Assistance may be in the form of loans, tax reductions, or grants for landlords, homeowners, and tenants.

See also Action 2.e regarding partnering with local trade schools.

1.k. As part of comprehensive plan and development code changes, include an evaluation of the impact such changes will have on housing affordability, especially for low-income households.

Changes to comprehensive plans and development codes should include an evaluation of how they would affect the amount of housing, the types of housing allowed, and the cost to permit, construct, and renovate housing. Evaluating the potential for displacement when affordable units are likely to be lost to redevelopment (such as a mobile home park that is redeveloped) is also appropriate.

1.l. Require low-income housing units as part of new developments.

Future Thurston County households will have a range of incomes, and a portion of residential development will need to be affordable to low-income households. Requiring low-income housing units – whether for rent or ownership – ensures such units will be built as part of development. Consideration should be given to the number of low-income units required, how they are integrated with market-rate units, and whether thresholds should be enacted that exempt smaller developments from this requirement.

Washington State law allows cities to impose affordability requirements in areas where residential capacity is being increased. This is sometimes referred to as inclusionary zoning and typical elements include:

- Minimum quantity of required affordable units within the development (ex., 10-20%)
- A targeted income range (ex., less than 80% area median income)
- Time period (ex., 50 years)
- Geographic scope
- A fee in lieu option

As learned from other cities, establishing an affordability requirement requires the right conditions. Studies show that in communities with strong, sustained housing markets, and a program that is flexible and structured with sufficient incentives to offset the affordability requirements, this can be an effective tool. But there can be unintended consequences. Added costs and complexity can discourage development. If the affordability requirements are not sufficiently offset, developers may need to raise the cost of the market rate units to make up the difference, also impacting affordability. They also may opt not to build the project at all, and neither market rate nor affordable housing units will be built. A proforma analysis can help determine if the right conditions exist to make this tool viable. Viability may vary from neighborhood to neighborhood.

See [RCW 36.70A.540](#) and [WAC 365.196.870.2](#) for more information.

1.m. Adopt a “Notice of Intent to Sell” ordinance for multifamily developments.

Requiring notice to the city, housing officials, and tenants when the owner of a multifamily development intends to sell gives the city the opportunity to preserve low-income units for the same purpose and tenants ample additional time to prepare for a potential move. Not every multifamily development is appropriate for purchase to preserve affordability, but the notice allows jurisdiction staff the time to consider it. Cities may consider developing a list of criteria to determine the types of multifamily developments they want to preserve, including units currently required to be dedicated for low-income households but which may be converted to market-rate units in the future.

Resources

- National Housing Preservation Database. Provides information on developments that have received housing subsidies. As of December 2020, more than 3,000 multifamily units (two or more units in a building) in Thurston County have active subsidies.

1.n. Allow manufactured home parks in multifamily and commercial areas.

Manufactured home parks serve as one of the most affordable housing options for households in the region. If a city has not adopted a dedicated zone for manufactured home parks, it should consider allowing such developments in commercial areas and all multifamily zones.

See also Actions 1.p regarding a preservation program, 2.i regarding rezones, 2.d regarding tenant opportunity to purchase, and 4.e regarding manufactured homes.

1.o. Require Planned Residential Developments (PRDs)/Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) for low-density development and include standards for including low-income housing.

Planned Residential Developments (PRDs) and Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) are intended to provide a developer flexibility when designing very large subdivisions. Generally, flexibility is provided in terms of lot size and housing types. Requiring low-income housing as part of low-density PUDs/PRD can introduce a greater variety of housing of low-density housing types (duplexes, small apartment buildings, cottage housing, etc.) into a new neighborhood and ensure the neighborhood is affordable for a wider range of households. This may also encourage the private sector to partner with non-profits such as Habitat for Humanity to develop detached single-family homes for low-income households.

Low-density developments are more likely to consist only of detached single-family homes. Requiring PRDs/PUDs for low-density development can encourage more housing types in such developments. Requiring low-income housing in PRD/PUD proposals is a type of inclusionary zoning (income-restricted affordable housing must be included as part of new developments).

1.p. Establish a program to preserve and maintain healthy and viable manufactured home parks.

Manufactured home parks can be prime locations for higher density redevelopment in communities with strong demand for new housing. However, they also serve as one of the most affordable housing options for households in the region. A program that seeks to preserve and maintain healthy and viable manufactured home parks may consider ways to assist:

- Unit owners to purchase the park outright.
- Unit owners to maintain and repair individual manufactured homes.
- Unit owners with funding to replace units that would be better replaced than repaired.
- Unit owners with funding for relocation when a park cannot be preserved.
- Park owners with making service and utility upgrades.
- Park owners with converting from septic to sewer service.

See also Actions 1.n regarding allowing, 2.i regarding rezoning, 2.d regarding tenant opportunity to purchase, and 4.e regarding manufactured homes

1.q. Enhance enforcement of property maintenance codes to keep housing in good repair.

Property maintenance codes are intended to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of the public is adequately protected. Improved enforcement can help ensure pest infestations, lack of sanitary conditions, presence of mold, and structural issues are addressed in a timely fashion, thereby protecting

homeowners, tenants, and the public at large. Enforcing adopted property maintenance codes is difficult due to the time, staffing, and funding needed to identify and address issues as they arise.

This strategy could have a negative impact on low-income households if resources are not also made available to such households (or their landlords) to make required repairs (see Action 1.j regarding funding).

Strategy 2: Make it easier for households to access housing and stay housed.

2.a. Identify and implement appropriate tenant protections that improve household stability.

Tenant protections help avoid or slow the process of displacement for households by preserving housing units, a household's tenancy, or access to information and assistance. Examples of tenant protections include but are not limited to:

- Adopting a just cause eviction ordinance that requires landlords to provide tenants with a legally justifiable reason for the eviction.
- Adopting a preservation ordinance, requiring developers to replace affordable housing units demolished as part of redevelopment.
- Adopting an eviction mitigation ordinance to find ways to mutually end a rental agreement rather than evicting tenants.
- Adopting an opportunity to purchase policy that better involves tenants in the decision-making process when a dwelling unit is to be sold.
- Developing a program to incentivize landlords to accept tenants with poor credit or criminal history.
- Improving enforcement of landlord/tenant laws.
- Increasing a tenant's access to legal assistance for landlord/tenant issues.
- Limiting or regulating fees associated with rental housing applications.
- Requiring landlords to establish payment plans for tenants that get behind on rent.

Each tenant protection has positive and negative aspects that should be reviewed and considered before implementing, and both tenants and landlords should be involved in the review process. For more information on protections offered by the Residential Landlord Tenant Act, see [Chapter 59.18 RCW](#).

2.b. Adopt short-term rental regulations to minimize impacts on long-term housing availability.

When a property owner rents out an entire living unit on a short-term basis (generally a period of time less than 30 days), that housing unit cannot be used for the community's long-term housing needs.

Regulating short-term rentals can reduce negative impacts to the housing market as well as the neighborhood where the short-term unit is located. While this action is most effective in communities that attract a robust tourism base, establishing regulations/registration for this use ensures the city can track the impact short-term rentals have on long-term rentals.

2.c. Provide displaced tenants with relocation assistance.

Displacement can happen for a variety of reasons through no fault of the tenant. As redevelopment becomes a more attractive option than keeping a development as is, households – especially low-income households – can be displaced. Moving costs money, and low-income households may not have the funds available for making a required move. State law authorizes local governments to adopt an ordinance requiring developers to provide displaced tenants with relocation assistance to households that have an income of 50 percent or less of the area median income. Cities and counties can also dedicate public funds or use a combination of public and private funds for relocation assistance. When public action results in tenant displacement, relocation assistance is required.

For more information on relocation assistance, see [RCW 59.18.440](#) (developer action) and [RCW 8.26](#) (public action).

2.d. Consider a Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Ordinance (TOPO)

Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Ordinances (TOPOs) aim to provide long-term protection of already existing affordable housing by allowing tenant groups the first opportunity to negotiate and bid on rental properties when they come up for sale. In other cities these are typically mandatory and have been applied to manufactured home parks only.

Manufactured homes provide some of the most affordable forms of housing in the county, particularly for seniors. While in some of the lowest cost housing available, residents in manufactured home parks are particular vulnerable because they usually own their home but not the underlying land.

Following implementation of a TOPO for manufactured home parks, the City could work with local organizations such as a land trust or cooperative development center to help residents purchase the property and place it in trust for long term affordability, perhaps in a cooperative model.

See also Actions 1.n regarding allowing manufactured home parks (MHP's), 1.p regarding a preservation program for MHP's, 2.i regarding rezoning MHP's, 2.d regarding tenant opportunity to purchase, and 4.e regarding manufactured homes.

2.e. Partner with local trade schools to provide renovation and retrofit services for low-income households as part of on-the-job-training.

According to a 2019 housing memorandum prepared by PNW Economics, LLC and LDC, Inc. for the Washington State Department of Commerce, the majority of general contracting firms struggle to find skilled tradespeople (Issues Affecting Housing Availability and Affordability, p. 71.) Trade schools, apprenticeship programs, and other professionals that provide repair, retrofit, and renovation services to homeowners can scale up training with the help of homeowners who are in need of services at reduced rates.

This action may require additional assistance to the household to accomplish (see Action 1.j regarding funding).

2.f. Explore barriers and policies that can increase access to housing for incarcerated individuals

A criminal conviction can be a lifelong barrier to accessing services housing and other services. Landlords often use criminal background checks to narrow the applicant pool for their housing. Also, public and supportive housing options are in short supply and often people reentering from jails or prisons are ineligible or screened out from these programs. Having a criminal record while competing for low income units in short supply puts people with criminal records at a severe disadvantage. These individuals are highly likely to become homeless, which also increases the likelihood of recidivism. These housing practices and policies disproportionately impact people of color and people with disabilities, as these persons are over-represented in the U.S. criminal justice system.

More exploration is needed to determine what other cities have done to mitigate this issue and what might be the right approach for Olympia.

2.g. Establish a down payment assistance program.

Washington State has a number of programs that provide down payment assistance to first time and low-income home buyers. Establishing a down payment assistance program at the local level can assist more households in the Thurston County community towards the goal of homeownership. Down payment assistance typically takes the form of a low- or no-interest loan to the home buyer, which can be paid back as part of the mortgage or at the time the mortgage is paid off, the home is sold/transferred to a new owner, or the property is refinanced.

For more information on state down payment assistance programs, see the [Washington State Housing Finance Commission](#).

2.h. Adopt a “right to return” policy.

A “right to return” policy prioritizes down payment assistance for first-time home buyers that have been displaced due to direct government action. Establishing a right to return policy should only occur if the city has also established a down payment assistance program (see Action 2.g.).

2.i. Rezone manufactured home parks to a manufactured home park zone to promote their preservation.

Manufactured home parks provide some of the most affordable, non-subsidized forms of housing in Thurston County. Occupants of manufactured and mobile homes who own their unit lease the land under the unit. As property values rise, pressure to redevelop manufactured home parks increases, putting unit owners at risk of having to move (which can be costly) and being unable to find a new place to establish their home. Rezoning such developments to a manufactured home park zone can limit the types of development allowed in the zone and result in a more thorough public review process if rezoning is proposed.

See also Actions 1.n regarding allowing manufactured home parks (MHP’s), 1.p regarding a preservation program for MHP’s, 2.d regarding tenant opportunity to purchase, and 4e regarding manufactured homes.

Strategy 3: Expand the overall housing supply by making it easier to build all types of housing projects.

3.a. Lower transportation impact fees for multifamily developments near frequent transit service routes.

Transportation impact fees are one-time charges assessed by a local government on a new development project to help pay for establishing new or improving existing public streets and roads. The streets and roads must be included in a community's Comprehensive Plan. The fee must directly address the increased demand on that road created by the development. For multifamily developments near frequent transit service routes, the idea is that many residents and visitors are able to utilize the public transit system, thereby reducing the impact of the development on public streets and roads.

Currently the City of Olympia collects Transportation, Park and School Impact Fees, but does not collect Fire Impact Fees. The Olympia School District establishes the School Impact Fee, which are collected by the City at the time of permit and then directed to the District.

January 2021 Transportation Impact Fees (rounded to the nearest dollar)

- **Lacey:** \$610-\$3,989 per dwelling unit. Varies according to unit type with detached single-family dwellings having the highest fees.
- **Olympia:** \$728-\$3,219 per dwelling unit. Varies according to unit type with detached single-family dwellings having the highest fees.
- **Tumwater:** \$497-\$3,919 per dwelling unit. Varies according to unit type with detached single-family dwellings having the highest fees. Assisted living facilities have a fee of \$439 per bed.

3.b. Allow deferral of impact fee payments for desired unit types.

New development impacts existing municipal and community investments, and impact fees are a way to ensure new development pays their fair share. Impact fees may be delayed, but they must be paid before the impact is realized. Delaying payment of such fees allows a developer building desired unit types to spread the costs of a development over a longer period of time. State law already requires the Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater to establish a system for deferring impact fee payments for small, single-family residential developments. This action would expand the deferral program to developments with desired unit types.

Desired unit types depend on the neighborhood or policy context and could include defining the type of building (courtyard apartment or manufactured home, for example), the need for income-restricted units, units of a certain size, or units containing a certain number of bedrooms.

See also Action 1.c. regarding fee waivers.

3.c. Reduce setbacks and increase lot coverage/impervious area standards.

Modest reductions in front setback standards can help to expand possible building footprint area. In dense urban environments, the opportunity to build a firewall up to the side property line allows greater flexibility and expansion of the possible building envelope. Overly ambitious impervious area standards can also be detrimental to desired infill housing development and limit achievement of maximum allowed units.

3.d. Reduce minimum lot sizes.

Like increasing minimum residential densities, reducing minimum lot sizes allows more dwelling units to be built per acre of land, can reduce the cost of each housing unit, increases the likelihood of public transit ridership, improves a neighborhood's walkability, and reduces the per housing unit cost of providing urban services (water, sewer, garbage, etc.). For low-density developments like single-family neighborhoods, it also allows for smaller and low-maintenance yards.

3.e. Relax ground floor retail.

While a mix of uses can be useful for neighborhoods, especially along main streets, many municipalities require retail uses in the ground floors of all new multifamily residential projects. This may oversupply the local retail and office market, reducing the financial feasibility of projects with space that is less profitable to developers. Strategically applying ground-floor retail requirements to essential streets or blocks can limit the barrier to housing development.

3.f. Require minimum residential densities

Washington's Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that communities within designated urban growth areas allow for urban densities. While a specific density isn't specified by GMA, veteran Washington planners often mention four dwelling units per acre as the minimum urban density, though closer to seven units has been shown to support transit service. Nevertheless, growing municipalities recognize higher densities reduce the per-household cost of providing urban service. While the real estate development market will in many cases render minimum residential densities unnecessary, setting a minimum density can be critical to achieving growth and community development goals and policies.

The purpose of establishing minimum densities in zoning is to ensure that a sufficient level of development occurs to support transit use, walkability, infrastructure investments, local retail or other goals. Applying minimum density standards around high-capacity transit stations and other well-served transit nodes or corridors has gained traction over the past decade.

3.g. Allow third-party review of building permits for development projects.

While retaining control of issuing building permits, a city may find third-party reviews helpful for maintaining good customer service and ensuring reviews are timely as demand for reviews increase or the permit counter is short-staffed. Third-party reviews may also be employed if expedited review policies are established.

3.h. Simplify land use designation maps in the comprehensive plan to help streamline the rezoning process.

Development must be consistent with a community's comprehensive plan; broad land use categories in the comprehensive plan provide the vision while more precise land use zones provide the implementation framework. Land use designations that are too specific in a comprehensive plan may require a developer to apply for a comprehensive plan amendment in addition to a zone change. Because comprehensive plan amendments are typically considered only once a year, this can slow the permitting process down substantially.

- **Lacey:** 33 land use designations in the Comprehensive Plan implemented by 33 land use zones.
- **Olympia:** 15 future land use designations in the Comprehensive Plan implemented by 33 land use zones.
- **Tumwater:** 19 future land use designations in the Comprehensive Plan implemented by 19 land use zones.

3.i. Reduce parking requirements for residential uses, including for multifamily developments near frequent transit routes.

Because parking can be expensive to install or take up valuable site area, reducing parking associated with new development or redevelopment can lower overall development costs. Reducing parking requirements can result in increased density and be an appropriate trade-off when the development is near transit routes that receive frequent service. Additionally, fewer residents may be likely to own multiple vehicles in areas within walking distance of frequent bus service or neighborhood centers.

3.j. Expand the multifamily tax exemption to make it available in all transit corridors.

The Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE) program is authorized by state law to stimulate residential construction within targeted areas. The Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater have each established a multifamily tax exemption (MFTE) program and utilize the program for specific areas of their respective communities where they desire a more urban residential or mixed-use pattern of development. The target areas as of January 2021 are:

- **Lacey:** Applies to the Woodland District.
- **Olympia:** Generally applies to downtown Olympia and portions of Harrison Avenue and State/Fourth Avenues.
- **Tumwater:** Generally applies to the Brewery District, Capitol Boulevard Corridor, Tumwater Town Center, and the Littlerock Road Subarea.

Opening the program to transit corridors can lead to more units being constructed in areas with low transportation costs and more units – at least for a time – affordable to low-income households.

Upon approval of qualified projects, Olympia may exempt the value of the new residential portion of the assessed property value from taxation for a specified period of time. There is an 8-year exemption, and a 12-year exemption for projects where at least 20 percent of the units are rented or sold to low or moderate income families, defined as having an income less than 115% of area median income. The

Thurston County Assessor determines the amount to exempt based on the improvement created through new residential construction or rehabilitation.

Most of the MFTE projects in the City have occurred in downtown and have used the 8-year MFTE. The MFTE program has been available downtown for over 20 years as the City has long tried to stimulate residential construction there to meet urban density, transit and other goals. The 8-year MFTE began to be used in 2014 as the pace of multifamily construction picked up following the recession. The City's first 12-year MFTE project, Merritt Manor on Martin Way, was completed in 2020.

The MFTE doesn't give a developer any money directly; it merely exempts a portion of the increase in assessed value of the property from taxation for a specified time period.

For more information, see [RCW 84.14](#).

3.k. Review fees/regulations to identify housing cost reductions

According to a 2019 housing memorandum prepared by PNW Economics, LLC and LDC, Inc. for the Washington State Department of Commerce, one of the factors leading to underproduction of housing throughout the State are complex, layered regulations that make development more costly and prone to risk (Issues Affecting Housing Availability and Affordability). When demand for housing is high but supply remains low – as our region is experiencing – housing costs increase for renters and potential buyers across the board. Thus, increasing the supply of housing for all income levels will play a role in stabilizing home prices across the board.

The issue of regulatory barriers to housing is consistently identified by local housing producers – both in the private and non-profit sectors - to stifle development. On August 12, 2019, the City of Olympia Land Use & Environment Committee held two study sessions with local producers of housing to better understand which potential City actions might effectively stimulate additional housing construction. The two study sessions focused on low-income housing (below 80 percent AMI) and moderate-income housing (80-120 percent AMI), respectively. Following the study sessions, the Committee held additional discussion at its September 19, 2019, meeting and directed staff to recommend specific tools that the City can focus on to address housing costs.

At this time the staff are working through an approved of regulations and fees that have the highest potential to address the costs of producing housing for moderate-income households:

- Phase 1: street connectivity, frontage improvement thresholds, downtown sidewalk standards, private streets in manufactured home parks.
- Phase 2: Increase flexibility in the permit process; street classification standards; definitions of change of use or density.
- Phase 3: regional stormwater approaches and retrofit requirements.

In the future, the Land Use Committee will also consider potential specific, direct incentives for housing production.

3.l. Consult with Washington State Department of Transportation as part of the SEPA review process to reduce appeals based on impacts to the transportation element for residential, multifamily, or mixed-use projects.

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) provides citizens with a process for challenge decisions made by jurisdictions and government agencies. While an important tool for holding government accountable, SEPA appeals can slow down projects, adding time and costs to the approval process.

HB 1923 – passed into law in 2019 – recognized that SEPA appeals add cost to infill and affordable housing projects while having minimal impact on transportation systems. The law provides cities with an option to protect SEPA decisions from appeal based on impacts to the transportation element of the environment when:

- The approved residential, multifamily, or mixed-use project is consistent with the adopted transportation plan or transportation element of the comprehensive plan.
- The required impact fees and/or traffic and parking impacts are clearly mitigated under another ordinance.
- Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) determines the project would not present significant adverse impacts to the state-owned transportation system.

Consultation with WSDOT as part of the SEPA review process can help streamline the development process. For residential, multifamily, and mixed-use projects that do not meet the criteria above, the right to appeal the SEPA decision is maintained.

For more information, See [RCW 43.21C.500](#).

3.m. Explore allowing medium density housing around Neighborhood Centers.

Olympia’s Comprehensive Plan identifies locations throughout the City for Neighborhood Centers. These are small walk and transit-friendly activity clusters within neighborhoods that serve the day-to-day retail and service needs of local residents and foster community interaction.

Olympia’s neighborhood centers are in various stages, from booming to completely undeveloped. In 2015, the Olympia Planning Commission conducted a study and found one of the key barriers to fulfillment of this vision is not enough customers living within a ½ mile to support business activity. (As a rule of thumb, a small convenience food store needs 1,000 households within a ½ mile to be sustained.)

A policy in the Comprehensive Plan provides that medium-density housing types may be located in or near neighborhood centers. Making this change would require further analysis, a public process and Council decision to change zoning regulations. The Planning Commission plans to take this up later in 2021-22.

3.n. Process short plats administratively

Short subdivisions, also called “short plats,” are defined in [RCW 58.17.020\(6\)](#). “Short subdivision” is the division or redivision of land into four or fewer lots, tracts, parcels, sites or divisions for the purpose of sale, lease or transfer of ownership. Cities, towns and Growth Management counties may increase the number of lots to a maximum of nine within urban growth areas. This means that these developments may be administratively approved instead of needing to go through a more lengthy subdivision process.

Consistent with established legal requirements, administrative approvals can improve the clarity, speed and consistency of the review process, which in turn encourages new housing construction by reducing potential confusion or perception of risk among developers as well as lowering their administrative carrying costs.

3.o. Offer developers density and/or height incentives for desired unit types.

Increasing height limits or the number of dwelling units per acre can provide an incentive for developers to include desired unit types. Desired unit types depend on the neighborhood or policy context and could include defining the type of building (courtyard apartment or manufactured home, for example), the need for income-restricted units, units of a certain size, or units containing a certain number of bedrooms.

3.p. Fix code so that Transfer of Development (TDR) bonus in R4-8 is a bonus not a restriction Olympia’s code is written in such a way that to achieve the maximum allowed density in the R4-8 zone (8 units per acre) the developer must purchase a development right from the county’s TDR program. The TDR program is meant to provide a bonus for the purpose of focusing growth in the urban areas while preserving land in the rural areas of the county. It is not meant to establish a restriction on allowed density. This provision is also confusing in regard to maximum density allowed in R4-8.

3.q. Maximize use of SEPA exemptions for residential and infill development.

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review process is intended to ensure government actions have fully taken into consideration the environment before a decision is made. Actions that will likely result in an adverse impact on the environment must go through a more rigorous review (an environmental impact statement or EIS). Some projects are exempt from the SEPA review process because their impact on the environment is generally considered to be minimal and not adverse, but developments must still meet environmental standards. Single-family and multifamily developments with four or fewer units are automatically exempt from review under SEPA, and state law allows cities to adopt more flexible exemptions. The Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater may exempt single-family developments with up to 30 units and multifamily developments with up to 60 units from SEPA review.

Table A-1. Adopted SEPA Exemptions as of January 2021

Exemptions	Development Type	
	Single-Family	Multifamily
Allowed per SEPA	30 units	60 units
Lacey	4 units	60 units
Olympia	9 units	No exemption
Tumwater	9 units	60 units

Infill Exemptions

In order to accommodate infill development, the Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater may adopt SEPA exemptions for infill development to help fill in urban growth areas.

To qualify for the infill exemption:

- An EIS must already be issued for the comprehensive plan or the city must prepare an EIS that considers the proposal's use or density/intensity in the exempted area.
- The density of the area to be infilled must be roughly equal to or lower than what the adopted comprehensive plan calls for.
- The development must be residential, mixed-use, or non-retail commercial development. Commercial development that exceeds 65,000 square feet does not qualify for the exemption.
- Impacts to the environment from the proposed development must be adequately addressed by existing regulations.

If a city takes action to adopt an infill exemption before April 1, 2023, the city's action cannot be appealed through SEPA or the courts.

Planned Actions

Up front review and analysis of impacts to the environment can help streamline the process for developments. Individual developments projects associated with an adopted plan (subarea plan or master planned development, for example) can be exempted from further SEPA review when a threshold determination or EIS has been issued for the adopted plan. The threshold determination or EIS for the adopted plan must detail the project-level impacts of the proposed development, thereby forgoing the need for review when the specific project applies for permitting.

For more information, see:

- [RCW 43.21C.229](#) (infill exemptions).
- [RCW 43.21C.440](#) (planned actions).

3.r. Complete a subarea plan for the Capital Mall High Density Neighborhood area

Olympia's Comprehensive Plan establishes a vision for three High Density Neighborhoods: Downtown, the Pacific/Martin/Lilly triangle and the Capital Mall area. A significant amount of Olympia's new housing growth will be concentrated into these areas, mixed in with new and existing commercial. These are to be highly active neighborhoods where people can meet their needs without traveling too far or needing a car.

The City has taken steps to bring downtown closer to this vision. In 2017 the City adopted a Downtown Strategy outlining actions the city and partners can take to move the community's vision for downtown forward. Helped along by a package of development incentives over 700 new housing units have been created in downtown since 2015, with hundreds more in the predevelopment phase. Additional work needs to be done in the other two high density neighborhood areas to make the vision a reality.

The Capital Mall area is a regional shopping center, which also includes one of the area's best balances of jobs within walking distance of medium-density housing. While still economically viable, the area currently has many vacant storefronts within the surrounding strip malls as well as many surface parking lots that rarely fill to capacity. Although the area has a land use pattern that is more auto-oriented than pedestrian or transit oriented, it does have transit service frequencies of 15 minutes or better and one of the highest board counts along the entire network of urban corridors. Sidewalks and mature landscaping also make walking here more pleasant than most auto-oriented commercial areas.

The vision is for the Capital Mall HDN is to evolve into a complete urban neighborhood with a mix of jobs, housing and services. Elements of the subarea plan may include:

- Revising regulations and incentives to encourage housing that is affordable for a range of incomes, including low income households
- Transportation-efficient land use development strategies that maximize housing choices, job access and travel options
- Focus on improving equity through greater access to opportunity for low income residents, who are disproportionately people of color
- Advancement of climate change adaptation strategies
- Focus on local sense of place and district character with appropriate design, district branding, and engagement
- Strategic infrastructure investments (#3.u)
- A SEPA planned action (#3q)
- Plan for adaptive reuse of commercial space (#3s)
- Reduced parking requirements (#3.1)
- Form based code (#4.i)

3.s. Develop a plan for adapting vacant commercial space into housing.

New technology – and the current COVID-19 pandemic – are changing how people work and shop. The increase in telework decreases the need for office space. More online shopping increases the need for warehouses but decreases the need for brick-and-mortar retail space.

Planning for converting vacant commercial office and retail space with low market value into residential use can meet the needs of property owners losing rents and households needing housing. A streamlined permitting process can help transition vacant commercial space into needed residential units.

3.t. Expand allowance of residential tenant improvements without triggering land use requirements.

For improvement projects that add housing but have minimal neighborhood impacts – such as accessory dwelling units (ADUs) or conversions from single-family to a duplex or triplex, – waiving building, engineering, and land use requirements can reduce the cost to the property owner or developer. Before implementing, cities should consider the impact of waiving requirements for parking, frontage improvements, landscaping improvements, etc. as waving some standards may not be appropriate given the context of the neighborhood.

3.u. Identify strategically placed but underdeveloped properties and determine what barriers exist to developing desired housing types.

It is not always clear why a property especially suitable for residential development is underutilized. Identifying existing barriers can lead to a better understanding of how existing codes, infrastructure, and market conditions affect the viability of development projects that contain desired unit types. Desired

unit types depend on the neighborhood or policy context and could include defining the type of building (four-story building or courtyard apartments, for example), the need for income-restricted units, units of a certain size, or units containing a certain number of bedrooms. Identifying barriers may lead to the city making investments in roads or utilities and present an opportunity to capture the value of city investments that spur private development (see Action 6.e). Barrier identification may also lead to changes to improve/streamline city codes, policies, and processes.

3.v. Increase minimum residential densities.

Increasing minimum residential densities allows more dwelling units to be built per acre of land, can reduce the cost of each housing unit, increases the likelihood of public transit ridership, improves a neighborhood's walkability, and reduces the per housing unit cost of providing urban services (water, sewer, garbage, etc.).

3.w. Integrate or adjust floor area ratio standards.

Floor area ratio (FAR) is the ratio of a building's total floor area to the size of the property it sits on. Using FAR in place of density limits provides flexibility for developers to utilize more units and unit types. FAR can be used in place of density limits and when larger buildings are desired but using both standards (FAR and density limits) can result in limiting the number of units developed as well as the size of buildings constructed. FAR standards can also be paired with design guidelines to ensure the building form is consistent with existing or desired development.

Strategy 4: Increase the variety of housing choices.

4.a. Allow accessory dwelling units (ADU's) in all residential zones

Accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are small dwelling units that are either attached to the primary dwelling or in a detached structure (DADU) that is typically placed to the side or rear of the primary dwelling. ADUs have long been an important option for communities to add variety and housing choice in single-family neighborhoods.

ADUs can provide low-cost housing in established neighborhoods. They provide dwelling opportunities for extended family members and small households that prefer a neighborhood setting over apartment living. ADUs can also offer a critical source of monthly income for home owners when rented out.

Cities and towns with a population greater than 20,000 are required to allow ADUs in single family zones ([RCW 43.63A.215](#)).

See 4.b and 4.c below.

4.b. Simplify ADU requirements

By simplifying ADU standards cities can make it easier for community residents to include an ADU on their lot. ADU's are more likely to be built if:

- Attached or detached units are allowed
- They do not require an additional parking space.
- Owner occupancy on the property is not required.
- Detached units are allowed adequate height and floor area for design flexibility.
- ADU and main house share utility connection.

Since adoption of the Housing Code Options ordinance in 2020, all of these elements have been implemented in Olympia.

See 4.a and 4.c.

4.c. Adopt pre-approved plan sets for ADU's

See 4.a and 4.b above. Plan sets are pre-approved to meet the City's building code. This help expedite the review process and eliminates design costs for the user. This is one thing cities can do to make it easier to build ADU's.

See 4.a and 4.b.

4.d. Allow group homes in all residential zones and commercial zones that allow residential units

Generally, a group is a residence shared by multiple unrelated persons with common needs. Group homes are a source of housing for people with disabilities, seniors, those undergoing treatment for a variety of medical concerns, children in foster care, partially released offenders reintegrating into society, etc.

The increase in the numbers of group homes desiring to locate in residential areas has been controversial, as have municipal attempts to regulate their location. As a result, federal and state laws have attempted to address the discrimination these homes have experienced, primarily in urban settings. In Washington, adult family homes must be a permitted use in all areas zoned for residential or commercial purposes, including areas zoned for single-family dwellings ([RCW 70.128.140.2](#)).

4.e. Recognize modular/ manufactured housing as a viable form of housing construction

Manufactured homes provide some of the most affordable, no subsidized forms of housing in the county, particularly for seniors. These homes are prefabricated in a factory and brought to a lot where they are attached to a foundation or otherwise anchored down in an approved fashion. In Olympia, manufactured homes can be found on individual lots in a neighborhood or in a manufactured home park.

See also Actions 1.n regarding allowing manufactured home parks (MHP's), 1.p regarding a preservation program for MHP's, 2.d regarding tenant opportunity to purchase, and 2.i regarding rezones.

4.f. Increase the types of housing allowed in low-density residential zones (duplexes, triplexes, etc.)

As previously discussed, zoning regulations may unintentionally bar disadvantaged populations, including people of color, from neighborhoods due to restrictions on the size and types of housing that are affordable and accessible such to them. When housing in low-density residential zones is generally limited to single-family homes, the zone does not meet community needs for ensuring affordable housing options are available to a wider array of households. Examples of housing types that may be appropriate for low-density zones include but are not limited to:

- Duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes.
- Townhouses.
- Accessory dwelling units.
- Courtyard apartments.

Not every low-density zone is the same, and some types of housing are more appropriate than others. Cities need to determine the most appropriate housing types for low-density residential zones.

4.g. Allow more housing types in commercial zones.

Like low-density residential zones, commercial zones may benefit from more diversity in housing types, especially as changes in consumer shopping habits and employer work policies (telework, for example) open opportunities to convert commercial space into housing. Examples of housing types that may be appropriate for commercial zones include but are not limited to:

- Live/work units.
- Multifamily units.
- Townhouses.
- Courtyard apartments.

Not all housing types are appropriate in commercial zones, and analysis will need to be done to determine the most appropriate housing types for a commercial zone.

4.h. Allow single-room occupancy (SRO) housing in all multifamily zones.

Single room occupancy housing are rentals units consisting of small rooms intended for a single person to occupy. Kitchen and bathroom facilities are typically shared, as are other amenities offered by the housing facility. SROs and other types of micro housing (dormitories, small efficiency dwelling units, etc.) offer affordable options at both subsidized and market rates. Such uses are appropriate for and can integrate well in multifamily zones.

4.i. Adopt a form-based code to allow more housing types and protect the integrity of existing residential neighborhoods.

In simplest terms, a form-based approach to regulating development emphasizes predictable built results and a high-quality public realm by using physical form and design rather than separation of uses

and density limits. This approach uses prescriptive standards for building massing, layout, orientation and design to help achieve a community's specific vision. It places a big emphasis on the design of streetscapes and how private development looks from the street.

Form-based codes (FBCs) were created in response to regulations that placed more of a concern with controlling land use than shaping the physical form of communities. Whereas a strict form-based code has little or no land use restrictions, many zoning codes for urban Washington communities now function as a hybrid of strict FBC and traditional zoning code by integrating stronger form-based design regulations with some use based regulations. FBCs can help add housing by letting the market determine how many units of what size are feasible.

Form-based codes are most useful in mixed use zones where the widest variety of uses are already allowed and encouraged.

4.j. Strategically allow live/work units in nonresidential zones.

A live/work unit is a single dwelling unit consisting of both a commercial/office space and a residential component that is occupied by the same resident who has the unit as their primary dwelling. The intent is to provide both affordable living and business space for a resident/business owner. The configuration of the live/work unit can vary:

- Live-within. The workplace and living space completely overlap.
- Live-above. The workplace is below the living space with complete separation between the two.
- Live-behind. The workplace is in front of the living space with complete separation between the two possible.
- Live-in-front. The workplace is behind the living space (typically a single-family dwelling) with some overlap between the two possible.

Although home occupations are a type of live/work unit, the emphasis here is on a more intensive nonresidential component (size, traffic generation, employees on site, etc.) that may not be appropriate to classify as a home occupation. Live/work units may also be appropriate in residential zones. In either case, cities will need to conduct additional analysis to determine the locations and types of uses appropriate for live/work units.

Strategy 5: Continually build on resources, collaboration, and public understanding to improve implementation of housing strategies.

5.a. Identify and develop partnerships with organizations that provide or support low-income, workforce, and senior housing as well as other populations with unique housing needs.

Both for-profit and non-profit agencies provide or support low-income, workforce, and senior households. They often have expertise to deliver programs and housing the Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater do not have, as well as access to funding streams unavailable to the cities. Identifying shared vision and goals can help each organization leverage funding and improve household access to assistance.

5.b. Fund Housing Navigators to assist households, renters, homeowners, and landlords with housing issues.

Housing issues are complex, and so are the resources available to households and landlords. When problems arise or a party needs to find information, having a designated resource to navigate issues and identify resources (development funding, tax assistance, housing opportunities, legal aid, weatherization programs, etc.) gives people more tools to reach their goals.

5.c. Establish a rental registration program to improve access to data and share information with landlords.

Understanding how many dwelling units are being rented, the types of units being rented, and the cost of rent is important information needed to understand the impacts on landlords and tenants of many of the actions in this plan. It also provides the Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater with an easy way to reach out to landlords and tenants, who are both important stakeholders when enacting many of the actions in this plan. This action is particularly suited to being implemented at the regional level and may be appropriate for the cities to develop through the regional Housing Council. Doing so would ensure the same data is collected across the jurisdictions effectively and economically.

5.d. Conduct education and outreach around city programs that support affordable housing.

Providing the public and developers information about affordable housing programs can help households in need find assistance and developers identify resources for building desired unit types. Desired unit types depend on the neighborhood or policy context and could include defining the type of building (triplex or single-room occupancy building, for example), the need for income-restricted units, units of a certain size, or units containing a certain number of bedrooms. Education and outreach can also invite community dialogue on the need for diverse housing options in the community.

Strategy 6: Establish a permanent source of funding for low-income housing.

6.a. Establish an affordable housing sales tax.

Beginning in 2020, cities may establish a 0.1 percent affordable housing sales tax by legislative authority or by voter approval. At least 60 percent of the revenue must be used for one or more of the following:

- Constructing affordable housing (new construction or retrofitting an existing building).
- Constructing facilities providing housing-related services.
- Constructing mental and behavioral health-related facilities.
- Funding the operations and maintenance costs of the above three projects.

Current Status:

- **Olympia:** established an affordable housing sales tax in 2018, referred to as the “Home Fund.” Approximately 65 percent of funds are dedicated to construction projects and 35 percent to housing program operations. Must be re-authorized by voters in 2028.
- **Lacey:** has not established an affordable housing sales tax.
- **Tumwater:** has not established a sales tax.
- **Thurston County:** has not established an affordable housing sales tax.

Olympia’s Home Fund Levy that was passed in 2018 will provide more than \$2 million in new revenue each year to develop and sustain supportive housing and affordable housing in our community. 65 percent of Home Fund dollars (around 1.3 million in 2019) are dedicated to construction of affordable housing and shelter. The other 35 percent will go to operations of homeless and housing programs.

So far, the City of Olympia has invested in two significant projects to address this need. At 2828 Martin Way the Low Income Housing Institute has a 64 unit supportive housing facility under construction. It also contains a 60-bed shelter on the ground floor. On the west side of town, the City partnered with the Family Support Center to help finance a 65-unit facility targeting homeless families and victims of domestic violence. This facility is in the planning and permitting process. The City will make a third Home Fund award this year, with more in the future.

Potential:

If the Cities of Lacey and Tumwater had enacted an affordable housing sales tax in 2019, the total available to serve low-income households, including Olympia’s enacted tax would be close to \$5 million (Table A-4). Thurston County can also establish the affordable housing sales tax.

Table A-2. Potential affordable housing funding from maximum affordable housing sales tax in 2019

Jurisdiction	2019 Taxable Retail Sales	Potential Affordable Housing Funds
Lacey	\$1.5 billion	\$1.5 million
Olympia	\$2.4 billion	\$2.4 million
Tumwater	\$0.9 billion	\$0.9 million
TOTAL (cities only)	\$4.8 billion	\$4.8 million
TOTAL (countywide)	\$6.2 billion	\$6.2 million

Note: Taxable retail sales are rounded.

Source: Washington State Department of Revenue, [Taxable Retail Sales](#).

For more information, see [RCW 82.14.530](#).

6.b. Take advantage of local revenue sharing program established by HB1406 (portion of State sales tax for affordable housing).

HB 1406 allows cities to receive a portion of the State's existing sales and use tax to fund affordable housing programs and services. The Cities of Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater have all taken advantage of this and as of 2021 pool the funds, which are then directed by the Regional Housing Council.

The [Regional Housing Council \(RHC\)](#) was created by interlocal agreement in 2020 with the primary purpose to leverage resources and partnerships through policies and projects promoting equitable access to safe and affordable housing in Thurston County. The RHC will consider issues specifically related to funding a regional response to homelessness and affordable housing and how to better coordinate existing funding programs to implement the county's [Five-Year Homeless Crisis Response Plan](#) and increase affordable housing options.

6.c. Use Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Section 108 loans and other federal resources for affordable housing.

The City of Olympia receives federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). According to the HUD website, the CDBG Program provides federal funds to "develop viable communities by providing decent housing, a suitable living environment and opportunities to expand economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons."

The City maintains a five-year strategic housing plan that outlines the priorities for CDBG grant funding. Each year, the City re-evaluates the plan to reflect the needs of the community. The Annual Action Plan serves as the blueprint for how Olympia will invest CDBG funds to address high-priority local needs. The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) provides information on the activities funded within a program year.

The City has identified the following strategies for the five-year Consolidated Plan:

- Affordable Housing
- Economic Development
- Public Facilities and Improvements
- Social Services
- Land Acquisition

The Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program (Section 108) provides Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) recipients with the ability to leverage their annual grant allocation to access low-cost, flexible financing for economic development, housing, public facility, and infrastructure projects. This can be a source of low-cost, long-term financing for economic and community development projects.

However, using Section 108 does reduce the city's annual CDBG allotment and it's complicated to manage, so careful consideration needs to be made before making use of this program.

6.d. Develop a comprehensive funding strategy for affordable housing that addresses both sources of funding and how the funds should be spent.

Without a comprehensive funding strategy, it will be difficult to ensure dollars earmarked for developing affordable housing in the community are used to their full effect and meet the greatest need. A comprehensive funding strategy takes into consideration how the funds can be used, whether they can be leveraged to obtain other funding (grants, loans, etc.), and the types of projects the funding can support. This action is particularly suited to being implemented at the regional level and may be appropriate for the cities to develop through the Regional Housing Council.

6.e. Use value capture to generate and reinvest in neighborhoods experiencing increased private investment (with a focus on areas with planned or existing transit).

Value capture is a type of public financing that recovers some or all the value public infrastructure generates for private landowners. When roads are improved, water and sewer lines extended, or new parks or public amenities developed, property values tend to increase. Value capture is best planned for from the outset of a project and can include developer contributions and special taxes and fees.

Specifically, tax increment financing (TIF), is a tool used by municipal governments to stimulate economic development in a targeted geographical area. TIFs are used to finance redevelopment projects or other investments using the anticipation of future tax revenue resulting from new development. At the time a TIF district is established, the base amount of property tax revenue is recorded using the status quo before improvements. The assumption is that property values will then rise due to the redevelopment and lead to an increase in actual property tax receipts above the base. While the base amount of property tax revenue continues to fund government services, the increase in tax revenue is used to pay bonds and reimburse investors and is often captured as city revenue and allocated toward other projects.

TIF's can be used to stimulate affordable housing. In some cities, TIFs are created for the sole purpose of funding development of affordable housing. In these cases, affordable housing is the capital investment intended to fuel community revitalization. In other cities, affordable housing is funded as a secondary activity using the revenues generated from the primary capital improvements (or bond proceeds raised in anticipation of those revenues).

A recent bill (HB1189) passed during the 2021 Legislative Session would allow TIF's to be used by local governments in Washington. At the time of this report the bill has been sent to the Governor for signature.

6.f. Establish an affordable housing loan program.

One method for supporting non-profit and low income housing developers would be for the City to provide bridge loans for purchasing or developing property. These could be used when the organization needs a short-term loan to meet current obligations by providing immediate cash flow.

Typically bridge loans provided by banks have relatively high interest rates, and are usually backed by some form of collateral, such as real estate or inventory. The City could offer the loans at a low interest rate. The purpose would be to help ensure low income affordable housing projects remain viable. There are many considerations to be made, and more research is needed to determine if and how such a program could be used in Olympia.

6.g. Establish a regional housing trust fund to provide dedicated funding for affordable housing. Housing trust funds are distinct funds established by local governments to receive funding to support housing affordability. It is not an endowment that operates from earnings but acts as a repository, preventing funds from being coopted for other purposes. Establishing a housing trust fund is particularly suited to being implemented at the regional level and may be appropriate for the cities to develop through the Regional Housing Council.

6.h. Establish an affordable housing property tax levy to finance affordable housing for very low-income households.

The Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater may impose a property tax levy up to \$0.50 per \$1,000 of a property’s assessed value to fund affordable housing. The levy must be used for low-income households.

The levy, which lasts for up to 10 years, can only be enacted if:

- The city declares an emergency exists concerning the availability of affordable housing for households served by the levy.
- A majority of voters approve it.
- The city adopts a financial plan for spending the money.

If a property tax levy were enacted at the maximum rate of \$0.50 per \$1,000 of assessed value, homeowners can expect their property taxes to go up. This amounts to \$175 per year for a home valued at \$350,000 (Table A-2). Households that rent can expect their monthly rent to increase on average between \$6.71 and \$11.91 each month, depending on the type of unit rented.

Table A-3. Additional costs to households with a \$0.50 per \$1,000 property tax levy

Owner-Occupied*		Renter-Occupied	
Assessed Value	Additional Property Taxes (annual)	Building Size	Additional Monthly Rent (average) per unit
\$350,000	\$175	Single-Family Dwelling	\$11.91
\$450,000	\$225	2-, 3-, and 4-plex units	\$9.04
\$550,000	\$275	5+ unit apartments	\$6.71

Note: Rates for owners only apply to detached single-family homes. Costs – which are rounded – are based on the 2017 total assessed value of all taxable non-exempt properties and are adjusted for inflation to 2020 dollars.

Source: Thurston County Assessor.

Thurston County also has the ability to establish a property tax levy. If both cities and Thurston County impose the levy, the last jurisdiction to receive voter approval for the levies must be reduced or eliminated so that the combined rate does not exceed the \$0.50 per \$1,00 of assessed property value.

If the Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater each enact the levy, nearly \$9.7 million could be collected for affordable housing in 2021 (Table A-3). If the tax levy were adopted countywide, more than \$30 million would be available to serve low-income households in 2021. This includes developing new housing, enabling affordable homeownership, and making home repairs.

Table A-4. Potential affordable housing funding from maximum property tax levy

Jurisdiction	2020 Assessed Property Values	Potential Affordable Housing Funds
Lacey	\$7.4 billion	\$3.7 million
Olympia	\$8.2 billion	\$4.1 million
Tumwater	\$3.9 billion	\$1.9 million
TOTAL (cities only)	\$19.5 billion	\$9.7 million
TOTAL (Countywide)	\$31.5 billion	\$31.5 million

Note: Values – which are rounded – are based on the 2020 total assessed value of taxable non-exempt properties. Potential affordable housing funds are based on the total assessment of all properties combined.

Source: Thurston County Assessor.

Property Tax Levies

- **Lacey:** has not established a property tax levy.
- **Olympia:** has not established a property tax levy.
- **Tumwater:** has not established a property tax levy.
- **Thurston County:** has not established a property tax levy.

For more information, see [RCW 84.52.105](#).

Appendix B.

Considered Actions

In developing this plan, many actions were considered, though not all were included. This appendix provides a full list of the actions considered in the plan’s development. Where appropriate, explanations for why an action was excluded are included. Actions were developed and refined over six months and the wording may not match previous versions.

Action Status (Plan Reference)	Action	Explanation for Exclusion
Included (1.a)	Donate or lease surplus or underutilized jurisdiction-owned land to developers that provide low-income housing.	
Excluded	Create shovel-ready housing developments that can be handed off to a developer to construct.	Action is out of scale with what our region can reasonably accomplish. Cities do not have the budgets or expertise to perform this action.
Excluded	Purchase property with the intent to donate or lease to developers that provide income-restricted affordable housing.	Combined with Action 1.a.
Included (3.a)	Offer developers density and/or height incentives for desired unit types.	

Action Status (Plan Reference)	Action	Explanation for Exclusion
Included (1.b)	Require PRDs/PUDs for low-density development and include standards for including low-income housing.	
Excluded	Make regulations and permit processing more predictable, to remove some uncertainty for both builders and lenders.	Action not specific enough. Other actions more specifically address the need to improve predictability of regulations and permit processing.
Excluded	Allow third-party review and approval of development projects (anytime OR when cities are backlogged).	See Action 3.b.
Included (3.b)	Allow third-party review of building permits for development projects.	
Excluded	Adopt a single development code for Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater, and the UGAs to make regulations and permit processing more predictable.	Each community has a different identity with a desire for different standards.
Excluded	Waive reviews for energy code compliance when a project receives a green building certification.	It does not appear that a green building certification actually makes housing more affordable vs. complying with energy code. In the right market conditions, may be an incentive to buy.
Excluded	Require shot clocks for permit processing.	State law already requires timelines for review, and each city is able to accomplish their reviews in a timely manner.
Included (1.c)	Adopt a "Notice of Intent to Sell" ordinance for multifamily developments.	
Included (1.d)	Provide funding for the Housing Authority of Thurston County and other non-profit organizations to income-restricted units proposed to be converted to market rate housing.	
Included (2.a)	Provide displaced tenants with relocation assistance.	
Implemented	With major comprehensive plan updates, confirm land is suitably zoned for development of all housing types.	
Excluded	On a regular basis, hold a series of community meetings to discuss how housing and zoning regulations affect equity goals.	See Action 5.a.

Action Status (Plan Reference)	Action	Explanation for Exclusion
Included (4.a)	Increase the types of housing allowed in low-density residential zones (duplexes, triplexes, etc.)	
Excluded	Allow more housing types in commercial and industrial zones.	See Action 4.c.
Included (4.b)	Allow more housing types in commercial zones.	
Included (4.c)	Adopt a form-based code for mixed-use zones to allow more housing types and protect the integrity of existing residential neighborhoods.	
Included (3.c)	Develop a plan for adapting vacant commercial space into housing.	
Included (3.d)	Expand allowance of residential tenant improvements without triggering land use requirements.	
Excluded	Prior to finalizing a draft for public review, vet comprehensive plans and development code changes with the development community to ensure desired housing types and locations are supported by market conditions.	See Action 1.e.
Included (1.e)	As part of comprehensive plan and development code changes, include an evaluation of the impact such changes will have on housing affordability, especially for low-income households.	
Implemented	Recognize modular/manufactured housing as a viable form of housing construction.	
Excluded	Provide for a dynamic mix of residential land uses and zones in order to create a diverse mix of sites available for different housing types	This action is already implemented. .
Implemented	Simplify requirements for accessory dwelling units (ex: title notification, owner living on site, etc.).	

Action Status (Plan Reference)	Action	Explanation for Exclusion
Implemented	Allow accessory dwelling units in all residential zones.	
Excluded	Allow accessory dwelling units in commercial zones.	Not an issue that's ever been raised to staff; need to focus on actions that have real and lasting impacts.
Included (3.e)	Reduce parking requirements for residential uses, including for multifamily developments near frequent transit routes.	
Included (3.f)	Identify strategically placed but underdeveloped properties and determine what barriers exist to developing desired housing types.	
Excluded	Identify strategically placed properties where up zoning is appropriate.	see Action 3.f.
Implemented	Require minimum residential densities.	
Included (3.g)	Increase minimum residential densities.	
Included (3.h)	Reduce minimum lot sizes.	
Excluded	Support and plan for assisted housing opportunities using federal, state, or local aid.	Action not clear/specific enough
Excluded	Support diverse housing alternatives and ways for older adults and people with disabilities to remain in their homes and community as their housing needs change.	Action not specific enough. Other actions more specifically address the need to support diverse housing alternatives for seniors.
Excluded	Retain existing subsidized housing.	None of the cities have subsidized units at this time, so it is not an action they would pursue. Other actions can support other entities in retaining existing subsidized housing.
Excluded	Encourage new housing on transportation arterials and in areas near public transportation hubs.	Action not specific enough. See Actions 3.i and 3.e for actions that more specifically address the issue of housing near transportation facilities.

Action Status (Plan Reference)	Action	Explanation for Exclusion
Included (3.i)	Lower transportation impact fees for multifamily developments near frequent transit service routes.	
Excluded	Reduce parking requirements for multifamily developments near frequent transit routes.	Combined with Action 3.e.
Implemented	Allow group homes in all residential zones and commercial zones that allow residential uses.	
Excluded	Limit the density of group homes in residential areas to prevent concentration of such housing in any one area.	May create a hindrance to ensuring there is enough housing opportunities for seniors. There are nearly 150 adult family homes in Thurston County now; their concentration in any one area is not known to be an issue.
Included (1.f)	Provide funding for renovating and maintaining existing housing that serves low-income households or residents with disabilities.	
Excluded	Support programs to improve energy efficiency, health conditions and public recognition of improvements in low-income rental housing	Statewide need - not just a local need. Combined with Action 1.f.
Excluded	Fund programs that improve the energy efficiency and health conditions in low-income rental housing.	Combined with Action 1.f.
Excluded	Encourage self-help housing efforts and promote programs in which people gain home equity in exchange for work performed in renovation or construction.	Action not specific enough. See Action 1.p.
Included (1.p)	Partner with local trade schools to provide renovation and retrofit services for low-income households as part of on-the-job-training.	
Excluded	Establish a manufactured home park zone to promote their preservation.	See Action 2.c.
Included (2.c)	Rezone manufactured home parks to a manufactured home park zone to promote their preservation.	
Included (1.g)	Allow manufactured home parks in multifamily and commercial areas.	

Action Status (Plan Reference)	Action	Explanation for Exclusion
Included (1.h)	Provide funding for low-income and special needs residents to purchase housing through community land trusts.	
Excluded	Fund programs that prevent homelessness for persons returning to the community from institutional or other sheltered settings (including foster care).	Action better suited to the Thurston County Homeless Response Plan.
Excluded	Fund self-sufficiency and transitional housing programs that help break the cycle of homelessness.	Deals with a temporary/emergency housing situation better addressed through the Regional Housing Council and other, more targeted efforts to address homelessness.
Excluded	Provide funding to the Regional Housing Council for temporary emergency housing programs.	Deals with a temporary/emergency housing situation better addressed through the Regional Housing Council and other, more targeted efforts to address homelessness.
Implemented	Adopt design standards that assist new forms or high-density housing and promote infill.	
Included (4.d)	Allow single-room occupancy (SRO) housing in all multifamily zones.	
Included (4.e)	Strategically allow live/work units in nonresidential zones.	
Excluded	Promote PUD/PRD and cluster subdivisions.	See Action 5.a.
Implemented	Establish a multifamily tax exemption.	
Included (6.a)	Develop a comprehensive funding strategy for affordable housing that addresses both sources of funding and how the funds should be spent.	
Excluded	On a regular basis, evaluate the effectiveness of how the multifamily tax exemption is being used to further affordable housing goals.	
Included (6.b)	Establish an affordable housing property tax levy to finance affordable housing for very low-income households.	
Included (6.c)	Establish an affordable housing sales tax.	

Action Status (Plan Reference)	Action	Explanation for Exclusion
Included (3.j)	Expand the multifamily tax exemption to make it available in all transit corridors.	
Included (1.i)	Offer density bonuses for low-income housing.	
Excluded	Require developers to provide income-restricted units as part of low-density developments.	The Thurston Region does not have the market to implement this action. Requires a market evaluation before implementing.
Excluded	Require property owners to provide an affordable housing fee when building homes over a certain size.	The Thurston Region does not have the market to implement this action. Requires a market evaluation before implementing.
Excluded	Establish alternative development standards for affordable housing. (standards in the zoning code to support affordable housing)	Action not specific enough. See Action 1.j.
Included (1.j)	Define income-restricted housing as a different use from other forms of housing in the zoning code.	
Included (1.k)	Offer and/or expand fee waivers for low-income housing developments.	
Excluded	Expand fee waivers for affordable housing developments.	Combined w/ Action 1.k.
Included (3.k)	Allow deferral of impact fee payments for desired unit types.	
Included (1.l)	Require low-income housing units as part of new developments.	
Included (1.m)	Fund development projects that increase low-income housing through grants or loans.	
Included (6.d)	Establish a regional housing trust fund to provide dedicated funding for affordable housing.	
Excluded	Establish a local housing trust fund to provide dedicated funding for low-income housing.	Coordination at the regional scale will have more of an impact than developing individual plans.
Excluded	Create partnerships with local housing groups to increase affordable housing options for seniors and other populations with unique needs.	Combined w/ Action 5.c.

Action Status (Plan Reference)	Action	Explanation for Exclusion
Implemented	Make strategic investments in infrastructure expansion to reduce development costs.	
Included (3.l)	Simplify land use designation maps in the comprehensive plan to help streamline the permitting process.	
Excluded	Inventory housing units dedicated for seniors, low-income households, and ADA-accessible units.	Data should support the actions that result in change.
Excluded	Inventory substandard housing units (units with poor energy efficiency, indoor air quality/mold issues, etc.).	Data should support the actions that result in change.
Included (5.d)	Establish a rental registration program to improve access to data and share information with landlords.	
Excluded	Require the owners of rental properties to obtain a business license.	Data should support the actions that result in change.
Excluded	On a regular basis, inventory rental housing.	Data should support the actions that result in change.
Included (3.m)	Integrate or adjust floor area ratio standards.	
Implemented	Relax ground floor retail requirements to allow residential units.	
Implemented	Reduce setbacks and increase lot coverage/impervious area standards.	
Excluded	Maximize SEPA threshold exemptions for single-family and multifamily development proposals.	See Action 3.n.
Included (3.n)	Maximize use of SEPA threshold exemptions for residential and infill development.	
Excluded	Utilize SEPA exemptions to encourage infill development in urban growth areas	See Action 3.n.
Excluded	Create subarea plans with non-project environmental impact statements.	See Action 3.n.
Excluded	Develop SEPA-authorized "planned actions" to streamline permitting process in designated areas.	See Action 3.n.

Action Status (Plan Reference)	Action	Explanation for Exclusion
Included (3.o)	Consult with Washington State Department of Transportation as part of the SEPA review process to reduce appeals based on impacts to the transportation element for residential, multifamily, or mixed-use projects.	
Implemented	Process short plat applications administratively.	
Excluded	Process preliminary long plat applications that meet specific requirements administratively.	Can implement this but if even one person requests a public hearing, a public hearing must be held. May not be worth implementing if a public hearing is always anticipated and it has different noticing requirements from the norm (administrative headaches).
Excluded	Market available housing incentives.	See Action 5.a.
Excluded	Establish a foreclosure intervention counseling program.	Already existing programs that fill this need.
Included (1.n)	Establish a program to preserve and maintain healthy and viable manufactured home parks.	
Excluded	Require developers to provide relocation assistance when a manufactured home park cannot be preserved.	
Excluded	Help residents convert manufactured home parks into cooperatives.	See Action #63
Excluded	Adopt a just cause eviction ordinance.	See Action 2.g.
Included (2.d)	Adopt a “right to return” policy.	
Included (2.e)	Adopt short-term rental regulations to minimize impacts on long-term housing availability.	
Included (2.f)	Establish a down payment assistance program.	
Excluded	Establish a property tax assistance program for low-income homeowners.	This may not be in the cities’ purview.
Excluded	Establish a property tax assistance program for homeowners with disabilities.	This may not be in the cities’ purview.

Action Status (Plan Reference)	Action	Explanation for Exclusion
Excluded	Require an impact analysis for new housing and land use proposals.	This action will lead to an increase in housing costs. Transportation impact analyses are already required where needed.
Excluded	Require subsidized housing be integrated with unsubsidized housing.	See Action 1.I.
Excluded	Develop and implement an education and outreach plan for affordable housing options	See Action 5.a.
Included (5.a)	Conduct education and outreach around city programs that support affordable housing.	
Included (5.b)	Fund Housing Navigators to assist households, renters, homeowners, and landlords with housing issues.	
Excluded	Review and, if necessary, update property maintenance codes (including standards for mold/moisture) to keep housing in good repair.	Enforcement of property maintenance codes is really the issue. See Action #76a
Included (1.o.)	Enhance enforcement of property maintenance codes to keep housing in good repair.	
Excluded	Co-locate emergency, transitional, and permanent affordable housing.	This is an action that is taken by the developer; may not be appropriate for the city to require.
Excluded	Working through the Regional Housing Council, identify appropriate locations for emergency housing within each jurisdiction.	This action deals with a temporary/emergency housing situation better addressed through the Regional Housing Council and other, more targeted efforts to address homelessness.
Included (5.c)	Identify and develop partnerships with organizations that provide or support for low-income, workforce, and senior housing as well as other populations with unique housing needs.	
Excluded	Look at options for creating workforce housing.	Action is not specific enough. Need to define what exactly should the cities be doing.

Action Status (Plan Reference)	Action	Explanation for Exclusion
Excluded	Explore creating dormitory-style housing, similar to what colleges have, with common bathrooms and communal kitchens for transitional housing.	See Action 4.d.
Excluded	Identify underutilized properties ripe for redevelopment.	See Action 3.f.
Excluded	Review the recommendations in the Urban Corridors Task Force Report (TRPC, 2012).	Data should support the actions that result in change.
Excluded	Adopt a preservation ordinance.	Combined with Action 2.g.
Included (1.p)	Partner with low-income housing developers (such as Habitat for Humanity) to expand homeownership opportunities.	
Excluded	Identify and remove code and fee impediments/disincentives to affordable housing.	Like equity, need to review all actions through an affordable housing lens. See Action 1.e.
Included (6.e)	Use value capture to generate and reinvest in neighborhoods experiencing increased private investment (with a focus on areas with planned or existing transit).	
Excluded	Limit or regulate fees associated with rental housing applications.	See Action 2.g.
Excluded	Require landlords to establish payment plans for tenants that get behind on rent.	See Action 2.g.
Excluded	Eviction mitigation to find mutual termination of rental agreement instead of evicting tenants.	See Action 2.g.
Excluded	Improve access to enforcement landlord/tenant laws (court enforcement is a barrier).	See Action 2.g.
Excluded	Increase access to legal assistance for landlord/tenant issues (free or sliding scale).	See Action 2.g.
Excluded	Program to incentivize LLs to accept tenants with poor credit or criminal history.	See Action 2.g.
Included (2.g)	Identify and implement appropriate tenant protections that improve household stability.	

Public Comments on the draft Housing Action Plan From Engage Olympia, as of May 7, 2021

The massive Impact and Permit fees and unreasonable sprinkler system requirements prevent the average property owner from building in the City. You put up financial barriers to building and then ask what can we do to have more homes built? I own 4 lots I would love to build duplex's on. @ 40k a unit plus the extra expense of the sprinkler system makes the Cities financial impact more expensive than the cost of the property. If the City really cared about affordable housing they would make it easier for small builders to build. Cut your fee's and eliminate the sprinkler system requirement.

Mark Ingersoll 14 days ago

All those big new fancy apartments downtown got property tax exemptions but they increase the need for schools, roads, LOTT, fire, police, and all the other infrastructure. The rest of us pay more so a few developers can pay less. Every action that makes it harder on small scale property owners nudges us further towards selling, likely to bigger entities who won't be as flexible, nor as affordable, nor as local. Notice how the rent moratorium did not include a tax moratorium; rather, my rental property taxes have doubled in the last five years, which I pass along to my tenants. Remember, renters pay property taxes too, or, more accurately, tenants pay all the rental property taxes.

LindaD 21 days ago

Giant U.S. landlords are cornering the housing markets nationwide, forcing rents and purchase prices beyond anything reasonable, and sucking up the primary means of wealth acquisition for all of us, regardless of race or other factors. Fighting amongst ourselves over crumbs empowers them.

Read the Reuters U.S. Legal News "Special Report - Giant U.S. landlords pursue evictions despite CDC ban".

How are we impacted in Olympia? We have no idea. We are too busy fighting amongst ourselves over the crumbs. Nowhere in all the mountains of housing documents does the city even mention who owns what in Olympia.

LindaD 14 days ago

This is not a plan for the homeless which is the most immediate crisis in Olympia, WA state & the country. Taxpayers do not want to support a "plan" that does not address housing, substance rehab, & mental illness for the homeless. Millions have been spent with ZERO results & a problem that gets worse. No more tax money without A Plan and results! Where's the Plan for homeless?

can212 22 days ago

Public Comments on the draft Housing Action Plan From Engage Olympia, May 8-17, 2021

It's nice to see this work being done and thank you for your efforts. However, the housing situation is clearly not being addressed in a way that has helped, especially regarding the homeless situation. Housing is needed but the homeless situation also requires services. Those services include local, available mental & substance abuse centers which then transition to readily available housing. Currently, there are waiting lists x3 for that type of housing. So clearly past efforts have not gone to resolving the issue. Another example of failed efforts - by way of attempts to encourage "affordable housing": The local MFTE plan that offers developers/builders tax credits in exchange for providing a percentage of units as low cost/affordable housing. Instead, through flaws in the language or definitions and a lack of enforcement & accountability the program fails to provide "affordable" housing, while instead, may have created inflated local rates. For example: using Area Median Income rather than Local Median Income to determine rental rates. Olympia Median Income is almost half the Area Median Income. The result is not lower rental rates in Olympia but actual market rates for "low cost" housing. This may have also driven typical market rates higher by setting higher low cost rates. It most certainly did not establish "affordable" or "low cost" housing. It may also be possible that the flawed formula and allowances created further homelessness, driving local people out of unaffordable housing when they're unable to afford the inflated rates. Another flaw in the plan: NO accountability/enforcement that the prescribed number of units are being rented, at reduced rates, for low income/affordable housing candidates. Those being allowed to take millions \$\$ in tax credits can surely provide proof of compliance, yet there appears to be no requirement. Or there's a lack of enforcement, since there's clearly a lack of the "affordable" rent rates. Creating what could be seen as another government feeding trough, creating harm upon harm. All of this leaves taxpayers witness to one of the most visible, anxiety-inducing (because nothing seems to work) failures in public policy over the last decade(s).

can212 5 days ago

When discussing affordable housing with a friend, she summed it up, "When you want more of something, make it easier." Removing barriers, in my opinion, is the best way to create a healthy ecosystem of housing options. A people centered approach that allows the market to deliver creative solutions, while being supported by thoughtful government support for those who need it, will yield better housing options for all.

When any one particular group starts determining what is best for the whole, there are many left with less options. If tenants and landlords determine they do not need additional parking to make a project work, the City does not need to create an additional requirement. If additional density, smaller lot sizes, or taking another look at zoning allows people to use their property as they see fit, this allows them to create more optionality.

The opposite of this is barriers for landlords and tenants. If there is demand for short term rentals, we should not create a barrier to those seeking them. If a landlord wants to complete tenant improvements on their property, and doing so triggers City of Olympia required, expensive, significant improvements, we disincentive improving properties and encourage rental properties to be in disrepair. If we put a First Right of Refusal for tenants on sales, in a market that already does not have enough houses to buy or sell, we have just made it more

difficult to sell a house. If you want more of something, make it easier.

If you want more housing affordability, we need more housing, and we should let the diverse fabric of Olympia determine how best to create that. City Councils and Planning Commissions do a great job of gathering public input, but if we remove artificial barriers, it's amazing what creativity and ingenuity our community is capable of. From that diverse group, we will find the best solutions. In law school we said, bad facts make bad law. When something really upsetting happens, we want to make it right. The lack of affordable housing, our growing houseless community, and everything that goes along with that is something that leaves us wanting a quick "policy change" to solve it. I would caution you that some very well intentioned policies, may not have the intended impact. I hope you will seek input from those creating housing to learn about the impact these policies will have on affordability.

Those having difficulty accessing housing need our support. This is a place where government must play a role. If the City of Olympia focused on how to support the individuals who need help, rather than restricting developers and property owners, we would create more housing and access to housing. Disincentivizing developers and landlords will hurt those currently houseless or teetering. I urge you to escape the binary idea that the only way to help those struggling to find affordable housing is by penalizing landlords and developers. If thoughtfully crafted, you will be able to leverage those property owners and developers and provide more access to housing for all, which is a goal we can all agree on.

Thank you. Amy Evans

Flavorfull 7 days ago

Amy Buckler

From: Joyce Phillips
Sent: Monday, May 17, 2021 4:18 PM
To: Candi Millar; Aaron Sauerhoff; Tammy Adams; Rad Cunningham; Paula Ehlers; Carole Richmond
Cc: Amy Buckler; Cari Hornbein; Kenneth Haner
Subject: FW: On tonight's agenda...

Please do not reply all to this email.

Hello, Commissioners.

Please find comments submitted related to items on the agenda for the meeting this evening.

Thanks.

Joyce

From: Patrick <Patrick@virgiladamsre.com>
Sent: Monday, May 17, 2021 4:12 PM
To: Joyce Phillips <jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Fwd: On tonight's agenda...

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Carrie/Amy:

I'm writing this as a concerned resident of west Olympia, and as a disgruntled former landlord.

I'm a former landlord in the city of Olympia; former because of the anti-landlord sentiment that flows from Olympia city hall. I know from having 20+ years in the real estate industry and 18 years as a landlord in this town, that housing is in great demand right now. Long term rentals are certainly no exception. But my wife and I all but made up our minds NOT to rent our house out any longer in Olympia in part because of A) the "don't pay your rent" rhetoric that festered in City Hall a year ago, and B) the constant graffiti and vandalism that is boiling over downtown and spilling into the nearby neighborhoods. Even the possibility of the following two proposals has sealed the deal for us, and I know it has helped make up the mind of other homeowners as well.

Proposals 1 and 2 ? (1sr right of refusal and short-term rental restrictions) create restrictions against homeowners and landlords. PERIOD. Restrictions AGAINST law abiding citizens that are in demand is

ludicrous and counterproductive, and will accomplish the antithesis of what is the real goal: more rental housing.

As an example, legislation over the past two decades in this area of the country is making it harder and harder to evict tenants. The result is NOT more rentals or cheaper rent. The result, which I have witnessed first-hand on several occasions in my real estate career, is exactly the opposite. Here's the logic of what is actually happening: If a landlord can't kick out a tenant as easily as they wish, they will make it increasingly more difficult for a renter to qualify in the first place. AND, if they can't get a problem renter out as quickly as they wish, the rent will be raised as quickly as possible to offset costs. Opposite outcome than what is desired. Now with even more restrictions against landlords, homeowners will choose to sell their second homes instead of dealing with the tenant problems that the City only continues to foster.

If you want more rental housing available, the policy should be to HELP those who make this possible. HELP the landlords. Proposals 1 and 2 certainly only HINDER the landlords and will only act to dissuade anyone thinking of being a landlord. We CAN NOT solve the lack of rental inventory by giving tenants another handout or by hindering landlords or their bottom lines. How about tax credits or other incentives for landlords? How about a zero tolerance for graffiti and litter and vandalism in the area? How about incentivizing tenants to pay the rent on time vs urging them not to pay rent at all.

If City Hall really feels like restricting people, make it extremely difficult and uncomfortable to be homeless. This is not a heartless statement; it is a sentiment of love. We teach our children to take care of themselves and be productive. We would be neglectful if we merely let our children do whatever they want, waste away, and ruin the environment along the way. The same argument holds true for our homeless. They should not be rewarded. They should not be made comfortable, as it is increasingly a lifestyle choice.

The homeowner is not the enemy. The landlord is not the enemy. The rhetoric from City Hall so far has made the tax-paying homeowner/landlord the enemy, when they should be wooed and appreciated.

It's time for City Hall to make sense. These two proposals specifically, should never stand.

Patrick Thier

Virgil Adams Real Estate

360-789-1011

SEARCH FOR HOMES: www.PatrickThierRealEstate.com

Amy Buckler

From: Esther Grace Kronenberg <wekrone@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 17, 2021 4:53 PM
To: Amy Buckler
Subject: Housing Action Plan

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Dear Ms. Buckler,

As for many residents of the City, the problem of costly housing is bad and getting worse so that middle income people, like my daughter, are having trouble finding a decent affordable place to live.

There are 2 points I'd like to make. First, the multi-family housing exemption does not, according to studies, increase density. What it has done when used by the City is exempt developers from paying their fair share of taxes, thereby raising the tax burden on everyone else. I object to using the MFTE unless the housing, all of it, is dedicated to truly affordable housing for lower income families.

Second, I object to the City building infrastructure in anticipation of future development. Again, this is a giveaway to housing developers and land owners. Growth should pay for itself.

I urge the City to work with non-profit agencies dedicated to the construction of housing for lower income families and individuals. The current policy of giving away incentives to private individuals is not helping create a livable future for Olympia and goes against the State Constitution which allows the public coffers provide for "the poor and infirm." The recent recipients of the City's largesse have been neither.

Thank you.

Esther Kronenberg

Sent from cyberheaven

Comments for the Olympia Planning Commission's 5/17/21 Hearing on the Housing Action Plan

I would like to speak against expanding State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) exemptions in the plan. These appear under 3.l - Reduce SEPA Transportation Appeals and 3.q - Maximize SEPA Exemptions for Residential and Infill Developments.

The SEPA review process is intended to ensure government actions have fully taken into consideration the environment before a decision is made. The environment is considered broadly in SEPA. For example, it includes things such as how many people would be displaced by a project, actions to avoid displacement, or what type of housing will be provided and at what income level.

SEPA provides citizens with a process to challenge decisions made by jurisdictions and government agencies. Appeals are both costly and time consuming and not launched lightly.

Excluding transportation from SEPA especially worries me. It is one of the items that is frequently an issue with development. Just recently the Commission had a hearing on the West Bay Yards. Many people who testified expressed concerns about the adequacy of West Bay Drive being able to handle traffic from an additional 478 new units. During a Community meeting about a development going in near Bark and Garden, residents worried about insufficient road access and a poorly designed turn that would impact their neighborhood. The community even hired a traffic engineer who found their concerns had merit. The proposed Trillium development didn't have the bus transportation required for a neighborhood center and it also lacked adequate connectivity. These are just *some* examples of adverse transportation impacts where SEPA might be needed.

Please think carefully before limiting SEPA just to speed development.

Judy Bardin
1517 Dickinson Ave NW
Olympia, WA 98502

Amy Buckler

From: hwbranch@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, May 16, 2021 9:27 PM
To: Amy Buckler
Subject: City of Olympia's Housing Action Plan (HAP)

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Dear Amy Buckler,

Here are my draft comments to the Planning Commission for tomorrow evening. Please provide them to the Commission.

Thank you, Harry Branch

Re: City of Olympia's Housing Action Plan (HAP)

The two sections of the plan that most concern me are section 3.i. which points out that "appeals add cost to infill and affordable housing projects", later clarified to be "residential, multifamily, or mixed-use projects" and section 3.q. which hopes to maximize the use of SEPA exemptions for residential and infill development. I fail to understand the logic.

The idea of concentrating growth into urban areas as a way of protecting rural areas would make some sense if there was any direct correlation between density and growth boundaries. We can limit growth boundaries regardless of density.

Does increasing density really create affordable housing? Compare Manhattan or San Francisco the Ritzville Washington. There is, if anything, an inverse correlation between density and affordability.

The Puget Sound Lowlands Ecoregion is unique, being characterized historically by large evergreens, deciduous forests and grasslands. The region connects directly to Puget Sound via numerous streams and rivers, it has a direct impact on the health of Puget Sound and it's highly urbanized. If we care about Puget Sound we need to do a better job of managing our urban watersheds. Science tells us we can do this by such simple actions as removing streams from culverts

Current housing affordability won't even exist in history books in a hundred years. Species extinction is forever. That should be our primary concern. Placing species at risk because of some unsupported notion that removing protections will make property more affordable would be unfortunate.

I'm pasting an article below from today's Seattle Times. This is the way Olympia should be heading.

Harry Branch
(360) 943-8508
hwbranch@aol.com

It doesn't look like much, this ditch by the side of the road. But to King County's culvert hunters, this isn't a throwaway landscape.

Kat Krohn, an engineer and fish passage specialist for King County, chopped right into a fierce bramble of blackberries and got into the ditch as traffic roared by on a busy thoroughfare in Lake Forest Park. Here, Lyon Creek flows through Lake Forest Park before draining into the northwest corner of Lake Washington, crossing in culverts under roads and even private driveways all along the way.

That's where Krohn and her teammates at King County come in. They are working in the field to compile an inventory of culverts on country roads, bridges and properties — the good, the bad, and the truly ugly in terms of whether a salmon can get through them to spawn or journey to the sea.

Urban creeks are the arteries and veins of the region carrying the lifeblood that animates the region's ecology: salmon. Food for more than 123 species of animals — including endangered southern resident killer whales that frequent Puget Sound.

It's no desk job, being a culvert hunter. These are the field medics looking for the blockages impairing the health of the region's signature fish in their home waters.

As Krohn cut back the brambles, Ben Gregory, another engineer and fish passage specialist on the county's culvert survey crew, bushwhacked into the muddy ditch and into thickets of roadside weeds.

It's a landscape most would never notice — let alone think is important to salmon. Garbage cans lined the road where Krohn helped Gregory trace the ditch to a tiny, crushed culvert under a driveway, where it then crossed under the road to the other side.

The driveway culvert was way undersized for managing high flows, creating a fire hose that would slam back a salmon trying to get upstream. It also would probably flood, creating a risk for the roadway infrastructure.

On the other side of the road, where the culvert exited, they looked for more problems, a slope too steep for a salmon to manage, or an opening of the culvert perched too far above the stream bed for a salmon to leap into.

"It is helpful to think like a fish," Gregory said, eyeing the pipe.

The team uploaded their field notes into handheld devices to feed their day's reconnaissance into a growing inventory of blockages.

For this stream is typical in this largely developed watershed, thickening with houses and driveways and cars since at least the 1970s. The creek is routed through dozens of culverts crossing under the road in just a few miles — challenging the coho and steelhead traveling this creek to and from Lake Washington, on their way to Puget Sound.

Both the orcas and Puget Sound Chinook are threatened with extinction. To help them survive, the county is committed to spending \$9 billion over the next decade on a Clean Water Healthy Habitat strategy, said Abby Hook, environmental affairs officer for King County's Department of Natural Resources and Parks.

The goal, Hook said, is to guide investments to boost salmon populations and water quality, and conserve essential habitat for the good of orcas, salmon and future generations of county residents — even as the climate changes and county population grows.

The initiative also is intended to unify efforts across programs and jurisdictional boundaries to achieve watershed level results, from the Cascades to Puget Sound. The work includes everything from storm water and wastewater projects to road repairs and land conservation and ecological restoration. The cross-disciplinary approach is intended to align and deliver projects to achieve the most improvement the fastest.

That's the big picture. Getting there is in the hands of people doing the day-to-day, on-the-ground work. This is combat biology, in environments mostly built to benefit and transport humans, not salmon.

"We are so unaware when we drive a road like this, we don't realize fish are under the road, we don't even know we are crossing a stream," Krohn said. Everything matters in their streambed world: how wide the banks are, how deeply cut the channel, how steep the slope.

Her work has taught her to see landscapes differently. "I notice culverts everywhere I go now," Krohn said.

Standing on the roadside amid the whizzing traffic, Gregory said the work can be daunting.

But then, there was the thrill last year of watching chum salmon barrel into Mary Olson Creek under Green River Road near Kent. County roads crews replaced a culvert carrying the creek that blocked most salmon from making it upstream. A deep, wide box culvert fixed the problem — and opened 2,000 feet of habitat for salmon and steelhead.

It was completed in August at a cost of \$900,000, and the chum moved right in. Prime orca chow, spawning right there in South King County.

Amy Buckler

From: Bob Bredensteiner <bob@bobbredensteiner.com>
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2021 11:21 AM
To: Amy Buckler
Subject: Housing Action Plan

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Amy,

As a board member of South Puget Sound Habitat for Humanity, I want to comment regarding Olympia's Housing Action Plan.

I have seen firsthand the struggle of hardworking people in our community who want nothing more than a safe and affordable place to call their own. Unfortunately, homeownership is increasingly unattainable for many across all age, racial and ethnic groups. In part, this is due to public underfunding of affordable homeownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income families.

Habitat for Humanity is asking that you please support affordable homeownership as a means to create lasting change in our community.

Specifically, we encourage the city to:

- partner with low-income housing developers to expand homeownership opportunities because homeownership is a wealth building tool that allows low-income families to exit cycles of poverty, create lasting generational change, and require less public assistance in the future.
- establish a down payment assistance program because a down payment is very often the biggest barrier for first time homebuyer. Down payment assistance as a regional approach would allow for greater access to homeownership in today's market.

Habitat for Humanity believes that homeownership can help alleviate part of the ongoing housing crisis, and restore racial, ethnic, and economic justice by promoting a break in a cycle of generational poverty.

We believe the City of Olympia can foster a richer and more inclusive community for all by incorporating these initiatives in its Action Plan.

Sincerely,

Bob Bredensteiner

Treasurer

South Puget Sound Habitat for Humanity



We build strength, stability, and self-reliance through shelter.

May 14, 2021

Olympia Planning Commission,

Homeownership, even as a concept, has increasingly become unattainable for many in our community, especially for the growing share of young buyers and historically and currently marginalized communities. The racial wealth gap, which is the legacy of historic practices of housing discrimination including redlining and predatory lending, as well as contemporary forms of discrimination are compounded by public underfunding of affordable homeownership for low- and moderate-income households and underproduction in for-profit “missing middle” for-sale homes.

The City of Olympia must act to reverse these historical wrong doings and develop policies that create an opportunity rich and inclusive community for all. Habitat for Humanity recognizes that a focus on homeownership can help alleviate parts of the ongoing housing crisis and restore racial, ethnic, and economic justice by promoting a break in a cycle of generational poverty for many, in addition to a further equitable distribution of wealth opportunities.

Specifically, we encourage the city to:

- partner with low-income housing developers to expand homeownership opportunities (1.g). Homeownership is a wealth building tool that allows low-income families to exit cycles of poverty, create lasting generational change, and require less public assistance in the future.
- establish a down payment assistance program (2.g), down payment assistance is the biggest barrier for first time homebuyers, this is especially true for people of color. Down payment assistance as a regional approach would allow for greater access to homeownership in today’s market.

Habitat for Humanity is asking that you please support affordable homeownership as a means to create lasting change in our community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Carly Colgan".

Carly Colgan
Chief Executive Officer

Amy Buckler

From: Davenport Moore <sdavenportmoore@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 8, 2021 9:28 AM
To: Amy Buckler
Subject: participation in virtual hearing 5/17

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Ms. Buckler,

I would like to reserve time in the virtual hearing for Thurston Housing Land Trust. What is the time allowance per each picture?

Would it be possible to include a 1:38 min. duration video clip on slide 3 of the following:

[Homebuyer's Orientation Presentation - Google Slides](#) for an introduction to Community Land Trusts? Is screen sharing by the facilitator something available for this purpose? There is also an online link to this video through Grounded Solutions -the national association of CLTs.

Thurston Housing Land Trust is working to be seen as a viable and primary solution for affordable housing in our municipality and county.

See: ThurstonHousingLandTrust.org

Thank you for any assistance you can provide.

Susan Davenport

VP BOT - THLT

360-970-6302

Amy Buckler

From: Cora Davidson <cora@coradavidsonconsulting.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 15, 2021 7:00 AM
To: Amy Buckler
Subject: City of Olympia - Notice of Public Hearing - 21-1702 Olympia Housing Action Plan

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Dear Ms. Buckler - thank you for your service to the city of Olympia.

As a resident of Olympia, and a supporter of Habitat for Humanity, I want to share my concern about affordable housing in our community and provide public comment regarding the Housing Action Plan.

As a supporter of South Puget Sound Habitat for Humanity, I see firsthand the struggle of hardworking people in Olympia who want nothing more than a safe and affordable place to call their own.

Homeownership, even as a concept, has increasingly become unattainable for many in our community, especially for the growing share of young buyers and historically and currently marginalized communities. The racial wealth gap, which is the legacy of historic practices of housing discrimination including redlining and predatory lending, as well as contemporary forms of discrimination is compounded by public underfunding of affordable homeownership for low- and moderate-income households and underproduction in for-profit "missing middle" for-sale homes.

The City of Olympia must act to reverse these historical wrongdoings and develop policies that create an opportunity-rich and inclusive community for all. Habitat for Humanity recognizes that a focus on homeownership can help alleviate parts of the ongoing housing crisis and restore racial, ethnic, and economic justice by promoting a break in a cycle of generational poverty for many, in addition to a further equitable distribution of wealth opportunities.


Specifically, we encourage the city to:

- partner with low-income housing developers to expand homeownership opportunities (1.g). Homeownership is a wealth-building tool that allows low-income families to exit cycles of poverty, create lasting generational change, and require less public assistance in the future.
- establish a down payment assistance program (2.g), down payment assistance is the biggest barrier for first-time homebuyers, this is especially true for people of color. Down payment assistance as a regional approach would allow for greater access to homeownership in today's market.

Habitat for Humanity is asking that you please support affordable homeownership as a means to create lasting change in our community.

Sincerely,

Cora Davidson, MPA
1008 Lybarger St NE, Olympia, WA 98506
Cora Davidson Consulting
She/her pronouns
cora@coradavidsonconsulting.com
coradavidsonconsulting.com
[linkedin.com/in/coradavidson](https://www.linkedin.com/in/coradavidson)
(360) 999-8014



STATEMENT TO THE CITY OF OLYMPIA HOUSING ACTION PLAN

Save existing affordable housing by giving owners of such properties tax breaks, or at least protection from tax increases, if we provide affordable units. Every tax increase on existing affordable housing gets passed along to the tenants, thus increasing rents and reducing affordable housing.

Property taxes on my one small affordable duplex have doubled over the last five years, while giving developers \$1.4M in property tax savings in roughly the same time. My tenants are the real people paying my increased property taxes.

Every action that makes it harder on small scale property owners nudges us further towards selling, likely to large entities that won't be as flexible, nor as affordable, nor as local.

All those big new fancy apartments downtown got property tax exemptions, but they increase the need for schools, roads, LOTT, fire, police, and all the other infrastructure. They also increase the value, property taxes, and the rents, on existing downtown affordable housing. The rest of us must pay for the increased infrastructure needs caused by the very developers who benefit but pay pennies on the dollar.

My rental property taxes have doubled in the last five years, which I pass along to my tenants. Remember, renters pay property taxes too, or, more accurately, tenants pay all the rental property taxes.

We are creating a permanent underclass of renters who will never have access to the primary means to build wealth. Wages are stagnant, health insurance and retirement plans have and continue to diminish, sucking out more wealth. Olympia, by giving tax breaks to those with substantial wealth, and increasing taxes on the rest of us, is actively furthering this sad decline.

When developers gain at the expense of the taxpayers, such as property tax exemptions and sweet deals like the Griswold building, they are no longer "private sector", they are government subsidized. Please let's refer to them as such.

Giant U.S. landlords are cornering the housing markets nationwide, forcing rents and purchase prices beyond anything reasonable, and sucking up the primary means of wealth acquisition for all of us, regardless of race or other factors. Fighting amongst ourselves over crumbs only weakens us. Read the Reuters U.S. Legal News "Special Report - Giant U.S. landlords pursue evictions despite CDC ban".

Linda DuPertuis
lmdupertuis@hotmail.com

Amy Buckler

From: prbill110@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, May 17, 2021 12:21 PM
To: Amy Buckler; Cary Retlin
Subject: Regional Housing Action Plan

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Amy/Cary:

I have previously sent emails regarding my objections regarding parts of the Regional Action Plan. I don't think that there is reason to repeat those comments now.

House Bill 1236 has been passed by the Legislature. It severely restricts a Landlords ability to end a lease.

1. If a landlord needs to update a rental, he may only end the lease for renovations, if they require a building permit. So assuming, the unit needs new carpet, vinyl, countertops, plumbing fixtures, etc. (not requiring a building permit, but cannot be completed with someone living there), then the lease could not be terminated. The work could not be done and would result in deferred maintenance and a substandard rental.
2. If a landlord decides to sell, he must list the property within a very short period of time. When a tenant moves out, it usually takes a month for cleaning, painting, carpeting vinyl, possibly countertops or plumbing fixtures, etc. If a landlord is required to list the property in a short period of time, this work could not be completed and either no one would want to buy the property or it would have to sell at a very reduced price (a fixer).

The Regional Housing Action Plan indicates that the City is developing an ordinance on these issues. I ask that you consider my above comments and not incorporate wording that would go beyond the scope of House Bill 1236.

Thank you,
Bill Fierst
360-480-9620

Amy Buckler

From: Amy Buckler
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2021 10:01 AM
To: prbill110@comcast.net
Subject: RE: FW: Olympia rent assistance and eviction moratorium information

Hi Bill,

Thanks for your comment – I will forward to the Land Use Committee members. To be clear, this evening the Land Use and Environment Committee is scheduled to receive an informational briefing from a local affordable housing group. They are sharing information about a policy approach they refer to as Tenant Opportunity to Purchase (TOPO), how it has been used in other cities and how *they think* it could be used in Olympia. The City is not formally considering a TOPO ordinance at this time.

Tenant Opportunity to Purchase Ordinances (TOPO) aim to provide long-term protection of already existing affordable housing by allowing tenant groups the first opportunity to negotiate and bid on rental properties when they come up for sale. Typically TOPO's have been applied to manufactured home parks only. The attachment to the staff report from the TOPO for the People group suggests it could be applied to single family and multifamily rental units as well. To be clear, this is not a recommendation from City staff, and it is not on our current year work plan to take this up further this year.

Currently the City is in the process of drafting a Housing Action Plan and TOPO has been identified as *a potential* action under the strategy to “increase the supply of permanently affordable housing for households that make 80% or less of the area median income.” Should the Committee advise we include it in the Housing Action Plan, the effect would be that we've identified it as a potential item to explore further in a future year. At that time we would need to conduct more research and public engagement and develop a staff recommendation. The staff recommendation about how TOPO could be used in Olympia, what it should apply to and other elements, would not necessarily be the same as the group is suggesting tonight.

Other cities have used policies like TOPO to preserve manufactured home parks. No cities are currently applying this to single family rentals. Should this be taken up in a future year we would need to conduct more research and outreach to determine if and how to approach this in Olympia.

Warm Regards,

Amy Buckler (She/Her)
Strategic Projects Manager
City of Olympia
601 4th Ave E
Olympia, WA 98502
(360) 280-8947 (Cell)
(360) 570-5847 (Desk)

This email is subject to public disclosure

From: Cary Retlin <cretlin@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2021 8:33 AM
To: Amy Buckler <abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us>

Cc: Keith Stahley <kstahley@ci.olympia.wa.us>; Leonard Bauer <lbauer@ci.olympia.wa.us>

Subject: FW: FW: Olympia rent assistance and eviction moratorium information

Amy,

This email is relevant to the TOPO agenda item at LUEC tonight. I got questions about it when a landlord called me yesterday afternoon:

From: prbill110@comcast.net <prbill110@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2021 7:38 AM

To: Cary Retlin <cretlin@ci.olympia.wa.us>

Subject: Re: FW: Olympia rent assistance and eviction moratorium information

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Cary:

Just want to provide input to you regarding the "right of first refusal" for a tenant to purchase a house that they have been renting.

This is fraught with potential problems and it is unlikely that they could afford to buy it anyway.

If I were to sell a house in today's market, it would be listed at an attractive price, then the highest bidder takes it. What price do I offer to the tenant? I should be able to get the full value from the house. It would not be practical to tell bidders that they can bid, but someone else has the "right of first refusal".

Or even the opposite. I offer to the tenant a price. The tenant can not afford it and moves out, so I can clean and paint, etc. and he may even move out of the area in the meantime. The house doesn't sell and I have to sell at a lower price. Then, do I have to track down the tenant and offer him the house at this price. Time would be an issue. The new buyer is not going to wait.

Also, I may wish to sell to a family member, rather than the tenant.

Please consider these comments.

Thanks,
Bill

Amy Buckler

From: Carol Houston <chouston@sdsu.edu>
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2021 2:46 PM
To: Amy Buckler
Subject: Housing Action Plans - public comment

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

As a resident of Olympia, and a supporter of Habitat for Humanity, I want to share my concern about affordable housing in our community and provide public comment regarding the Housing Action Plan.

As a board member of South Puget Sound Habitat for Humanity and a volunteer tax preparer with TaxAide for 13 years, I have seen firsthand the struggle of hardworking people in Olympia who want nothing more than a safe and affordable place to call their own for themselves and their families.

Homeownership, even as a concept, has increasingly become unattainable for many in our community, especially for the growing share of young buyers and historically and currently marginalized communities. The racial wealth gap, which is the legacy of historic practices of housing discrimination including redlining and predatory lending, as well as contemporary forms of discrimination are compounded by public underfunding of affordable homeownership for low- and moderate-income households and underproduction in for-profit "missing middle" for-sale homes.

The City of Olympia must act to reverse these historical wrongdoings and develop policies that create an opportunity rich and inclusive community for all. Habitat for Humanity recognizes that a focus on homeownership can help alleviate parts of the ongoing housing crisis and restore racial, ethnic, and economic justice by promoting a break in a cycle of generational poverty for many, in addition to a further equitable distribution of wealth opportunities.

Specifically, we encourage the city to:

- partner with low-income housing developers to expand homeownership opportunities (1.g). Homeownership is a wealth building tool that allows low-income families to exit cycles of poverty, create lasting generational change, and require less public assistance in the future.
- establish a down payment assistance program (2.g). Down payment assistance is the biggest barrier for first time homebuyers, especially for people of color. Down payment assistance as a regional approach would allow for greater access to homeownership in today's market.

Habitat for Humanity is asking that you please support affordable homeownership as a means to create lasting change in our community.

Sincerely,

Carol Olson Houston

Amy Buckler

From: jacobsoly@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, May 16, 2021 4:29 PM
To: Amy Buckler
Subject: Comments for Planning Commission re Draft Olympia Housing Action Plan

External Email Alert!
This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Amy --

Here are my draft comments to the Planning Commission for tomorrow evening. Please provide them to the Commission. I may not be able to get to all of them depending on time limits.

Thank you, Bob Jacobs

=====

Planning Commission Members:

I'm Bob Jacobs and I live at 720 Governor Stevens Avenue in Olympia.

I served as a public representative on the Stakeholders Group which helped develop the Regional Housing Action Plan that formed the basis of this draft city plan.

Probably the most important thing about the regional plan is that it contains no recommendations. Rather it is a collection of possible actions that the cities could adopt. Furthermore, these options were not evaluated for likely effectiveness, cost-shifting, or any other criteria. Thus, these options should be approached with caution.

In general, I consider the options dealing with subsidized housing to be the most reliable. This is also our greatest need locally, because the federal government has failed miserably to carry out its duty in this area. Basically, what we need is money. Lots of it.

The most unreliable section is the one dealing with increasing the supply of market rate housing. This is not surprising because there is very little that any city can effectively do in this area; market rate housing is provided by the private sector.

Here are a few specific comments out of many that I could offer:

1. A number of suggested actions are based on the mistaken notion that if the cost of producing housing can be reduced, the price of housing will decline. While this idea has surface appeal, the way the market actually works is that cost reductions produce increased profits for either land owners or builders or both. Of course we should avoid unnecessary costs, but we should not sacrifice quality of life or fiscal fairness by compromising appropriate fees or regulations. This applies to a number of options, including 1.f, 1.k, 3.i, and 3.k.

2. Items 1.p and 2.i are related to protecting mobile/manufactured home parks. The logical way to do this is by rezoning, which Olympia did in at least one case about 25 years ago. I suggest the Commission change this recommendation to rezoning.

3. Item 3j recommends expansion of the Multi-Family (property) Tax Exemption (MFTE) to all transit corridors. The MFTE was examined in detail by legislative performance staff just a couple of years ago. Their conclusion was that no evidence could be found to indicate that the MFTE accomplishes its objective of producing more housing. Thus, all it does is subsidize land owners and housing developers. I suggest you drop this staff recommendation.

4. Item 3.u recommends that the city pay for infrastructure development such as transportation and utility facilities in order to make housing development feasible sooner than it would otherwise be in certain areas. This is unjustified. It amounts to a public subsidy to land owners. Growth should pay for growth, at least as much as state law allows, via charges like impact fees and utility connection fees. I recommend that you drop this staff recommendation.

5. Item 6.e recommends that the city start using Tax Increment Financing (TIF). TIF has been recognized as a scam. It double-counts local tax revenues by diverting taxes meant for general city costs to pay for infrastructure, thus increasing taxes. I suggest you drop this suggestion.

Thank you for your consideration.

Please feel free to call me at 360-352-1346 if you would care to discuss any of these suggestions -- or other city policy matters.

Amy Buckler

From: Kenneth Haner
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 7:05 AM
To: Amy Buckler
Subject: FW: City of Olympia - Notice of Public Hearing - 21-1702 Olympia Housing Action Plan

fyi

Ken Haner
Program Assistant
City of Olympia
Community Planning and Development
PO Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue | Olympia WA 98507
Phone: (360) 753-8735
Email: khaner@ci.olympia.wa.us

From: Tom Schrader <schraderfour@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 07, 2021 12:39 PM
To: Kenneth Haner <khaner@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Subject: Re: City of Olympia - Notice of Public Hearing - 21-1702 Olympia Housing Action Plan

External Email Alert!
This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Ken,

Thank you for sending this over...!!!

We at TCRA feel, along with the City of Olympia, housing is our number one social concern during these COVID times!

I will circulate this through our 800 TCRA Realtors, and attend this public hearing!

Thanks again for sending, and all the work you are doing for our beautiful community!

Tom Schrader
REALTOR | CBA | TCRA Board President
RE/MAX PARKSIDE AFFILIATES
300 Deschutes Way SW #200
Olympia, WA 98501
(360) 480-9387

+++++

On Fri, May 7, 2021 at 12:31 PM Kenneth Haner <khaner@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

The City of Olympia has issued the following **Notice of Public Hearing with the Olympia Planning Commission** for the project known as **Olympia Housing Action Plan**.

PROJECT: **21-1702**

See the above attachment for further details.

Please forward questions and comments you may have regarding this project to the staff contact listed below:

- Amy Buckler, Strategic Projects Manager, 360.280.8947, abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us

Ken Haner

Program Assistant

City of Olympia

Community Planning and Development

PO Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue | Olympia WA 98507

Phone: (360) 753-8735

Email: khaner@ci.olympia.wa.us

Amy Buckler

From: Beau Shattuck <beaushattuck@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2021 11:52 AM
To: Amy Buckler
Subject: Fw: COMPLETELY FINNISHED PPP FOR HL IN TC

External Email Alert!


This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

PowerPoint presentation.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Beau Shattuck <beaushattuck@yahoo.com>
To: Beau Shattuck <beaushattuck@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021, 03:33:41 PM PDT
Subject: COMPLETELY FINNISHED PPP FOR HL IN TC

[Homeless Population Presentation.pptx](#)



Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation

A LITTLE BIT ABOUT MYSELF SO YOU CAN GET TO KNOW ME....

- Community Volunteer since 2012
- Housing Navigator at SideWalk since 2018
- Housing Liaison at Olympia Community Court since March 2018

According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.....

Before the Pandemic at least 580,000 Americans were homeless.

- 23,000 of those people were in Washington State.

- Skeptics have argued that...

Substance Use Disorders and Mental Health issues must be addressed BEFORE someone becomes a suitable a candidate for long-term housing.

**THIS IS BACKWARDS
&
WRONG**

The page features several decorative circles of various colors (orange, pink, green, blue, purple) scattered in the corners. The main text is centered on a light blue background.

Housing is a HUMAN right

We MUST adopt a Housing FIRST approach to homelessness in Olympia.

• .

**Let's take a look at the
Leaders like Finland and
Japan; whom have the
lowest homeless
populations in the world.**

KEYS TO SUCCESS.....

- Politicians who have an understanding of human dignity.
- Affordable/ Social Housing
- Low barrier Service Centers
- Transitioned away from the temporary shelter model and converted their entire system into a supportive-housing-model.

Dignity....

Dignity is the right of a person to be valued and respected for their own sake.


AFFORDABLE/SOCIAL HOUSING

- **The cost of housing should NOT make it difficult to STAY housed.**

LOW BARRIER SERVICE CENTERS

The idea here is to maintain multiple service agency's within the same building such as:

- Medical/Dental Professionals
- SUD/MH Case managers/Providers
- D.S.H.S Representative
- Peer Support Specialists
- Housing Navigators
- Family Support/Education Services
- Veterans Affairs Staff

The slide features a light blue background with decorative elements consisting of various colored circles (orange, pink, green, blue, purple) scattered in the corners. The main text is centered and reads:

Transition away from temporary shelters and convert our entire system into a Supportive Housing Model.

Homelessness in Thurston County Since 2017


- In 2017 there was a census taken that counted **124** homeless individuals.
- The 2019 Census counted **394** homeless people in Thurston County. Which more than DOUBLED in two years!
- This year that number has more than doubled yet again! The new tally in 2021 is **1,100!** With MANY who remain uncounted.

**OUR HOMELESS POPULATION IN
OLYMPIA IS RAPIDLY INCREASING.
WE MUST DO SOMETHING NOW!**

+

•

○

The slide features a light blue background with decorative elements consisting of various colored circles (orange, pink, green, blue, purple) scattered in the corners. The text is centered on the slide.

My name is Beau D. Shattuck
He/Him Pronouns

Thank you for your time and
careful consideration.

3043 Central St SE
Olympia WA 98501
May 12, 2021

Olympia Community Planning and Development
PO Box 1967
Olympia, WA 98507-1967

RE: Olympia Housing Action Plan

I applaud your goals of increasing supply, diversity, and affordability of housing.

1. Insist on mixed income development.
2. Include requirement for wheelchair accessible spaces.
3. Use Housing Land Trust model to extend affordability.

Insist on mixed income development. Improve the quality of life for high and low income people both. There is less crime in mixed-income neighborhoods. Imagine West Bay Yards with a mix that includes studios for elderly people who will keep watch, and healthy young adults who will carry groceries and do chores for others more feeble or more fortunate. Some cities require that “mansion” properties include living quarters for service people. This in turn provides for that lower-crime mix of housing.

Include requirement for wheelchair accessible spaces. For buildings with parking garage, require one or two wheelchair accessible apartments set up with video surveillance of the garage, plus an adjoining care-giver’s studio. Think dignified role for an injured Afghan war vet. Allows paid or volunteer security surveillance.

Use the Housing Land Trust model to extend ownership affordability into the future, with a non-profit organization, not a city employee, handling the assurance that the property stays affordable when it changes hands many years later.

I hope these ideas will help you design a plan that delivers.

Callie Wilson

Amy Buckler

From: bobesan@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, April 9, 2021 10:18 PM
To: Amy Buckler
Cc: Joyce Phillips
Subject: Re: FW: Reminder: Housing Action Plan Open House starts in 1 hour (I put my public comment in the Q&A but provide it here as well, in expanded form)

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Thx for fwd'g my comments & your thoughtful response, Joyce & Amy, respectively. Here's another comment for the record:

I'm glad that efforts are being made to deal w/ the homeless situation, as I don't want to see us suffer the lawlessness that Seattle & Portland are unfortunately showing in a BIG way now. I avoid Wheeler Ave. now b/c the homeless are taking over that street along I-5.

And today, a likely homeless woman obviously dropped her coat in the middle of Eastside Ave., as she continued walking to Wheeler. As I cycled by, I let her know that she lost her coat, but she responded slowly. Finally, she turned around to get her coat, but almost got hit by a car in the process, as she wasn't being very careful. Fortunately, she was able to get her coat (w/ some swearing at the driver) before walking back to Wheeler. Public safety is suffering as the homeless population increases...

-Bob V.

On 04/09/2021 12:41 PM Amy Buckler <abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Dear Dr. Vadas,

Thank you for your comments. You asked whether the camps are considered "households"? Unfortunately, unsheltered individuals and camps are not included in the number of households counted by the American Community Survey, which is our source for this data. However, the housing needs of people experiencing homelessness in our community are considered in our planning and implementation. While it is difficult to get an accurate number of people experiencing homelessness in Thurston County we look to the annual Point in Time Census, Homeless Management Information System data used by Coordinated Entry providers as well as observational data by our field staff, Thurston County and a host of service providers to better understand the scope of need.

We recognize that the only true solution to homelessness is more housing (sometimes with wrap around services for people with disorders such as mental health or substance use) and the City of Olympia has

invested in two significant projects to address this need. At 2828 Martin Way the Low Income Housing Institute has a 64 unit supportive housing facility under construction. It also contains a 60-bed shelter on the ground floor. On the west side of town, the City partnered with the Family Support Center to help finance a 65-unit facility targeting homeless families and victims of domestic violence. This facility is in the planning and permitting process. We will make a third Home Fund award for another project this year, with more in the future.

As I mentioned on Wednesday night, to scale up the production of low income housing to serve our community including those experiencing homelessness will take more resources. A countywide home fund would help. Meanwhile, the City of Olympia is working with the County to expand services including trauma informed case workers to several of the larger encampments in our City. We hope to have that program in place by the beginning of summer.

Warm Regards,

Amy Buckler

Strategic Projects Manager

City of Olympia

601 4th Ave E

Olympia, WA 98502

(360) 280-8947 (Cell)

(360) 570-5847 (Desk)

This email is subject to public disclosure

From: Joyce Phillips <jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us>

Sent: Friday, April 9, 2021 8:11 AM

To: Amy Buckler <abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us>

Subject: FW: Reminder: Housing Action Plan Open House starts in 1 hour (I put my public comment in the Q&A but provide it here as well, in expanded form)

Hi, Amy.

Below are comments from Dr. Vadas regarding the Housing Action Plan. Please add them to the public record.

Thanks!

Joyce

From: ROBERT VADAS <bobesan@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, April 08, 2021 11:14 PM

To: Joyce Phillips <jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us>

Subject: Fwd: Reminder: Housing Action Plan Open House starts in 1 hour (I put my public comment in the Q&A but provide it here as well, in expanded form)

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Dear Joyce:

I put my public comment in the Q&A for the Housing Action Plan Open House, but provide it here as well, in expanded form.

I'd like to enter my 2 online articles into the public comment, given Olympia's present favoring of market-rate projects over low-income (e.g., elderly) projects w/ less incentives for bldg. profits (Vadas 2020, 2021). The rich developers can take care of themselves & don't need my taxes to build projects that are meant to bring more rich Central Sound (Seattle/Tacoma) people there to gentrify the Olympia area.

And what about all of the presently homeless, many of whom have mental-health issues that may require institutionalization (Vadas 2021)? Do you consider those camps" households"?

Sincerely, Dr. Robert L. Vadas, Jr. (Bob)

Aquatic ecologist

2909 Boulevard Rd. SE

Olympia, WA 98501-3971

Tel. (360) 705-2231 (H), (360) 584-2135 (C)

E-mail bobesan@comcast.net (H)

Vadas, B. Jr. 2020. The future of Olympia's urban zoning in the face of covid-19 and climate change. Works In Progress (Olympia, WA) 31(3): 14 (<https://olywip.org/the-future-of-olympias-urban-zoning>).

Vadas, R.L. Jr. 2021. OP-ED: Concerns about West Bay Yards development proposal. Olympia Tribune [online], March 4: 1 p. (<https://theolympiatribune.com/op-ed-concerns-about-west-bay-yards-development-proposal>).

----- Original Message -----

From: Anastasia Everett <no-reply@zoom.us>

To: bobesan <bobesan@comcast.net>

Date: 04/07/2021 3:57 PM

Subject: Reminder: Housing Action Plan Open House starts in 1 hour

Hi Robert Vadas,

This is a reminder that "Housing Action Plan Open House" will begin in 1 hour on:
Date Time: Apr 7, 2021 05:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android device:

[Click Here to Join](#)

Note: This link should not be shared with others; it is unique to you.

Passcode: 716734

[Add to Calendar](#) [Add to Google Calendar](#) [Add to Yahoo Calendar](#)

Or join by phone:

US: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 929 260 6099

Webinar ID: 883 7703 4620

Passcode: 716734

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/kHrkD77Vb>

You can [cancel](#) your registration at any time.

Amy Buckler

From: hollygadbow@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, April 7, 2021 8:19 PM
To: Amy Buckler; Leonard Bauer; Joyce Phillips; Cary Retlin
Cc: CityCouncil; Jay Burney
Subject: Great program

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Amy, Leonard, Joyce, and Cary,

Thank you for putting together a terrific program. One of the best done by Olympia that I have attended lately.

Well organized, great slides, full of information (some of it new to me). Amy's opening presentation was excellent, full of pertinent facts and well delivered. Olympia has stepped up, and there is so much more to do. This is an issue that takes courage and tenacity. Instead of being overwhelmed by the immensity of the problem, the staff and the council keep moving forward.

I have to admit I like Zoom formats and think this venue worked well for this. The survey questions were a nice touch and kept the audience engaged. With Zoom, I actually can hear better and attend more meetings.

I appreciate your good work.

Best regards,
Holly Gadbow

Amy Buckler

From: Pamela Hanson <TheTuesdayShow@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 9, 2021 4:03 PM
To: Amy Buckler
Cc: Brad Medrud; jdoan@ci.tumwater.wa.us; Boone, Rolf
Subject: Re: HOUSING ACTION PLAN - OPPORTUNITY FOR INPUT

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Amy,

Thank you. I appreciate your long range planning efforts.

Some people only learn, with age and by reading, that there is "a big economic grey area" with an uneven scale of justice regarding housing. A scale of justice has two places of weight. I have survived a more complicated scale of justice - reality - and I have survived it more than once.

The King County Housing Authority just sent me an application. I have no intention of leaving Tumwater, but an opportunity to be closer to major media and a university may sway my opinion. Because of the difficulty in obtaining local non-profit corporation services, I began participating at the congressional level regarding homeless assistance and was connected to King County.

I participate to help others not experience what I have experienced and to get rehoused. I also need a shower, bathroom and bed. I need a home and to not be intimidated by a City of Tumwater Police Department misdemeanor charge of "nuisance" and a Thurston County Court Commissioner's guilty decision.

The following people went before me and hopefully they weren't subjected to city council, city ordinances and police tactics to clear their streets. You can use the link or find the article by searching google. The 2019 investigative journalist covered loopholes that may or may not be in the current no cause/just cause Senate bill that was in the media today.

<https://t.co/iTctvgk02u?amp=1>



Legislators passed evi...
crosscut.com

Crosscut.



NEWS

Legislators passed eviction protections. Washington landlords found loopholes

Reforms that give struggling tenants more time to make

Amy, I qualify for an approximate \$50,000.00 per year state job. That is the source of my sarcasm. I served in state employment while Booth Gardner was Governor. I was right across the capital campus lawn, in the General Administration Bldg. Please look him up on C-Span. There is a KOMO "State of the State" speech you should watch. In part, Governor Booth Gardner was lecturing the Legislature about and for health care improvements. There has never been a greater Yale and accounting focused consumer protection Governor, in my opinion. I know he would be disappointed in what has happened to me.

I have to medicate my feet and eyes, and I can't leave the country to find quality health care like Governor Booth Gardner did.

Thank you again.

Pamela Jean (Hale) Hanson
City of Tumwater Resident

From: Amy Buckler <abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Friday, April 9, 2021, 9:14 AM
To: Pamela Hanson
Subject: RE: HOUSING ACTION PLAN - OPPORTUNITY FOR INPUT

Hi Pamela,

I know you said you have reached out to Community Action Council in the past. They are the main organization that connects single adults to housing services in Thurston County. I just received the attached email from them on Wednesday – sounds like rental assistance for 2021 just opened so you might give them a call again. My position is more long range planning so I don't disperse any assistance; I'm trying to work on a larger scale to bring in more resources and adjust rules to help address housing affordability, supply and stability over the long term.

Warm Regards,
Amy

From: Pamela Hanson <TheTuesdayShow@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 8, 2021 6:31 PM
To: Amy Buckler <abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Cc: jdoan@ci.tumwater.wa.us; Boone, Rolf <rboone@theolympian.com>
Subject: Re: HOUSING ACTION PLAN - OPPORTUNITY FOR INPUT

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Amy,

Your work frequently makes other people's problems, your problem. That is not my intent.

I wrote this quickly and appreciate your efforts. Simply put, where do I go to get housing assistance during this 2021 regional homeless assistance effort?

I cc'd John Doan because he has sent me to CACLMT. Some may get frustrated with my deliberate calmness with sometimes inserted reasonable and appropriate moments of emotion. I move slowly due to health, bathroom drives, and daily food shopping.

Here is the lengthy:

I was born in Olympia, at the old St.Peter Hospital, and only spent a few months in a second story apartment next to a church before my parents purchased the largest house on the block in our neighborhood in Tumwater in 1965.

With this current regional effort, what is available to or for me from Olympia's perspective? To a certain extent, any answer could be sending me to the same people who haven't followed through with services that they are expected to offer. I have approached, called or written information for Sidewalk twice and CACLMT three times, and the CACLMT number is a conservative numbers.

Are there any services if I park at one of the Olympia encampments? Is that how I get a caring case worker? Because of Prime Locations, I was made homeless and have parked and basically vehicle camped in violation of the Tumwater "nuisance" ordinance (a misdemeanor). Because of the way the nuisance ordinance is written - I cannot sue any of the aggressive "policy" police officers and/or the city - and would have to say yes and plead guilty in Thurston County Court.

I wrote parking tickets and presented them at the State level in the Alaska Court System to Judge Levy and Judge Nave. I could challenge the guilty misdemeanor, because I think some Judges and prosecutors understand the money and politics of homelessness - and someone made Former Security Officer Hanson "homeless." **I was paying my rent and my rent checks were then rejected - sending me to court. The refused rent checks are disputable and I was told to keep them.I was not a problem. I was stating rent facts to one of our State's 281 cities and then Prime Locations gave me a 20 Day Notice No Cause Termination.** Prime Locations is not stupid, they put me in a misdemeanor criminal category with the 20 Day Notice No Cause Eviction, while there were no apts avail., not more than a \$100 promise from a church, and more than my income for a hotel room that can only last 28 days a month, and Sidewalk considered me housed because the day I called I was in a hotel room.

A driving glass and metal tent, a city council candidate that deserved more than her achievement of 2,000 votes for doing hardly nothing, and a city council candidate that was subjected to being called homeless by The Olympian and others - with their McClatchy money apparently supporting the court's decision, Tumwater, and Prime Locations. What a great court we have that wouldn't let my case go to trial - her voice, the Thurston County Court Commissioner's, stated it and it is in the court's audio record. I cannot afford a lawyer.

Six out of 10 homeless in seattle, just on KOMO News Radio this afternoon, as stated by Seattle Mayor Jenny Durkan, were homeless before Seattle.

I won't be moving to Seattle to sit and wait for a phone call from a case worker, and Tumwater has stated that homelessness is a [Thurston County] regional problem.

You have a different job description and perspective than mine. The direction I am "supposed to go" is where?

Positive Attitude Closing:

I joke about this because someone suggested it to me - a person that believes in a homeless person. "You should run for Mayor." The downside is that I may only get around 2,100 votes to be Mayor. It would go on my resume. **It is a pay raise.** And, it would push me off of SSA Disability Income and into work - as told to do so by the voters.

Why are you running for office? You were made homeless the last time.

Do homeless services extend to political candidates?

In what year do homeless services extend to political candidates?

Who looks at the filing for office records and plots for the opposition without talking and/or writing to anyone?

Pamela Jean (Hale) Hanson
City of Tumwater Resident

From: Amy Buckler <abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Sent: Thursday, April 8, 2021, 2:06 PM
To: Pamela Hanson
Subject: RE: HOUSING ACTION PLAN - OPPORTUNITY FOR INPUT

Hi Pamela,

Thank you for attending last night's open house and for spreading the word. I understand your concerns about the lack of affordable housing (especially compared to fixed incomes like social security) and tenant protections. As we discussed last night this is a very challenging issue and the City of Olympia hopes we can make a difference through our actions. Unfortunately the housing affordability crisis won't be solved overnight, which leaves a lot of people without stable housing in the short term. I am very sorry you are experiencing this. I was heartened to hear the new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Marcia Fudge's announcement today that the federal government is sending \$5 billion in new grants to states and local governments across the country for rental assistance, development of affordable housing and other services to address homelessness. We will take whatever we can get to help our community members stay safe and housed.

Thanks again for your input,

Amy Buckler
Strategic Projects Manager
City of Olympia
601 4th Ave E
Olympia, WA 98502
(360) 280-8947 (Cell)
(360) 570-5847 (Desk)

This email is subject to public disclosure

From: Pamela Hanson <TheTuesdayShow@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 7, 2021 6:29 PM
To: Amy Buckler <abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us>
Cc: Boone, Rolf <rboone@theolympian.com>
Subject: Fwd: HOUSING ACTION PLAN - OPPORTUNITY FOR INPUT

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Presenters:

Thank you for the presentation in progress.

I sent this input and encouragement to participate by attending your event earlier this morning. This email is not going to that full list.

I personally now live in a glass and metal tent, also called a Korean passenger vehicle. I have a fire extinguisher, knife and scissors to protect myself at night. I do not tell people where I park, to maintain my personal safety, because it isn't intended by me for anyone to know. It would be too easy for the motivated that have already labeled me a 12 [as used in downtown riot paint and during the same time] to smash a window, etc.

Having worked as a security officer prepared me for some of my necessary determination. My 12 years as an At-Home-Mom prepared me to attempt to continue my faith in children's flash card definitions of people and industry. My career at the Department of Revenue provided me with a never met again level of a Comptroller's ethics regarding the conservative use taxpayer monies. Ralph Osgood, Former Mayor of Tumwater was only my co-worker, not my mentor.

The forwarded email explains more about me but it is not my full life. It does not include my working at a welding shop where they were grinding serial numbers off of high pressure gas cylinders, meeting and listening to one of two murder suspects, and finally making it home to Tumwater alive but with TB from Alaska.

The development, construction and building management industry has no flash card in my life anymore. I have no one to please with my input and comments, except possibly the innocent victims that had the time to exit plan themselves out of danger.

In closing: The importance of detailed costs and continued operations disclosures followed by thorough audits of the industry when the industry is provided with "incentives" - if and when applicable should be charged with fraud if and when found to be deceptive.

Pamela Jean (Hale) Hanson
City of Tumwater Resident



From: Pamela Hanson <TheTuesdayShow@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 7, 2021, 8:23 AM

To: Pamela J. Hanson

Cc: Boone, Rolf; jdoan@ci.tumwater.wa.us; pkmet@ci.tumwater.wa.us; council@ci.tumwater.wa.us; Brad Medrud

Subject: HOUSING ACTION PLAN - OPPORTUNITY FOR INPUT

Dear Readers,

IMPORTANT: There is an opportunity for input today and the link is within the online version of this top of the fold news article from The Olympian newspaper.

I disagree with the last bullet in this article for developer, management company and non-profit corporate housing entity reasons because they do profit from low income persons in many ways. I believe that municipalities should use their property "in a ownership way and to own the issue." **Build the sustainable condos, sell the condos to low income while keeping ownership of the municipal property, and require the sell back of the sustainable condo to the**

municipality. This will control costs, provide open government "program related" documents to review that are audited, and will protect low income homeowners in the municipal home ownership program. In this way, a low income person can build equity and payment history by owning a condo, and the municipality can continue the effort with the next low income person in need of purchasing housing when the sell back to the municipality happens - over and over again.

It was a management company, Prime Locations, that made me homeless. They do understand income, market rate, low income housing, and unprotected speech. I was given a 20 Day No Cause Termination by Prime Locations [while I was current on my rent and with a positive rent balance, with a previous letter inviting me to renew my lease, and speaking on live TV to the Tumwater City Council about rising rents making people homeless with \$1,231.00 per month disability income and \$1,040.00 in apartment rent costs].

Obviously, Prime Locations supports No Cause terminations, and many other management companies with the Thurston County Court may also.

I ask you to support low income persons for many reasons. Please read the the COLA Fact Sheet that I continue to use. The PDF document is attached.

Here is the screenshot and link to The Olympian article:

<https://www.theolympian.com/news/local/article250473311.html>



Please read the last line in the following PDF. It is regarding all disability income recipients. And, the data on page two includes this year's average SSA retirement income. \$1,277.00 per month income is the disability income average and my permanent disability income is almost there with COLA increases - at \$1,266.50 [DSHS]. I continue to be homeless due to Prime Locations and the Thurston County Court.



The eviction moratorium has not yet been lifted. We are about to experience the fourth wave of SARS CoV-2 COVID-19 infections and deaths. Please, wear a mask, social distance and wash your hands - while I continue to work my way off of permanent disability and have opinions about myself and others. My lungs are clear and I have stated that for years.

Pamela Jean (Hale) Hanson
City of Tumwater Resident

(Apologies if there is formatting problems within this email. My phone has a problem - and this time my phone isn't in Alaska during the time Snowden went to Russia. There is and should be no hard return formatting between the words income and recipients. It appears on my phone while in the non-landscape orientation and is obvious.)

Amy Buckler

From: jacobsoly@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, April 7, 2021 9:06 PM
To: Amy Buckler
Subject: Thanks

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Hi Amy --

Thanks for defending impact fees at the Open House this evening. They are very important for city finances and for fair treatment of residents.

In the future, you might also mention that impact fees don't begin to cover all impacts. For instance, there are no impact fees for police stations, jails, libraries, courthouses, etc. Those impacts are mostly paid by the rest of us.

Thanks again,

BobJ

Amy Buckler

From: ComcastIMAP <mike.mccormick@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 7, 2021 6:43 PM
To: Amy Buckler; Joyce Phillips; Leonard Bauer
Subject: Good Session

External Email Alert!

This email originated from a source outside of the City's network. Use caution before clicking on links or opening attachments.

Amy, Joyce, Leonard and Cary,

Thank you for tonight's housing session. It was well organized. There was a ton of new information—at least to me. I appreciated that my question was included. And you accurately responded to what is my real concern—the size of the problem is gigantic and the solutions, for the significant part, are expensive. Also, you eluded to desirability of a regional approach. We (both Kathy and I) are concerned by the lack of engagement and meaningful commitment from the other Thurston cities and the county.

(Please pass this note on to Cary. I've seem to have lost his contact information.)

Again, nice job. Keep up the good work.

Best, Mike

Mike McCormick
360.754.2916



FIRST SOME FACTS :

* OLYMPIAN NEWSPAPER

** ZILLOW

*** ME

* IN 2015 NEARLY 83% OF DOWNTOWN OLYMPIA WAS AVAILABLE FOR LOW INCOME TENANTS. THE CITY REPORTED 1,263 TOTAL LOW INCOME UNITS IN DOWNTOWN.

* ALSO IN 2015 THERE WERE PROJECTS UNDERWAY TO REDUCE LOW INCOME UNITS TO 73%

* IN 2015 CAPITOL CROSSING WAS CONSIDERED MARKET RATE - RENTS WERE ABOUT 825^{00} - 995^{00} MO.

** 2021 THE AVERAGE RENT FOR A 1 BDRM IN OLYMPIA : $1,450^{00}$ THIS IS INSANITY!

* 2021 DOWNTOWN IS NOW 77% MARKET RATE
8 8 YEAR MFTE MONSTERS HAVE BEEN BUILT
ONLY 1 12 YEAR MFTE - MARKET MANOR -
NO WHERE NEAR DOWNTOWN OLYMPIA
THERE ARE PLANS TO GIVE MORE 8 YEAR MFTE
CONTRACTS IN THE MAKING.

WE DONT EVEN USE THE TOOL OF
INCLUSIONARY ZONING THAT THE STATE
HAS GIVEN US.

*** YOU CANT ADD 73% AND 77%
AND GET 100%

*** THERE IS A THUMB ON THE WRONG SIDE OF
JUSTICES SCALES.

#1

THE MEAT OF THE MATTER AND COMMON SENSE:

My NAME IS AUTUMN. I AM 46 YEARS OLD, AND DOWNTOWN OLY HAS ALWAYS BEEN MY HOME. IT STILL IS. IT'S WHERE MY ROOTS GROW. IT'S MY HOME, BUT I HAVE BEEN GENTRIFIED OUT OF MY COMMUNITY. MARKET RATE FANTASY AND CLASSISM HAS DISPLACED ME. I WANT TO GO HOME.

SOME PEOPLE TRY TO SELL THE IDEA THAT BECAUSE THESE MARKET RATE MONSTERS WERE BUILT ON WHAT HAD BEEN EMPTY LOTS THEY DIDN'T DISPLACE ANYBODY. THIS IS SIMPLY NOT TRUE. I WAS DISPLACED. AND SO WERE MOST, IF NOT ALL OF THE PEOPLE LIVING IN THE 14 UNIT STUDIO APT. BUILDING AT 506 1/2 E. 4TH AVE. SOME OF US WERE COUPLES SO ITS PROBABLY MORE LIKE 20 PEOPLE.

IT WAS OVER 100 YEARS OLD AND HAD "GRANDFATHERED IN" CODE PROBLEMS. WELCOME TO OLY! WE ARE AN OLD TOWN. MY RENT WAS 420⁰⁰ A MO. MORE THAN AFFORDABLE! THIS WAS ALSO NATURALLY OCCURRING AFFORDABLE HOUSING. IT WAS NOT SUBSIDIZED. I WAS HAPPY. THIS WAS JUST A FEW YEARS AGO.

- WHEN 123 4TH AVE WAS BEING BUILT - PEOPLE WERE UPSET. THIS TYPE OF PLACE DIDN'T BELONG. CHERYL SELBY TOLD US SHE WAS OPEN TO MORE AFFORDABLE OPTIONS IN FUTURE BUILDS. I DID NOT PROTEST 123 4TH. I BELIEVED CHERYL SELBY AND I BELIEVE IN SHARING. INCLUSIVENESS MEANT TO ME, WE - THOSE OF US ALREADY LIVING IN DOWNTOWN - COULD SHARE SPACE

②*

WITH SOME WEALTHIER NEIGHBORS MOVING IN, THE KEY WORD BEING SHARE. I DIDN'T WANT TO BE A NIMBY. I DESPISE THAT WAY OF THINKING. WE ALL LEARNED TO SHARE IN KINDERGARTEN. BEFORE WE HAD CLASSIST BUNDERS.

THE OWNER OF 506 1/2 E. 4TH AVE SOLD. SHE TOLD US THAT WITH ALL THE NEW CONSTRUCTION GOING IN DOWNTOWN SHE COULDN'T JUSTIFY NOT SELLING. THE MARKET WAS TOO PRIME FOR PROFIT.

AT LEAST SHE FACED US. PERHAPS SHE THOUGHT BY EXPLAINING IT WOULD MAKE US FEEL BETTER ABOUT BEING DISPLACED. IT DID NOT FEEL BETTER. I BECAME HOMELESS.

THE NEW OWNERS SENT IN HANDLERS TO DO THE DIRTY WORK VIA REAL ESTATE AGENTS. THEY GAVE US 28 DAYS TO UPROOT AND VACATE WITH NO REGARD AS TO WHERE. I DIDN'T EVEN GET MY DEPOSIT BACK BECAUSE OF CONFUSION OVER WHO WAS SUPPOSED TO PAY IT.

I DIDN'T KNOW ABOUT NORTHWEST JUSTICE PROJECT UNTIL IT WAS TOO LATE. I COULDN'T AFFORD A LAWYER, SO RICH PEOPLE WITH CONNECTIONS WERE ABLE TO STEAL MY 200⁰⁰ DEPOSIT.

I WAS, EVENTUALLY, ABLE TO FIND ANOTHER PLACE I

③*

COULD AFFORD. THEY WEREN'T ARTIFICIALLY RISING RENT BY USING THE 3X RENT RULE, REQUIRING NOT ONLY 1ST, LAST, DEPOSIT, SCREENING AND ADMINISTRATION FEES, BUT ALSO THAT A PERSON'S INCOME BE AT LEAST 3X THE AMOUNT OF RENT.

IT'S A BIG PROBLEM WHEN LANDLORDS WHO HAVE NO CONNECTION WITH SUBSIDY ARE ALLOWED TO KEEP PEOPLE OUT OF HOMES THEY COULD OTHERWISE AFFORD. RENT BURDEN SUCKS, BUT THE BURDEN OF BEING HOMELESS IS FAR WORSE.

THE PLACE I FOUND WAS FAR REMOVED FROM HOME. OUT PAST HAWKS PRARIE. WHAT FELT TO ME LIKE CORPORATE HELL. DOWNTOWN OY WAS ALWAYS WHERE I SPENT 100% OF MY INCOME, BUT NOW I WAS LEFT WITH SHOPPING OPTIONS THAT MADE ME FEEL LIKE A TRAITOR TO MY MORALS. JUST CORPORATE SUCK.

NOW MY PARTNER ALL OF A SUDDEN HAD A 1 HOUR EACH WAY BUS RIDE TO WORK, RATHER THAN A 5 MIN. WALK. WE LOST 2 PRECIOUS HOURS WITH EACHOTHER EVERY DAY. OUR TIME IS JUST AS VALUABLE AS ANYONE ELSE'S, AND IT WAS TAKEN AWAY WITH NO RETURN OR BENEFIT.

IT WAS SHORT LIVED. THE RANCH HOTEL APARTMENTS

SOLD. NEW OWNERS WANTED TO TEAR IT DOWN TO RE-BUILD UNAFFORDABLE MONSTERS.

AT LEAST WE HAD KIND MANAGERS WHO WERE ABLE TO GET US ALL NEW 1 YEAR LEASES BEFORE THE SELL WENT THROUGH. IT DIDN'T MAKE THE REALESTATE AGENTS SENT OUT TO HANDLE US HAPPY. THEY HAD PLANNED ON QUICKLY GETTING US OUT OF THE WAY. EVEN LIED AND TRIED TO TELL US OUR NEW LEASES WERENT VALID BUT IF WE'D BE WILLING TO SIGN OURSELVES OUT OF THEM THEY WOULD OFFER US A FREE MO. RENT.

SOME PEOPLE SIGNED, WE DID NOT. THANK YOU NORTHWEST JUSTICE PROJECT FOR EXPLAINING OUR LEASES WERE IN FACT VALID. THE BUSINESS MONSTERS WOULD HAVE TO WAIT A YEAR.

WHEN THE YEAR ENDED WE WERE HOMELESS AGAIN. UNABLE TO FIND A PLACE WE COULD BOTH AFFORD THAT DIDNT USE THE 3X RENT RULE.

A LOT OF THE PEOPLE WHO LIVED THERE BECAME HOMELESS. THE 68 YEAR OLD VETAN NEX DOOR, WHO HAD SERVED OUR COUNTRY AND WORKED HIS WHOLE LIFE BECAME HOMELESS FOR THE FIRST TIME EVER. BUT GREED DID NOT CARE.

* 5

MY PARTNER AND I WERE LUCKIER THAN MOST.

WE ENTERED AND WON A HOUSING LOTTERY THROUGH HUD.

WE KNOW HOW BLESSED WE ARE TO HAVE BOTH
SHELTER AND HELP. WE ARE THANKFUL EVERY DAY.

I HAVE SHELTER - BUT I AM NOT HOME.

EVEN WITH THE VOUCHER WE HAD A HARD TIME FINDING
HOUSING WE COULD AFFORD. NONE THAT LED US BACK
HOME. I'M JUST STUCK IN A DIFFERENT CORPORATE HELL.
IRONICLY WE ARE NEXT TO WHAT IS CALLED CORPORATE CENTER.

SOME MIGHT STOP HERE AND SAY SHE DOESN'T EVEN LIVE
IN OLYMPIA, WHY LISTEN TO HER? I WOULD REMIND YOU
I DID NOT WISH TO MOVE - I WAS MOVED. I AM
THINKING IF I HAVE TO GIVE UP A ROOF AND WALLS
IN ORDER TO GO HOME I MAY DO SO. UNSHELTERED
PEOPLE CAN STILL VOTE AND I WOULD LIKE TO BE
ABLE TO USE MY VOTE TO HELP MY HOMETOWN.

WITH EVERY PRECIOUS PIECE OF REAL ESTATE BEING HANDED
TO BUSINESS MONSTERS - USING THE 8 YEAR MFTE RATHER
THAN THE 12 YEAR MFTE OR EVEN BETTER OPTION OF
INCLUSIONARY ZONING - WE (YOU) ARE EFFECTIVELY CLOSING
DOORS TO PEOPLE WHO HAVE ALWAYS LIVED AND
WORKED DOWNTOWN OLY.

AND YOU ARE PICKING THE PEOPLE'S POCKETS TO DO SO.

IF WE ARE BUILDING FOR FUTURE GROWTH SHOULDN'T THIS GROWTH BE INCLUSIVE? WHO ARE WE GROWING FOR?

CERTAINLY NOT THE ACTUAL AVERAGE INCOME IN THE AREA. MEDIAN AREA INCOME PAINTS A FALSE PICTURE. IT DOES NOT REFLECT THE MAJORITY OF PEOPLE AT ALL. WE NEED TO STOP USING IT TO PUSH WEALTH'S AGENDA.

DOWNTOWN OLY HAS ALWAYS BEEN MOSTLY WORKING POOR. IF WE ONLY ONLY BUILD FOR WEALTHY PEOPLE WHERE WILL WE FIND THE DIVERSITY THAT MADE IT SUCH A GEM? IF ITS SUPPOSED TO "TRICKLE DOWN" WHEN IS THAT SUPPOSED TO HAPPEN? ALL I SEE IS DRYING UP. WE ARE PARCHED.

WHAT HAPPENED TO ALL THE NATURALLY OCCURING AFFORDABLE HOUSING? BUSINESS MONSTERS ATE IT UP. WHERE IS THE AFFORDABLE OPTIONS THE PEOPLE ELECTED YOU TO HELP CREATE CHERYL SELBY? IF IT IS BEING BUILT ITS SO FAR REMOVED FROM THE DOWNTOWN CORE IT MAY AS WELL BE IN LACEY.

THE CITY DIDN'T NEED "PROOF" THAT PEOPLE WANTED TO LIVE DOWNTOWN OLY. MANY PEOPLE ALREADY DID LIVE THERE. WE WANTED TO. I'M SURE I'M NOT THE ONLY PERSON WHO HAS BEEN

* ⑦

DISPLACED AND WOULD LIKE TO BE ALLOWED TO GO HOME.

WE CANNOT ALLOW DOWNTOWN OLY TO BE TURNED INTO A WEALTH HUB BY TAKING AWAY FROM THE NEEDS OF THE MANY TO PLEASE THE WHIMS OF THE FEW. THIS IS CLASSISM, NOT A DEMOCRACY.

IF SOMEONE LIKE WALKER JOHN WANTED TO MOVE HERE TO GROW HIS EMPIRE - BECAUSE HE THOUGHT IT WAS SUCH A GREAT COMMUNITY AND WANTED TO HELP REALIZE ITS POSSIBILITIES - WHY THEN DID HE NOT ACT LIKE A GOOD NEIGHBOR AND HELP BUILD FOR THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY? WHY DID HE CHOOSE INSTEAD TO PICK THE PEOPLES POCKETS - LIKE A NASTY CARPET BAGGER? CLASSISM I SUSPECT.

PROFIT NEEDED TO BE MADE. THE MORE FOR HIM THE BETTER FOR HIM. BUT ONLY FOR HIM. HE COULD NOT SEE VALUE IN LOWER INCOMES. HE COULD NOT LOOK PAST INCOME TO SEE THE VALUE OF THE LOW INCOME PEOPLE.

HIS "LUXURY LIVING" MONSTERS WERE BUILT WITH ONLY HIS WEALTH IN MIND. PUT IN A GYM AND A COFFEE BAR ETC... NOW THAT MONEY GOES TO HIS POCKET RATHER THAN, SAY, THE YMCA OR DANCING GOATS. IT DOES NOT REACH THE COMMUNITY.

THESE PEOPLE DON'T WANT TO BE PART OF OUR

* (6)

COMMUNITY, THEY WANT TO OWN IT. AND THEN CHANGE IT AS THEY SEE FIT. IF THEY DON'T WANT TO BE PART OF IT THEY SHOULD NOT BE PAID WITH OUR TAXES TO RUIN IT. SUCKING THE SOUL FROM THE CITY.

OLY HAS A LONG HISTORY WITH BEING LIBERAL AND PROGRESSIVE. WE LIKE IT THAT WAY. THIS IS IN PART THANKS TO EVERGREEN HAVING BEEN A LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE. IT'S MOSTLY THANKS TO THOSE OF US WHO CALL IT HOME.

WE TACKLE BIG ISSUES. WE ARE ANTI RACISM. WE SHOULD BE. RACISM IS DISPICABLE. WE ARE ANTI SEXISM.

WE SHOULD BE. SEXISM IS UNFAIR AND WRONG. WE LIKE TO USE WORDS LIKE EQUALITY. THIS IS ALL GOOD.

WE HAVE MORE WORK TO DO TO CLOSE THE GAPS BETWEEN OUR PROGRESSIVE WORDS AND ACTIONS THAT BACK THEM UP, BUT WE AT LEAST ARE NOT AFRAID TO CALL THEM OUT BY NAME.

YET THERE IS ANOTHER ISM THAT IS PLAGUING OUR SOCIETY. WE SEEM TO DO ANYTHING AND EVERYTHING TO NOT HAVE TO CALL IT WHAT IT IS. CLASSISM.

IT'S DIRECTLY LINKED TO RACISM AND SEXISM, BUT RARELY MENTION IT IN CONVERSATIONS. IF WE DO, WE PREFER TO USE WORDS LIKE "INCOME GAP." AS IF IT WERE ONLY A GAP AND NOT A GROWING CANYON.

* 9

IT'S SYSTEMIC. PUT IN PLACE TO VILIFY THE POOR AND WEAPONIZE BEING HOMELESS.

TO TALK ABOUT CLASSISM WE WOULD HAVE TO ADMIT THE SYSTEM WE USE - CAPITALISM - IS SET UP TO ELEVATE THE FEW WHILE KEEPING THE MAJORITY SUPPRESSED.

CLASSISM PUSHES THE IDEA OF "TRICKLE DOWN ECONOMICS" WHILE IGNORING THE FACT IT DOESN'T WORK. ALLOWING BUSINESS OWNERS TO PROFIT WHILE NOT PAYING WORKERS A LIVABLE WAGE.

CLASSISM TOUTS WE ARE SO PROGRESSIVE WE ARE PAYING 15⁰⁰ AN HOUR - OR AT LEAST PHASING IT IN - WHILE IGNORING THAT MARKET RATE MONSTERS ARE EATING ANY GAINS IT WAS SUPPOSED TO ACHIEVE FOR THE PEOPLE BEFORE THEY ARE EVER REALIZED.

THE CRUMBS THAT "TRICKLE DOWN" TO ME ARE MORE AKIN TO "LET THEM EAT CAKE."

CLASSISM USES OTHER TERMS TO PROTECT WEALTH TOO. "BOOTSTRAPPING" AND "MERITOCRACY" ARE TWO THAT COME TO MIND. THESE ARE JUST PLATITUDES. IGNORING THE LUCK, WEALTH, AND OR CONNECTIONS THAT HELPED WEALTH ACHIEVE ITS GOALS.

BECAUSE THE IDEA OF CAPITALISM HAS BEEN SPOON FED TO US FROM CHILDHOOD - IN ORDER TO SUPPORT ITSELF - WE PRETEND IT'S THE ONLY WAY. CLASSISM DEPENDS ON THIS.

CLASSISM ALLOWS PEOPLE WITH WEALTH BECOME SELF APPOINTED SO CALLED COMMUNITY LEADERS TO MAKE DECISIONS THEY WERE NOT ELECTED TO MAKE. THEY FORM "CLUBS" AND "ASSOCIATIONS" WITH DUES AND FEES AND REQUIRMENTS THE MAJORITY CANT AFFORD.

CLASSISM HANDS THE REINS OF POWER TO THESE PEOPLE WHO WERE NOT ELECTED BY THE PEOPLE. GIVING THEM A BIGGER SAY IN DECISION MAKING. THESE ROTARY CLUBS AND "DOWNTOWN ASSOCIATIONS", TO NAME TWO, ARE ALLOWED TO SIT AT TABLES AND REACH EARS THE MAJORITY OF US CANNOT ACCESS. THEY ARE FEWER IN NUMBER BUT ALLOWED TO DROWN OUT THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE. THIS IS NOT DEMOCRACY. THIS IS CLASSISM.

WEALTH DOES NOT MAKE A BETTER PERSON IN ANY WAY. CLASSISM WOULD HAVE US BELIEVE IT DOES.

CLASSISM WOULD SAY: "SOUNDS LIKE SOUR GRAPES." I WOULD COUNTER WITH ITS MORE LIKE GRAPES OF WRATH.

11

CARY RETLIN - YOU ARE THE MANAGER OF OLYMPIAS
AFFORDABLE HOUSING HOME FUND AND RESIDENT HOUSING
ADVISOR. HOW CAN YOU SAY WITH CLEAR CONSCIOUS THAT
"ALL HOUSING IS GOOD HOUSING" WHEN MARKET RATE
MONSTERS ARE EATING UP ALL THE ALREADY EXISTING AND
MUCH NEEDED NATURALLY OCCURRING AFFORDABLE HOUSING?
DID YOU FORGET THE AFFORDABLE PART OF YOUR
JOB TITLE? OR DID YOU JUST DECIDE TO JUST KEEP
TRYING TO SELL THE "TRICKLE DOWN" LIE? THIS LIE
IS PERPETUATED BY THE "HAVES" IN ORDER TO PROTECT
WEALTHS POCKETS. PLEASE STOP HELPING THEM.

SOME MIGHT SAY MY DISPLACEMENT - AND THOSE LIKE ME -
WAS A BYPRODUCT OF GROWTH THAT CITY OFFICIALS
ARE POWERLESS TO CONTROL. THIS IS A LIE.

WE HAD AND STILL HAVE THE TOOLS TO CREATE WHAT
MOST PEOPLE NEED AND WANT. HOUSING WE CAN
AFFORD IN PLACES WE FEEL HAPPY TO LIVE. MY INCOME
SHOULD NOT DETERMIN MY ZIP CODE. MY HOME IS
DOWNTOWN OLYMPIA.

THE 'TOOLS' ARE BUSY BECAUSE WE DON'T USE THEM
BUT THEY ARE THERE STILL TO BE USED. WE COULD TELL
DEVELOPERS THESE ARE THE "TOOLS" YOU MUST USE TO
BUILD IF YOU WANT TO PROFIT FROM OUR PEOPLE

* (12)

BUT CLASSISM DEMANDS - LIKE A SPOILED CHILD - THAT WE DON'T. BUST OUT THE TOOLS!

IN A DEMOCRACY THE MAJORITY IS SUPPOSED TO WIN. I WAS TAUGHT TO TRUST MY GOVERNMENT. I WAS TAUGHT THAT WHO WE ELECTED MATTERED. I WANT TO BE ABLE TO BELIEVE THIS STILL. LATELY THIS IS HARD. IT FEELS LIKE DEALING WITH A TWO HEADED SNAKE.

CHERYL SELBY - IF YOU WERE SO OPEN TO USING OUR TOOLS LIKE THE 12 YEAR MFTE - WHY IN DOWNTOWN OLYMPIA - WHERE BUILDABLE LAND IS MORE SCARCE THAN ANYWHERE ELSE IN OLYMPIA - DID YOU ONLY HAND OUT 8 YEAR MFTE CONTRACTS? WHERE ARE YOUR POM-POMS FOR THE PEOPLE? THE PEOPLE WHO HIRED YOU TO CHEER FOR US?

AS WE MAKE ROOM FOR GROWTH WE NEED TO TAKE LESSONS FROM CITIES THAT HAVE GONE THROUGH THE GROWING PAINS. WEALTH POCKETS ARE NOT GOOD FOR STRONG COMMUNITIES. THEY JUST PUSH LOWER INCOME PEOPLE INTO POVERTY POCKETS.

I PERSONALLY BELIEVE WE COULD AND SHOULD MOVE AWAY FROM AND FIX DAMAGES DONE BY CLASSISM BY USING SOMETHING THAT LOOKS LIKE AUSTRIAS HOUSING MODEL.

13

RICH AND POOR SHARING THE SAME SPACES. NOT ONLY IN THE SAME NEIGHBORHOODS, BUT IN THE SAME BUILDINGS AS WELL. IF WE CAN ALL LEARN TO SEE EACH OTHER AS DESERVING HUMAN BEINGS REGARDLESS OF RACE - SEX - RELIGION - AND INCOME WE CAN FIX THE BROKEN AND BUILD BACK BETTER.

WE CAN'T JUST COME UP WITH SLOGANS LIKE "NO MORE MISSING MIDDLE" WHILE ITS REASON FOR MISSING GETS OVERLOOKED. RISING POVERTY. THIS IS JUST ANOTHER CLASSIST TOOL - USING MIDDLE INCOME EARNERS AS A COUSION TO PROTECT THE WEALTHY FEW.

TROY KIRBY OF THE CIDER BARREL WAS QUOTED IN A THURSTON TALKS ARTICLE I RECENTLY READ. I BOTH AGREED WITH AND DISAGREED WITH WHAT HE SAID.

I DISSAGREE GREATLY WITH THE PART WHERE HE SAID HE FINDS IT BETTER TO LISTEN TO CUSTOMERS OVER NON CUSTOMERS BECAUSE NON CUSTOMERS TEND TO COMPLAIN MORE. WHO'S CUSTOMERS? I MAY NEVER CHOOSE TO GO IN HIS CIDER BAR - BUT AGAIN DOWNTOWN OLY WAS WHERE I SPENT 100% OF MY INCOME.

CAN TROY KIRBY SAY THE SAME?

I DID HOWEVER AGREE WITH - AND WAS HAPPY TO

FIND COMMON GROUND - HIS IDEA OF FINDING WHAT HE CALLED THE VIBRANCY OF THE LATE 80'S / 1990'S.

YES. THOSE WERE GREAT TIMES. HE DISCOVERED IT WALKING AROUND WITH GRANDMA BIRDIE WHEN HE WAS A CHILD AND WOULD VISIT FROM HIS HOMETOWN LACEY. I ALREADY KNEW BECAUSE I LIVED DOWNTOWN. IT IS HOME. I WAS PART OF THE VIBRANCY HE IS LOOKING FOR.

LETS BE CLEAR. THIS WAS A TIME WHERE THE PEOPLE WHO WORKED DOWNTOWN COULD ALSO AFFORD TO LIVE DOWNTOWN. THE WORKING POOR ARE THE COGS AND THE GEARS. WITHOUT THEM DOWNTOWN OLYMPIA - AND EVERYWHERE ELSE IS MOOT.

IT IS THE EMPLOYEES - COOKS - JANITORS - BARISTAS - CASHIERS - STREET SWEEPERS - WAITERS - GARBAGE COLLECTORS - DISH WASHERS - BAR TENDERS ETC... THAT WERE THE MAKERS OF WHAT TROY REMEMBERS.

ABLE TO DO SO BECAUSE THE COMMUNITY SUPPORTED THEM IN HAVING A HAPPY LIFE FOR THE MOST PART. WE WERE POOR BUT ABLE TO LIVE WHERE WE WORKED. WE HAD FREE TIME TO CREATE AND PLAY.

AGAIN - IF IT WERE NOT FOR THE WORKING POOR THERE IS NO "LIFESTYLE" TO SELL. THEY ARE THE SOUL OF THE CITY.

15

WHILE YOU PAT YOURSELVES ON THE BACK AND GIVE EACH OTHER "PERSON OF THE YEAR" AWARDS FOR BEING GOOD "LEADERS" I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU THIS -

WHEN WE CAN'T AFFORD TO LIVE ANYWHERE ON POVERTY WAGES YOU BRAG ABOUT AS PROGRESSIVE - BECAUSE MARKET RATE MONSTERS HAVING NO CHECKS TO BALANCE THEM - WHO DO YOU THINK WE WILL TURN TO? WE WILL NEED YOU TO PAY US EVEN MORE.

SOME WOULD TRY TO SAY MINIMUM WAGE JOBS WERE NEVER MEANT TO BE A LIVING WAGE. IGNORING THE REALITY OF MEANT TO BE OR NOT THEY ARE THE WAGE MANY PEOPLE SURVIVE ON. SINGLE PEOPLE AND ENTIRE FAMILIES AS WELL.

AS LONG AS YOU IGNORE THE UNCOMFORTABLE TRUTH YOU DO NOBODY JUSTICE. YOU WILL FAIL TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE. SO IM CALLING ON YOU - OUR ACTUAL LEADERS - ELECTED BY THE PEOPLE - TO MAKE BETTER DECISIONS. DECISIONS THAT FILL THE NEEDS OF THE MAJORITY - NOT BEND TO THE WHIMS OF WEALTH.

WHEN I SAY MARKET RATE AND BUSINESS MONSTERS IM REFERRING TO ANYBODY WHO WOULD MOVE TO A COMMUNITY WITH CLASSIST BLINDERS AND GREEDY

INTENTIONS. DO NOT SMILE AND WAVE AND SAY YOU WANT TO BE MY NEIGHBOR WHILE SECRETLY MAKING PLANS TO REMODEL MY HOME AND MOVE ME OUT.

FINDING ALLIES IN WEALTHS CLASSIST CLUBS - USING LIES AND ORWELLIAN DOUBLE SPEAK, LIP SERVICE AND PLATITUDES. IT'S VAMPIRE BEHAVIOR - SUCKING THE SOULS FROM COMMUNITIES, LEAVING MANY IN DISPAIR.

OLY HAS BEEN THROUGH A LOT OVER THE YEARS. WE ARE TOUGH - WE CAN MANAGE WITHOUT GIVING AWAY OUR FEW AND PRECIOUS RECOURCES LIKE BUILDABLE LAND.

EVENTUALLY DEVELOPERS GREED WILL BRING THEM HERE ANYWAY. IF WE ARENT GETTING WHAT WE NEED FROM THEM, WE SHOULDN'T BE GIVING THEM WHAT THEY WANT FROM US.

THIS IS MY 4TH DRAFT OF THIS LETTER. MY HAND HURTS. I HAVE BLISTERS. STILL I TRY. TRY TO FIND WORDS THAT CAN PENETRATE THE WALLS ELITISTS HAVE BUILT AROUND YOUR EARS AND YOUR HEARTS. I HAVE LITTLE HOPE IT WILL HELP, NOT IF YOU'VE ALREADY MADE UP YOUR MINDS TO KEEP PUSHING "TRICKLE DOWN" LIES TO ACHIEVE A CLASSIST AGENDA, BUT HOW EVER SMALL, I DO STILL HAVE HOPE. SHOW ME YOU SEE MY VALUE, AND THE VALUE OF OTHERS AND MOVE AWAY FROM UNAFFORDABLE MARKET RATE MONSTERS.

17
FIX WHAT THEY WERE ALLOWED TO BREAK. CREATE SOLUTIONS TO REPLACE WHAT HAS ALREADY BEEN STOLEN.

SOME MIGHT THINK ITS A THREAT, BUT I FEEL LEFT WITH FEW OPTIONS, IF I HAVE TO GIVE UP THE SECURITY OF WALLS AND A ROOF SO I CAN GO HOME I WILL MAKE THAT CHOICE FOR MYSELF. IT'S ONE OF THE ONLY THINGS I FEEL I CAN STILL HAVE CHOICE IN. I DON'T WANT TO BE HOMELESS. I JUST WANT TO GO HOME.

THERE IS ENOUGH ROOM DOWNTOWN TO SHARE. STOP BEING SO SELFISH AND GIVE SOME OF IT BACK.

WHAT WE NEED IS RENT CONTROL. I KNOW WE DON'T HAVE IT NOW, BUT THATS WHAT WE ELECT LEADERS FOR. TO HELP CHANGE UNJUST LAWS TO HELP REFLECT THE NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE.



My STORY - AND WHY THIS IS SO PERSONAL : (IN SUMERY)

THE FIRST PLACE I REMEMBER - VAUGLY - LIVING DOWNTOWN OLYMPIA WAS AT THE REX. I WAS MAYBE 2 OR 3.

AT THE TIME THEY HAD A NO CHILDREN RULE SO MY MOM WOULD SMUGGLE ME IN AND OUT IN A LAUNDRY DUFFIE BAG. IT WAS OUR CLIMB IN THE BAG AND STAY QUIET GAME. IT WAS ALL SHE COULD AFFORD ON A WAITRESS PAY. SHE TRIED THE BEST SHE COULD. THE REWARD FOR ~~ANY~~ SUCCESS IN THE QUIET GAME WAS FOR BOTH OF US SECURITY - FOR ME A NEW STICKER.

EVENTUALLY WE WERE ABLE TO MOVE INT A DUPLEX BY THE LIBRARY DOWNTOWN. THATS WHEN AND WHERE I FELL IN LOVE WITH BOOKS. AND I ALSO FELL IN LOVE WITH A LIBRIAN. SHE WOULD GIVE ME A RUBBER STAMP AND PAPER CLIPS AND SCRAP PAPER, MAK ROOM FOR ME AT HER DESK AND LET ME HELP RUN THE LIBRARY. SHE MADE IT ALL SEEM VERY IMPORTANT.

SHE WAS MY DEFACTO CHILD CARE.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD WAS FULL OF KIDS WHO DIDNT HAVE PROPER CHILD CARE. WE HAD WORKING CLASS PARENTS WHO WERE DOING THE BEST ~~BY~~ THEY COULD. THE KIDS WOULD JUST BAND TOGEATHER AND WATCH OUT FOR EACHOTHER IN A PECKING ORDER FORMED BY AGE.

2

WE WOULD RIDE BIKES DOWN TO YARDBIRDS TO PLAY VIDEO GAMES, LOOK AT ALL THE PET STORE ANIMALS, AND TURN IN COUPONS SENT OUT IN THE MAIL FOR 1 FREE SM. POPCORN OR 1 FREE SM. DRINK. THEY WOULD LET YOU USE 2 COUPONS IF YOU HAD 'EM SO THEY BECAME TRADING GOLD TO US KIDS.

WE'D ROAM ALL OVER DOWNTOWN. EVEN WENT SWIMMING IN CAPITOL LAKE. SOUNDS GROSS NOW, BUT THEY HAD A ROPED OFF AREA, AND EVEN A LIFEGUARD FOR AWHILE.

THIS WAS THE PLACE I MADE MY FIRST BEST FRIEND. RACHEL G. AND THE PLACE I STARTED SCHOOL FROM (GO LINCOLN LIONS!)

THIS IS WHERE MY ROOTS AND MY HEART MADE PLANS TO SURVIVE THE CONDITIONS OF MY LIFE IN POVERTY. THE ROOTS GRABBED MY HEART - WRAPPED THEMSELVES IN SAFETY AND DUG DOWN DEEP FOR STABILITY.

AND IT WORKED. LATER WHEN MY MOM MET AND MARRIED A MAN WHO MOVED US MY ROOTS REMAINED.

WHEN MY MOM'S NEW ~~NEW~~ HUSBAND ABUSED ME, THIS IS WHERE I WOULD RETURN. I WOULD LIE DOWN IN THE TALL GRASS OF WHAT HAD BEEN MY YARD,

3

REALLY JUST A VACANT LOT NEXT DOOR, AND I WOULD LET MY HOME HEAL ME. THEN WITH RENEWED STRENGTH I WOULD SPEND HOURS WALKING AROUND TOWN. VISITING ALL THE PLACES THAT I LOVED. DOWN TO THE DOCKS TO CLIMB THE VIEW TOWER - OVER TO THE TREASURE CHEST TO PET THE MOOSE - ARCHIBALD SISTERS - RADIANCE-EARTH MAGIC AND MORE. ALL THE SIGHTS SOUNDS AND SMELLS ALONG WITH FAMILIAR KIND FACES LET ME KNOW I WAS OK. I WAS HOME. THE HOUSE I LIVED IN WAS DISFUNCTIONAL, BUT MY HOME WAS HERE TO TAKE CARE OF ME.

BY THE TIME I WAS 16 MY MOM AND HER HUSBAND MOVED OUT OF THE COUNTY COMPLETELY. I STAYED WITH MY HEART. I WAS ~~HOME~~ WITHOUT SHELTER BUT I WAS HOME. AND I TRIED TO GIVE BACK THE BEST THAT I COULD. I WAS AND AM A GOOD PERSON. OLYMPIA GAVE ME THAT. I HELD DOORS FOR PEOPLE CARRYING PACKAGES - MADE EYE CONTACT - SMILED. MY COMMUNITY SMILED BACK, THEY WERE KIND AND HELPED ME GROW.

AS I GREW I HAVE SCRUBBED TOILETS - CLEANED BOATS - WASHED WINDOWS - DONE OFFICE WORK - BEEN A BARISTA - A JEWELERS HELPER - A STORE CLERK - A WAITRESS - AND EVEN DID PIECE WORK FOR THE STUFF SOLD AT ARCHIBALD SISTERS. MOST OF IT OFF THE BOOKS - I DID WHAT

[4]

I HAD TO SURVIVE. OFF THE BOOKS MEANS MOST OF IT DIDN'T COUNT TWARD WORK CREDITS FOR SSI.

I HAVE LIVED AND PAID RENT IN 8 PLACES I CAN THINK OF ALL DOWNTOWN. I DIDN'T WANT TO LIVE ANYWHERE ELSE.

I'VE BEEN UNSHELTERED CLOSE TO HALF MY LIFE IF YOU ADD ALL THE TIME TOGETHER. THE LONGEST STRETCH LASTING OVER 10 YEARS. I CHOSE WHEN I WAS UNSHELTERED TO TRAVEL A LOT BUT I ALWAYS AFTER A FEW MO. WOULD RETURN HOME. IT CALLED OUT TO ME - MY HEART AND MY ROOTS SAID COME HOME - WE WILL HEAL YOU.

THE LAST TIME I WAS ABLE TO FEEL THIS VITAL CONNECTION WAS AT 506 1/2 E. 4TH. SOME MIGHT HAVE THOUGHT IT WAS A RUN DOWN DUMP BUT IT WAS JUST OLD. IT WAS FULL OF CHARACTER - 15' CELINGS - CROWN MOLDING - OLD COOL DOORKNOBS - AND MANY MORE FEATURES THAT MADE IT MORE THAN A HUMAN STORAGE BOX. IT WAS PART OF DOWNTOWN - IT AND I BELONGED.

IT WAS HERE WHERE MY HOME TOWN HEALED ME AGAIN. I HAD BEEN WITHOUT SHELTER OVER 10 YEARS - I WAS SO VERY TIRED, TIRED IN A WAY MOST WILL NEVER KNOW. I WAS ALSO ADDICTED TO PILLS GIVEN TO ME BY DR'S. THE OPIATE BAND-AID.

5

AFTER LIVING AT 506 1/2 E. 4th FOR ABOUT A YEAR IT WAS THERE - IN MY TINY STUDIO - WITH THE STRENGTH OF MY HEART AND THE GROUNDING OF MY ROOTS AND THE COMFORTS OF A SOFT BED AND SECURITY OF A LOCKING DOOR - AND LOVE OF A DEAR FRIEND - I WAS ABLE TO CHOOSE FOR MYSELF TO STOP TAKING THOSE PILLS. I DIDN'T HAVE TO - DR'S GAVE ME 120 EACH MO. I STILL HAD MORE REFILLS - THEY WOULD HAVE GIVEN ME MORE. I CHOSE TO.

IT HURT. I WAS VERY SICK FOR LIKE A WEEK. BUT MY HOMETOWN WAS THERE FOR ME, AND I HEALED.

I DRANK THE ARTISIAN WATERS THAT POOLED FREELY FOR ALL RIGHT ACROSS THE STREET. IT FILLED ME WITH LIFE.

WHEN I WOULD WAKE UP WITH THE NIGHTMARES THAT HAUNT ME I COULD WALK OUT MY BACK DOOR AND GO SIT BY THE WATER CALMING MY RACING MIND. THE COOL BREEZES WOULD SMACK RIGGINGS AGAINST MASTS WHILE SEAGULLS MADE SOFT COOS CREATING A MUSIC THAT WOULD SOOTHE ME. IT WOULD FILL ME UP AND I WOULD KNOW I WOULD BE OK. AND I WAS.

TORN
UNTIL I WAS ~~DISPLACED~~ FROM MY ROOTS -
PLUCKED LIKE A RANDOM WEED FROM THE GARDEN
IN WHICH I ALWAYS GREW.

①

JUST A FEW MORE THOUGHTS BEFORE YOU GO:

CLASSISM PITS THE POOR AGAINST THE POORER -

HAVING US ALWAYS LOOK DOWN TO SEE HOW "THOSE PEOPLE" ARE GETTING ALL THE HANDOUTS - "THOSE PEOPLE" ARE KEEPING ME FROM CLIMBING THE SOCIAL LADDER ETC... IN ORDER TO INOCULATE WEALTHY "ELITE CLASSES". WE DON'T LOOK UP TO SEE OR SAY THOSE ARE THE PEOPLE THAT MAKE LIFE HARDER FOR THE MAJORITY.

CLASSISM WANTS US ALL TO FEEL FOR "SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS". WE SHOULD. THEY ARE IMPORTANT. BUT IT DOESN'T WANT US TO SEE WHEN THE LINE HAS BEEN CROSSED BETWEEN STRUGGLING SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS AND BUSINESS MONSTERS. EXAMPLE: CAFFEE VITA. CONSIDERED A SMALL BUSINESS. I KNOW NOTHING OF NEW OWNERS BUT JUST THIS YEAR I SAW WHERE THE OLD OWNERS OF THIS "SMALL BUSINESS" WERE TRYING TO SELL THEIR REDICULOUS MANSION ON VASSON ISLAND SO THEY COULD MOVE TO A DIFFERENT MANSION ON THE SAME ISLAND. THERE IS NOTHING SMALL ABOUT A MANSION, OR THE WEALTH THAT BUYS ONE. YET CAFFEE VITA IS STILL CONSIDERED "SMALL BUSINESS." SHOW ME ONE OF THE EMPLOYEES - ACTUAL WORKERS - WHO WOULD BE ABLE TO

②

AFFORD TO LIVE IN ~~THE~~ ANYTHING CLOSE TO A MANSION.

THEY DON'T EXIST BECAUSE THE "OWNERS"
HOARDED MOST THE WEALTH TO THEMSELVES.

NO MATTER IF YOU SLEEP IN YOUR CAR, AS LONG
AS YOU SHOW UP TO WORK TO GROW WEALTH
FOR THE BUSINESS OWNER.

WE MIGHT NOT EVER BE ABLE TO FIX ALL OF
THIS. THE MOLE HILL WAS ALLOWED TO BECOME
A MOUNTAIN. ONE THAT MOST OF US WILL
NEVER BE ABLE TO CLIMB.

BUT WE CAN TRY. STARTING WITH BREAKING
DOWN WALLS ELITISTS HAVE ERRECTED.

NO MORE SELF APPOINTED SO CALLED
COMMUNITY LEADERS IS A START. SO IS
RE THINKING WHO DESERVES WHAT TYPE
OF HOUSING AND WHERE IT SHOULD BE BUILT.

BUILD BETTER. BUT BUILD BETTER FOR
EVERYONE. HOUSING IS A HUMAN RIGHT. ~~BE~~

WHEN I WAS IN 4TH GRADE WE WERE TAUGHT
WE NEEDED 3 THINGS FOR SURVIVAL (SOCIAL STUDIES)
FOOD - SHELTER - AND WATER.

IM GLAD WE WORK TWARD GOALS LIKE HEALTH
INSURANCE FOR ALL, BUT THAT WASNT EVEN ON
THE LIST FOR SURVIVAL.

3

CLASSISM WOULD HAVE YOU BELIEVE YOU NEED FORMAL EDUCATION TO BE MORE PRODUCTIVE IN SOCIETY. IT PAYS BETTER TO THE HIGHER EDUCATED PEOPLE WHO WERE ALLOWED TO ACCESS ENTRY THROUGH THOSE DOORS. THIS IS A LIE. PERPETUATED BY THE PEOPLE WHO ALREADY "HAVE" IN ORDER TO FUNNEL WEALTH TO THE ALREADY CONNECTED.

I COULD PROBABLY FILL ANOTHER 12 PAGES WITH THESE TRUTHS. CLASSISM WILL PROBABLY WHISPER IN YOUR EAR NOT TO LISTEN.

I HAVE PAGES AND PAGES OF THOUGHTS AND TRUTHS THAT ARE HOMELESS SPECIFIC. I DIDNT INCLUDE MOST OF THEM HERE AS THE BIGGER PICTURE WAS AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR ALL WHO ARE ~~AND~~ NOT LUCKY ENOUGH TO GAIN WEALTH. BUT HERE ARE A COUPLE THOUGHTS:

I ALWAYS HEAR ABOUT HOMELESS AS BEING "MENTALLY ILL OR DRUG ADDICTS." THIS DOES EXIST, BUT PAINTS A FALSE PICTURE OF REALITY - DISTORTS THE TRUTH TO PROTECT CLASSIST AGINDAS.

I WOULD ARGUE BEING CONSTANTLY BOTH OTHERIZED AND MISREPRESENTED IF NOT FLAT OUT IGNORED MAKES HOMELESS PEOPLE MENTALLY ILL AND TURN

④

TO DRUGS. BEING HOMELESS HURTS. NOT JUST THE MIND AND SPIRIT BUT PHYSICALLY. IT'S PAINFULL TO SLEEP ON SUCH HARD SURFACES (SIDEWALKS - PACKED EARTH). JUST THINK ABOUT WHEN YOU GO "CAMPING", AT THE END YOU ARE ABLE TO SHAKE OUT THE KINKS FROM GROUND SLEEPING BY GOING HOME, TAKING A LONG HOT SHOWER, AND CLIMBING INTO A FLUFFY CLOUD OF A BED. HOMELESS PEOPLE DO NOT HAVE AN END TO THE CAMPING TRIP. THERE ISNT EVEN ANYWHERE TO SIT AND REST A BODY THAT ISNT A HARD SURFACE. AND WHEN HOMELESS PEOPLE SIT DOWN ON PUBLIC BENCHES TO NOT SIT ON THE GROUND THE CITY REMOVES THE BENCHES.

IT IS ALSO IGNORED THAT SOME PEOPLE CHOOSE TO BE HOMELESS BECAUSE ITS ONE OF THE ONLY WAYS TO FEEL POWER OVER OUR OWN LIVES. ELITISTS MAKE UP "SOCIETIES RULES OF BEHAVIOR" AND EXPECT THE REST OF US TO FOLLOW.

THIS IS CLASSISM. THESE RULES DICTATE WHAT WE SHOULD THINK - WEAR - LIVE - ETC... AND TELL US IF WE DONT LIKE IT WE CAN LEAVE.

LEAVE TO WHERE? WHY SHOULD I NOT BE ALLOWED TO BE MY AUTHENTIC SELF BECAUSE IT MAKES WEALTHIER PEOPLE "UNCOMFORTABLE" NOT HARMS THEM MIND YOU - JUST "UNCOMFORTABLE"

5

TO SEE PEOPLE DENYING THEM WHAT THEY SEE
AS THEIR RIGHT TO MAKE THE RULES WE MUST
ALL FOLLOW.

ON THE OTHER HAND... IF SOMEONE IS HOMELESS
BECAUSE OF A TRUE MENTAL HEALTH ISSUE THEN
SHAME ON US FOR NOT QUICKLY GETTING
THEM THE HELP AND SUPPORT THEY NEED AND
DESERVE.

IF SOMEONE IS HOMELESS DUE TO DRUG ADDICTION
SHAME ON US FOR CREATING A SYSTEM
THAT ROTATES PEOPLE THROUGH CHEMICAL DEPENDANCY
VIA 20-30 day "TREATMENT" THEN LET THE OUT WITH
A "RECOURSE" PACK FULL OF SOCIAL SERVICES PHONE
NUMBERS IN A SORT OF SINK OR SWIM KINDA
WAY. MOST SINK. TO BE EFFECTIVE TREATMENT
NEED BETTER WRAP AROUND SUPPORTIVE POLICY. IT
NEEDS TO BE RE INVENTED - WHAT EXISTS RARELY
WORKS IN A FUNDAMENTAL LASTING WAY TO HELP PEOPLE.
BUT DR'S AND STAFF AT TREATMENT CENTERS
ARE ALLOWED TO KEEP PROFITING FROM THE REVOLVING
DOOR. THIS NEEDS TO STOP.

BUT SOCIETY DOES HAVE RULES. NOT SO MUCH
DICTATED BY ELITIST RULES. THERE ARE RULES

(12)

TO PROTECT HEALTH OF EVERYBODY. SO ONE I CAN THINK OF IS HOARDING. IF A PERSON OWNED A HOUSE AND WAS A HOARDER THE CITY WOULD NOT ALLOW IT. IT SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED SIMPLY BECAUSE SOMEONE DOESN'T HAVE A HOUSE.

BUT WE WOULD NEED TO INVEST IN SOLUTIONS.

STORAGE UNITS AND LOCKER ROOMS. PLACES FOR PEOPLE TO PROTECT WHAT LITTLE THEY HAVE.

WE NEED TO INVENT WAYS FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE WITHOUT HOMES TO NOT BECOME WITHOUT HOPE. WE NEED TO CHANGE THE NARRATIVE AWAY FROM "CRAZY DRUG ADDICTS" AND ADDRESS THE CORE ISSUE - POVERTY AND CLASSISM. AND THE DISPAIR IT CAUSES.

I'VE BEEN THROUGH ~~AND TO~~ MOST OF OUR STATES. I'VE SPENT TIME IN AT LEAST 20 THAT I CAN THINK UP RIGHT NOW. I'VE SEEN A LOT 'OUT THERE. WHAT WORKS AND WHAT DOESN'T. AND WHAT CALLS ITSELF HOMELESS SERVICES WITHOUT EFFECTIVELY LOOKING AT THE WHY. I DISAGREE WITH A LOT OF POLICY AROUND HOW HOMELESS ARE CARED FOR. WE NEED TO FIND WAYS IN ORDER TO HELP IN RICH PEOPLE'S LIVES RATHER THAN GIVE THEM LABELS THAT MAKES IT

7

OK TO TREAT THEM SO BADLY. WE NEED TO STOP WEAPONIZING PEOPLE WITHOUT HOMES.

WHERE ARE ALL THE NEWS STORIES ABOUT THE SO CALLED "HIDDEN HOMELESS"? WHY DO WE ALLOW THE NEWS TO NARRATE TO US WHO AS HOMELESS AND WHY? CLASSISM.

WE SEND OUT "STIMULUS CHECKS" TO QUELL THE ANGER AND FRUSTRATION OF A CLASSIST SOCIETY - YET MANY HOMELESS WILL NEVER SEE A STIMULUS CHECK. THERE IS NO PLACE TO SEND IT - NO BANK ACCOUNT TO DIRECTLY DEPOSIT. WHO ARE WE TRYING TO HELP WITH STIMULUS CHECKS? THE BUSINESS OWNERS WHO ARE ALREADY LUCKY ENOUGH TO HAVE WEALTH. ITS CRUMBS THROWN TO THE POOR TO KEEP THEM FROM LOOKING AT WEALTHS GREED - AND EXPECTED TO GO BACK INTO WEALTHS POCKETS.

I AM ON SSI DISABILITY. I AM NOT ALLOWED BY THE SYSTEM TO SAVE MONEY WITHOUT HAVING IT COUNT AGAINST ME AND ENDANGERING MY FLIMSAY "SAFETY NET." I LIVE IN CORP. HELL WITH NO PLACE TO SPEND MONEY THAT DOESNT DEFILE MY MORALS. SO I GIVE MY MONEY TO PEOPLE ON THE STREET. SPEND HOW THEY WANT.

8

I WOULD NOT GIVE TO "CHARITIES" BECAUSE THEY USE A CLASSIST SYSTEM TO DECIDE WHO DESERVES WHAT. THESE "CHARITIES (SOME OF THEM) PAY EXECUTIVES FAR MORE THAN A LIVABLE WAGE OUT OF THE MONEY COLLECTED TO HELP PEOPLE. THE "TRICKLE DOWN" EFFECT.

I GIVE MONEY DIRECTLY TO THE PEOPLE WHO NEED HELP. I WISH THERE WAS A BETTER SYSTEM.

PEOPLE DON'T WANT TO BE FORCED TO RELIGIOUS THINKING. THIS IS WHERE SO CALLED "CHARITY" GETS MOST ITS FUNDING FUNNELED. IT'S INSULTING. IT ALLOWS CLASSISTS TO IGNORE THAT THEIR ~~WIFE~~ JESUS WAS HOMELESS AND HAS TOLD THEM EXACTLY WHAT HE WOULD LIKE THEM TO DO IN HOW THEY TREAT THE POOR.

I READ UPTON SINCLAIRE'S PROFITS OF RELIGION. ~~MYSELF~~ I HAVE MY OWN IDEAS OF WHY WE FUND CHURCHES AND NOT PEOPLE. AND WHY, IF CHURCHES ARE NOT FOLLOWING GODS MANDATES, ARE THEY ALLOWED TAX FREE PRIME REAL ESTATE? CLASSISM.

IF YOU HAVEN'T READ IT - I SUGGEST IT.

ALSO DOWN AND OUT IN PARIS AND LONDON

BY GEORGE ORWELL AND ALMOST ANYTHING
R:1 - JOHN STEINBECK.

9

CLASSISM USES RELIGION - MOSTLY CHRISTIAN RELIGION - AS A WAY TO SERVE US UP MORE PLATTITUDES. WITH STORIES OF "KEEPING THE FAITH" AND JUST REWARDS IN THE AFTERLIFE, SUCH AS THE RICH MAN THE CAMEL AND THE EYE OF THE NEEDLE. IT DOESNT WANT US TO SEE THE REALITY OF THE HERE AND NOW. WE ARE TO JUST "TRUST IN GOD" WHILE WE ALLOW WEALTH TO STEAL FROM US.

FAITH WITHOUT WORKS IS DEAD.

IF GOD LOVES US ALL AND CHRISTIANS LOVE GOD THEN WHY DO THEY NOT FOLLOW HIS MANDATES?

CLASSISM

ONE FINAL THOUGHT: IT IS THIS CLASSIST SYSTEM THAT ELITISTS DEPEND ON WORKING AGAINST THE PEOPLE. SO WHEN THEY HEAR THE TERM "AFFORDABLE HOUSING" THEY AUTOMATICALLY HEAR "HOUSING FOR THE HOMELESS" INSTEAD. SO THEY WILL ACTIVELY COME OUT AGAINST IT EVEN WHEN IT WOULD BE IN THEIR BEST INTEREST. THE NARRATIVE IS CAPTURED BY PEOPLE WITH WEALTH TO NOT HAVE TO CONTRIBUTE A FAIR SHARE BACK. THEY CAN THEN SAY SEE - PEOPLE DON'T WANT INVESTMENTS BEING MADE INTO AFFORDABLE HOUSING - EVEN WHEN THE PEOPLE TRICKED INTO BELIEVING IT'S A BAD THING ARE HOUSING COST BURDENED THEMSELVES.

Housing Action Plan – Survey Report

The City of Olympia posted a housing survey on Engage Olympia during the month of March 2021. Community members were asked to share information about their housing experiences and preferences, as well as level of support for various proposed actions. The survey was geared for Olympia residents, but open to others as well. There were 319 respondents. The attached survey report was generated from the Engage Olympia platform.

Limitations

This is not a statistically valid survey and represents the opinions of only a small fraction of the Olympia public. Engage Olympia users tend to be more actively engaged in City affairs, so opinions of more marginalized populations may not be widely reflected. In addition, a majority (77%) of respondents to this survey were homeowners rather than renters. This compares to citywide where in Olympia only 45% of residents are homeowners. No one experiencing homelessness responded to this survey.

Key Take-Aways

Some key take-aways include:

- 92% of non-homeowners who responded to the survey (renters plus those who live with family or friends) said they would like to own a home someday.
- When asked what type of housing they would like if they could choose, 54% of respondents would choose a detached house (or stay in one). The next most popular housing choice is cottage housing (8%).
- A majority of homeowners are not interested in renting in the future. Owners are mixed on whether to downsize, and a majority do not want a larger home.
- 21% of respondents say they are interested or somewhat interested in home sharing. 65% are not interested, even somewhat. Homeowners with a mortgage appear the most open to home sharing, however the majority still is strongly disinclined.
- 45% of respondents report having experienced difficulty finding affordable housing in Olympia. 35% report that housing costs pose a significant burden for their household.
- While only 6% of respondents reported spending more than 50% of their income on housing, we dug deeper into the data to reveal the rate goes up to 14% for those born between 1990-1999 (the youngest demographic to respond).
- Each type of housing action listed was supported somewhat or strongly by a majority of respondents.


Open Ended Responses:



The following themes rose out of the open-ended responses received. The attached report includes the full comments.



- Concern about quality of life, environment, maintaining design standards
- Skeptical about incentives – it is wrong to incentivize profit

- Support for accessory dwelling units
- Need to protect low density neighborhoods
- While the actions sounds good, more process will be needed because the ‘devil is in the details’
- The main problem in Olympia is over regulation and fees
- Concerns about homelessness, mental health and safety
- Concerns that Olympia is building high rise condos and luxury homes
- Concern that area median income formulas result in inflated ideas about is low income
- City needs to focus on/don’t forget the struggling middle class
- City should stay out of the housing business
- Concerns about displacement
- Investing in Olympia is not desirable due to homeless
- Support for using vacant buildings for affordable housing
- Would like to see more on mixed income social housing, land trusts and cooperatives
- Want to see impact fees lowered
- Concern about lowering impact fees
- Act, don’ t plan
- Support for performance measures
- Want City to be more creative
- Need to reduce sprawl, build up

Survey Demographics







Housing Survey

SURVEY RESPONSE REPORT

19 March 2019 - 28 March 2021


PROJECT NAME:

Housing Action Plan



SURVEY QUESTIONS

Q1 Which of the following describes your relationship with housing in Olympia?(check all that apply)




Question options

- Resident (primary address)
- Property manager/landlord
- Real estate agent
- Developer
- Housing services provider
- Builder or designer
- Second homeowner
- Visitor/past or future resident
- Other (please specify)

Optional question (314 response(s), 2 skipped)
 Question type: Checkbox Question

Q2 What best describes your current primary housing situation?




Question options

- I rent my home
- I own my home (and still pay a mortgage or home equity loan)
- I own my home (and am free of mortgage or home equity payments)
- I have stable housing but do not pay rent (e.g., live with parents or children)
- I do not have stable housing (e.g., stay at a shelter, experiencing homelessness)

Optional question (314 response(s), 2 skipped)

Question type: Radio Button Question

Q3 When did you begin your current living situation?




Question options

- Within the past year
- 1-4 years ago
- 5-9 years ago
- 10-19 years ago
- 20+ years ago

Optional question (314 response(s), 2 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question

Q4 Which best describes the make-up of your household?




Question options

- Couple with children
- Couple no children
- Single parent living with children
- Householder living alone
- Householder living with non-family members
- Other (please specify)

Optional question (316 response(s), 0 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question

Q5 What type of housing do you currently live in?




Question options

- Detached house
 ● Townhouse
 ● Duplex, triplex, or fourplex
- Multifamily apartment or mixed-use building (Rental situation)
- Multifamily condominium or mixed-use building (Ownership situation)
- An accessory dwelling unit (backyard cottage or unit in home with separate entrance)
- Cottage housing (small homes with a shared common area)
 ● Mobile home or trailer
 ● Other (please specify)
- Student dormitory
 ● I do not have stable housing at this time

Optional question (314 response(s), 2 skipped)
 Question type: Radio Button Question

Q6 How many bedrooms is your current primary home?




Question options

- Studio
- 1 bedroom
- 2 bedroom
- 3 bedroom
- 4+ bedrooms

Optional question (315 response(s), 1 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question

Q7 | If you could choose, what type of housing would you most like to live in next?




Question options

- Detached house
 ● Townhouse
 ● Duplex, triplex, or fourplex
- Multifamily apartment or mixed-use building (Rental situation)
- Multifamily condominium or mixed-use building (Ownership situation)
- An accessory dwelling unit (backyard cottage or unit in home with separate entrance)
- Cottage housing (small homes with a shared common area)
 ● None. I would stay where I am.
 ● Other (please specify)
- Mobile home or trailer
 ● Student dormitory

Optional question (314 response(s), 2 skipped)
 Question type: Radio Button Question

Q8 How many bedrooms would like to have in your home?



Question options

- Studio
- 1 bedroom
- 2 bedroom
- 3 bedroom
- 4+ bedroom

*Optional question (309 response(s), 7 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question*

Q9 How much do you agree with the following statements?



Optional question (315 response(s), 1 skipped)

Question type: Likert Question

Q9 | How much do you agree with the following statements?

I rent now, but would like to own my own home someday

Not applicable : 215




Definitely disagree : 11



Somewhat disagree : 2



Neither agree nor disagree : 9



Somewhat agree : 11




Definitely agree : 46




25 50 75 100 125 150 175 200 225 250


I own my home now, but would prefer to rent someday



At some point I would like to downsize to a smaller home



At some point I would like to move into a larger home



The idea of homesharing (sharing a dwelling with one or more unrelated people) appeals to me

Not applicable : 5


Definitely disagree : 168

Somewhat disagree : 38


Neither agree nor disagree : 25

Somewhat agree : 46


Definitely agree : 21



I plan to live in my current home for as long as possible



Q10 | Approximately what percentage of your monthly gross (before taxes) household income would you say you spend on housing costs (include rent/mortgage, utilities and insurance.)




Question options

- Not sure
- More than 50%
- 41%-50%
- 36%-40%
- 31%-35%
- 21%-30%
- 20% or less

Optional question (315 response(s), 1 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question

Q11 How much do you agree with the following statements?



Optional question (314 response(s), 2 skipped)
Question type: Likert Question

Q11 | How much do you agree with the following statements?

I have experienced difficulty finding housing that is affordable for me in Olympia

Definitely disagree : 75



Somewhat disagree : 32



Neither agree nor disagree : 58



Somewhat agree : 56



Definitely agree : 88



10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Housing costs are a significant financial burden for me

Definitely disagree : 98



Somewhat disagree : 50



Neither agree nor disagree : 48



Somewhat agree : 56




Definitely agree : 57




10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 110

In recent years I have had to make tradeoffs (such as cutting back on spending for other needs like health care or healthy food, or taking a second job) in order to make my housing payments



I have been foreclosed on or evicted from my home due to an inability to afford my housing payments

Definitely disagree : 260



Somewhat disagree : 15



Neither agree nor disagree : 20



Somewhat agree : 3



Definitely agree : 7



25 50 75 100 125 150 175 200 225 250 275

I worry that in the future I will be foreclosed on or evicted from my home due to an inability to afford my housing payments

Definitely disagree : 200



Somewhat disagree : 38



Neither agree nor disagree : 33



Somewhat agree : 23




Definitely agree : 12



25 50 75 100 125 150 175 200 225

I worry that rising housing costs will force me to move out of Olympia

Definitely disagree : 108



Somewhat disagree : 45



Neither agree nor disagree : 32



Somewhat agree : 57




Definitely agree : 69



10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 110 120

I worry that I will never be able to afford to own a home

Definitely disagree : 180



Somewhat disagree : 25




Neither agree nor disagree : 36



Somewhat agree : 15




Definitely agree : 49



20 40 60 80 100 120 140 160 180 200

Q12 Which best describes how the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the stability of your housing situation?




Question options

- My housing was already unstable and COVID made it worse
- My housing was already unstable, but COVID has not changed the situation
- My housing was stable, and COVID made it worse
- My housing was stable, and COVID has not changed the situation

Optional question (314 response(s), 2 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question

Q13 First of all, did you read our storymap titled, “Welcome to the Neighborhood: Unlocking More Affordable Housing in Olympia”




Question options

- No
- Yes

Mandatory Question (316 response(s))
Question type: Radio Button Question

Q14 | How useful was the information in the storymap toward your understanding of the housing situation in Olympia?



Question options

- Not useful
- Somewhat useful
- Very useful

Optional question (206 response(s), 110 skipped)
Question type: Radio Button Question

Q15 How much do you agree with the following statements?



Optional question (316 response(s), 0 skipped)
Question type: Likert Question

Q15 | How much do you agree with the following statements?

I want to see more housing built within Olympia

Definitely disagree : 12



Somewhat disagree : 22



Neither agree nor disagree : 24



Somewhat agree : 63




Definitely agree : 193



25 50 75 100 125 150 175 200 225

I want to see more housing built within my neighborhood



I want Olympia to have more dedicated affordable housing for low-income people

Definitely disagree : 11



Somewhat disagree : 22



Neither agree nor disagree : 20



Somewhat agree : 46




Definitely agree : 214




25 50 75 100 125 150 175 200 225


I want my neighborhood to have more dedicated affordable housing for low-income people




Olympia should include housing for people with a variety of incomes



Most, if not all, neighborhoods in Olympia should include housing for people with a variety of incomes



People should be able to afford housing in the community where they work




Q16 What is your level of support for the City of Olympia taking the following type of action?




Optional question (315 response(s), 1 skipped)
Question type: Likert Question

Q16 | What is your level of support for the City of Olympia taking the following type of action?


Provide funding and/or land to non-profit organizations and low-income housing developers to help them purchase, build or maintain housing for low income households.




Establish a revolving affordable housing loan program to help non-profit and low-income housing developers purchase and develop properties for low income housing.




Make strategic infrastructure investments (e.g., sewer, transportation) in areas underdeveloped due to lack of infrastructure in order to spur housing development.



Establish incentives (e.g., density bonus, development fee reductions, etc.) that help make it financially feasible for developers to include a certain percentage of low-income housing units within new multifamily developments.



Carry out a strategic planning process aimed at increasing residential density around the Capital Mall area on Olympia’s westside.



Develop an easier path for adapting vacant commercial space into housing (e.g., relaxed regulations, incentives).

Definitely oppose : 15



Somewhat oppose : 9



Neither support nor oppose : 17



Somewhat support : 66



Definitely support : 203



25 50 75 100 125 150 175 200 225

Reduce parking requirements for residential uses near frequent transit routes.

Definitely oppose : 42



Somewhat oppose : 28



Neither support nor oppose : 54



Somewhat support : 65




Definitely support : 122




10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 110 120 130

Review fees and regulations (e.g., thresholds for requiring street or other improvements, permit process) to identify housing cost reductions.


Definitely oppose : 22



Somewhat oppose : 21



Neither support nor oppose : 43



Somewhat support : 74




Definitely support : 153




20 40 60 80 100 120 140 160 180

Work with partners to help households achieve home ownership.




Require owners of multifamily housing to provide tenants with the first opportunity to purchase the property when it is going up for sale.




Require owners of single-family homes to provide rental tenants with the first opportunity to purchase the property when it is going up for sale.

Definitely oppose : 44



Somewhat oppose : 25



Neither support nor oppose : 47



Somewhat support : 71




Definitely support : 127




20 40 60 80 100 120 140

Require developers to provide low income tenants with relocation assistance if they will be displaced by redevelopment.


Definitely oppose : 35




Somewhat oppose : 10



Neither support nor oppose : 31



Somewhat support : 59



Definitely support : 178



20 40 60 80 100 120 140 160 180 200

Q17 | Is there anything else you would like to tell us?

- 3/05/2021 02:03 PM
This survey is clearly biased and is aimed at the continuing to degrade our neighborhoods and support destruction of neighborhoods. It doesn't address environmental considerations and is aimed at supporting developers.
- 3/05/2021 02:07 PM
I'm a little nervous about easing parking requirements. Better to replace the need with alternatives to cars. Otherwise, we all need to do what we can to provide more housing for all, even if it affects us in ways that we don't like. Our housing policies are racist and classist. Maybe we didn't plan it that way, but the proof is in the pudding.
- 3/05/2021 02:15 PM
The City of OLYMPIA needs to reduce the Permit and impact fees on new housing. It also needs to remove the Sprinkler system mandate. it makes building in the city too expensive. This simple step will have a huge impact on new housing.
- 3/05/2021 02:15 PM
Don't place the burden of supplying low cost housing on landlords who have their own cost issues to deal with. This is a city or county responsibility; take ownership.
- 3/05/2021 02:23 PM
Go Olympia!
- 3/05/2021 02:47 PM
These choices are interesting but seem at odds with the current emphasis on building market-rate apartments while giving developers extreme tax deferrals. Requiring the developers to have a percentage of low-income housing should have happened years ago. Concentrating the drug -addicted and mentally unstable in the downtown core while not providing services is not compassionate and does not lead to people wanting to live and work in Olympia. At least not long-time residents who know what it was like before.
- 3/05/2021 02:48 PM
Don't try and manipulate the market. Provide incentives and reduce costs to building. There are so many new requirements and impact fees, that adds tremendously to the cost of construction. You can't build affordable housing when between impact fees of \$40k, pervious surface requirements, sprinkler system, and on site water retention, that can add upwards of \$100k to a home! You have to charge at least \$400-500k to make it pencil out. Then downtown requirements of flood gates, parking, trees, street lights etc, again it makes marginal projects unaffordable. Make development easier, quicker, and cheaper, and it will come. Also look at higher building heights so we go up vs out.
- 3/05/2021 02:51 PM
When will Capital Lake, Wheeler Road, Ensign Road and similar areas be cleaned out? Enough studies!
- 3/05/2021 03:07 PM
Reinvest in working people instead of the homeless and drug addicted that drain. Out already limited resources. Cut the tens of thousands of dollars

legal, county, state fees including permit fees to build a new home in Olympia.

3/05/2021 04:06 PM

Thanks for your thoughtful attention to this important issue. It's difficult to solve and reach agreement on how to create more housing at different price points/density for many reasons. On a personal note, I'd like to see more attention paid to building sidewalks next to busy roads that are used by pedestrians. I know sidewalks are expensive. But they are worth it for quality of life and for safety of walkers. I'm thinking in particular of the very busy road that leads to Marshall Middle School on the westside. It is so dangerous for kids walking up that hill. Also, please pay attention to building height. I was disappointed by the Parkside Cafe being so overwhelmingly tall and out of scale on Harrison Avenue. There need to be firm planning codes in place to prevent this from happening, no matter how well intentioned the developer is in creating a new retail space. I also encourage the city to continue working on ADUs. Providing approved models (like Lacey is doing) seems like a good route to go. We will need more of these as the population increases and ages. I'm glad the city has relaxed the sprinkler codes for older homes that are building ADUs. More needs to be done to incentivize their development and integration into existing neighborhoods without making them so costly to be compliant with city codes.

3/05/2021 04:09 PM

Maintain zoning that prevents out of town landlords and investors from building without interest or care of existing communities

3/05/2021 04:10 PM

When Seattle moved toward allowing developers to NOT provide parking space due to nearby mass transit, people brought their cars to the area anyway creating serious parking issues. Complex builders should be required to provide parking space on the property where they build whether on surface parking lots, underground, or in parking structures. If they can't do that, due to water tables, et al, the property should be repurposed to something else.

3/05/2021 04:15 PM

Consider impact of overflow parking on narrow residential streets to ensure easy access by emergency and sanitation vehicles.

3/05/2021 04:18 PM

I know this is irrelevant to your survey but, Thurston Co./cities, in coalition with other state counties/cities, must pressure the state legislature to institute law(s) making it mandatory for homeless residents (HR) to accept community/other placements when available and appropriate to the HR's situation. I know any such law will be appealed, referencing the 9th circuit, but we must keep trying. Thank you for the opportunity to take the survey and enter this comment.

3/05/2021 04:29 PM

This isn't truly a survey. Nowhere does it seek input or new ideas. It focuses narrowly on the topics the city considers important and that list is biased. It mentions infrastructure briefly but doesn't address issues related to homelessness such as Health and Safety or Environmental Impacts. More importantly, these plans do not address the new reality that is made clear by the pandemic - People want space, both indoors and outdoors to deal with

the lockdown. The pressure on housing is even greater than it was a year ago as residents realize that they need an extra room for office or schooling, not a space made smaller by cheaper and limited housing styles and cost-cutting measures by developers. They want to be able to have a yard and play space to enjoy the day not a 16 unit, 3 story box with a 5 foot yardline setback. The market pricing is already 13% higher than a year ago. How does your funding model pay for that? It does not address the impacts of creating classifications of neighborhoods which by style and manner of construction could amount to the development of ghettos and stigmas attached to the area and its residents. If tax breaks and reduced development fees were important, why did the city waste the incentives on expensive, high end developments near the waterfront that will never be affordable housing and only line the pockets of already wealthy developers and dentists. There is a high level of hypocrisy related to the wording of these plans verses the actions seen.

3/05/2021 05:01 PM

We need state level section 8 or federal that is need based and not limited. I have tried to get housing help for 10 YEARS. My rent is 105% of my income. I cannot get housing help if I am housed, I have to be on the streets. I am being penalized for steely fiscal discipline. I have to do a GFM to raise rent, so in other words I am forced to beg. I did get 3 months assistance in 2020 due to COVID and it made all the difference in my life. I should not have to live with this level of stress. My house is up for sale now. Luckily my landlord is trying to find an investor who will take the house and me as a package deal because despite my rent being so high relative to my income, I have always paid it because housing is my number one value. I stay housed in Oly on 15K a year. It is remarkable I can do it. It is a testament to my ability to survive on nothing. I use the food bank, union gospel, all the providers because I cannot get rental help. Yet able bodied young people will get vouchers ahead of me. I am not alone, I had a severely disabled woman staying in my spare room, she too could not get help unless she was on the streets. That is not right. I thought Housing First was designed to keep people off the streets not force them on to them. She tried the shelters, she tried to stay on the streets a couple nights to qualify, she did not, it was incredibly sad. I had a near breakdown over guilt when I had to have her leave due to my lease, and my fear that I would be in violation and lose my housing. This is NOT RIGHT! She was incontinent w heart & cognitive problems, and Olympia was forcing her to stay on the streets to get help. There was NOTHING for her. It was all going to the street subculture, she was left to fall. I honestly do not know what happened to her and it weighs on me constantly. It is stories like hers and mine (and so many others) that are propelling my run for Olympia City Council. It is morally WRONG.

3/05/2021 05:10 PM

My household is not cost burdened, because we had the good fortune to buy our home 20 years ago. It's really painful to watch many families not be able to get into stable rental housing or ownership. We need more diverse infill housing.

3/05/2021 05:34 PM Drug addiction is the primary driver of homelessness. Affordable housing is largely unrelated to homelessness.

3/05/2021 05:47 PM Denser and more diverse neighborhoods are critical to a strong Olympia. As an owner of a single family home in an established neighborhood, I would love to welcome more neighbors to this great community - and my neighborhood in particular. It's people who give Olympia its great character. I strongly support whatever efforts are required to make sure all of Olympia is available to everyone who wants to live here regardless of income, age, race, and ability.

3/05/2021 06:17 PM If new housing does not pay impact fees the rest of us will be paying for the needed parks, roads, etc. Okay to help people who really need support but I do not support subsidies for housing types that simply 'increase the inventory.' I don't really buy the 'trickle down' concept that any new housing makes housing more affordable. Large homes and expensive condos do not bring down the price for other housing. Developers and builders should be finding ways to offer housing that fits current needs. Also wages are part of this problem so having a minimum wage that offers a living wage makes sense as part of the solution.

3/05/2021 07:13 PM I have lived in Olympia for 36 years. We as a city are losing our identity, allowing developers to get special concessions, build high rate apartments with not enough parking. This takes parking away from people who are trying to shop at downtown businesses.

3/05/2021 08:23 PM I do not have a lot of information about "low income property developers" and find myself wary and untrusting of their intent. This may just be a lack of clear information. I have some concerns about how well low income housing is managed and cared for now. I'd hate to see that grow!

3/05/2021 08:25 PM Great work and keep up the good work.

3/05/2021 10:55 PM Vadas, B. Jr. 2020. The future of Olympia's urban zoning in the face of covid-19 and climate change. Works In Progress (Olympia, WA) 31(3): 14 (<https://olywip.org/the-future-of-olympias-urban-zoning>). Vadas, R.L. Jr. 2021. OP-ED: Concerns about West Bay Yards development proposal. Olympia Tribune [online], March 4: 1 p. (<https://theolympiatribune.com/op-ed-concerns-about-west-bay-yards-development-proposal>).

3/06/2021 08:00 AM While I am generally supportive of "missing middle"-type housing and increasing the density of inner-Olympia neighborhoods (NE, SE, Westside, etc.), city officials should not be so dismissive of the impacts of these types of changes on residents, many of whom are not particularly affluent. Go walk around similar neighborhoods in Seattle and Portland to see what lies ahead: 100-year old homes being demolished left and right, and being replaced with big shiny condos for even wealthier inhabitants. Rents and housing costs remain sky high. What's different about Olympia than Portland, Seattle, etc.,

is that there is TONS of vacant land here. Downtown is 25% parking lots or vacant buildings. The westside is home to some of the most regrettable land use decisions in Olympia planning history: Capital Mall and Cooper Point Blvd. Think of all the housing that could be there if city officials hadn't decided that thousands of parking stalls and half-vacant strip malls were a better use of all that space. (I'm sure the impact fees were great, though!) Maybe you should focus more of your efforts there? Sort of feels those of us who were fortunate enough to be able to move to inner-Olympia neighborhoods back when it was still barely affordable are now being asked to shoulder a disproportionate burden of the changes needed to accommodate the region's growing population.

3/06/2021 08:09 AM

Stop City leaders from recommending tenants start a rent strike. The City needs to be friendly to developers if you want the housing we need built.

3/06/2021 08:37 AM

You did not ask what other things people spend their money on. Without this info, you can hardly analyze who can afford what (ie people who choose to spend money on things other than housing, then complain they cannot afford housing). You also did not ask about whether the person was capable of gainful employment or voluntarily unemployed. You did not ask about why someone has unstable housing, and any attempts they have made to secure stable housing. As to the question about, essentially, being entitled to afford to live where one works, the question should be whether one should chose to live where one can afford to do so, or whether one who chooses to live in an area where one cannot afford should expect his fellow neighbor to absorb the cost of that decision. The city's job is to ensure the city runs efficiently and productively most of the time for most of the people. The city's job is not to socially engineer housing affordability so that a certain population in Olympia consumes a disproportional amount of the city's and taxpayer's time, money, and resources. I purchased my home in an area where there are stable, long-term residents. I do not wish to reside along unstable, short-term residents as there exists a difference in behavior, treatment of the land and property, expectations and involvement in community gatherings, safety, etc. In low-income, higher-density housing areas I see behavior of residents that are inconsistent with my values and expectations of behavior.

3/06/2021 09:33 AM

Whatever works to bring more housing online, I support it.

3/06/2021 11:22 AM

We live in a neighborhood that is currently all smaller, one story homes. However, directly behind us is a one-plus acre parcel with one dwelling (also a one story home). We are very worried that if this parcel is sold, it could be developed with two or three story dwellings, such that we lose all our backyard privacy. That would be devastating, since we purchased this home because of its relative privacy. If any future development was limited to only allow one-story homes, that would be perfect.

Olympia should be careful not to turn into Seattle.

3/06/2021 03:11 PM

Consider reducing or eliminating any existing requirements that on-site parking be included in multi unit development near transit.

3/06/2021 04:16 PM

Housing people is - and will continue to be a challenge. Use all available strategies to continue to make progress on adequate housing and prevention of additional houselessness for as many people as possible in our city and region.

3/06/2021 04:35 PM

I'm particularly interested in seeing the city use the Housing Land Trust model.

3/06/2021 09:15 PM

I would need more information about these strategies. While some sound good, I want to better understand costs, funding sources, risks, and possible unintended consequences.

3/07/2021 08:54 AM

Build more middle-income housing!! More homes worth 300,000

3/07/2021 08:58 AM

We moved into Olympia, and bought a ridiculously over-sized house because that was all that was available. It's affordable for us, but we wished there were options close in to downtown Oly that were smaller.

3/07/2021 10:34 AM

Thanks for all your efforts to supply more affordable housing. This is an extremely important issue.

3/07/2021 11:33 AM

Use of tax incentives to achieve some affordable units.

3/07/2021 11:39 AM

How about enforcing some standards around RV's and Campers that dump waste into our waterways.. Preach about environmental consciousness but I guess they all get a pass. My property tax keeps going up but the streets are dirtier than ever and now I don't even want to go downtown because its disgusting.

3/07/2021 01:55 PM

Adjustments to housing cost metrics to take single parent/primary income budgets into consideration

3/07/2021 02:18 PM

City and county planners should inventory properties to deed over to a community land trust to develop permanently affordable housing for cost burdened families and preserve governmental housing subsidies with an affordable housing resale formula.

3/07/2021 02:41 PM

Thank you for working to increase density and affordable housing in Olympia's city limits!

3/07/2021 04:27 PM

Thanks for investing the time and resources to make the city a better place!

3/07/2021 05:59 PM

3/07/2021 08:20 PM

Use city public land, particularly downtown parking lots for housing. Remove parking requirements for all buildings, instead look into a parking cap and a goal for reduction in absolute (rather than relative to population) vehicle miles traveled in Olympia.

3/08/2021 08:18 AM

Safe, affordable housing in Olympia is very difficult to find. I had to relocate to Tacoma to find such housing. I would have preferred to stay in Olympia, where I work.

3/08/2021 08:32 AM

800 sf houses were common at one time. Small but affordable. No one builds small houses now due to high cost of development fees. \$40,000 in permit and impact fees averages out to \$50 a square foot for a 800sf house. Have to build big to lower the SF cost. Scale the fees to fit the size of the house. Technical engineering and studies (biologist report, tree report, geotechnical engineering, etc) add another \$5-15,000 in costs. Planners don't consider the cost impacts when they require more studies, reports and surveys. Costs are incorporated into the price of house (\$10,000 avg./ 800sf house = \$12.50 a square foot). Again you have to build big to average out the costs of the reports. Thank you

3/08/2021 08:35 AM

Clear the homeless camps.

3/08/2021 08:37 AM

I appreciate that the City of Olympia is working WITH other local jurisdictions to address our housing challenges. This is a regional problem and I am grateful to see Olympia leading the way to address it.

3/08/2021 08:40 AM

The following is a loaded question because it assumes it is not already "financially feasible" for developers to do this. Once again, the city is loading questions in favor of developers: Establish incentives (e.g., density bonus, development fee reductions, etc.) that help make it financially feasible for developers to include a certain percentage of low-income housing units within new multifamily developments. Also, this needs a whole lot more explanation: " Work with partners to help households achieve home ownership." What partners? Nonprofits? Developers? Without specifics, this is impossible to answer.

3/08/2021 09:48 AM

More funding for mental health services and supportive housing. More funding for seniors who need affordable housing. More funding for housing adults who need in home provider services due to health or disability, nursing homes are full and expensive. Funding for supportive housing for those with a criminal backgrounds. Look at the big picture it's not a simple fix, all must be included in affordable housing in order to help our city continue to exist.

3/08/2021 09:55 AM

I think we need to specifically discuss economic displacement, aka "gentrification," and come up with some concrete strategies to address it.

The burden of increased fees and the sprinkler mandate are the one of the

3/08/2021 10:02 AM

largest costs of building a new home. Many of the review fees that were previously free, are now so cumbersome, that they dissuade business from investigating and possibly developing property to allow affordable housing. The cost of the fire sprinklers and the alarms are an additional roadblock to affordable housing. Every additional cost added to the building process by a jurisdiction, makes housing, that much further out of reach for first time homebuyers and people with lower incomes. The additional taxes, codes, and regulations may, in an academic sense, make housing safer, however, I do not believe a safer house is better than the population of a city being able to afford housing. The burden placed on the citizen's housing looks acceptable at the micro level. In my opinion, if you step back and look at housing in its totality, these costs and regulations are making housing unattainable for the people you are trying to help.

3/08/2021 10:47 AM

Converting commercial space seems to me to hold the best possibility for quickly creating transitional housing, even if it's not permanent, and help folks get off the street.

3/08/2021 11:00 AM

The homeless situation in Downtown area has reached a serious risk to public safety. I am interested in helping with the issue as a member of this community.

3/08/2021 11:27 AM

The homelessness issue is more and more visible everyday. How are they allowed to throw all of their trash on the ground and not be held accountable? They are destroying our environment and ruining the image of this beautiful city. If they want to be apart of the community they should be held to the same standards as everyone else. I understand not all encampments can be removed, and even the homeless deserve compassion and a safe place to sleep, but they need to be accountable for preserving the environment and valuing the land that they live on.

3/08/2021 11:28 AM

Please reduce sprawl onto undeveloped land. Instead focus development in city centers or along major streets. Also consider bringing in a fresh grocer like Spuds and a business such as a Rite Aid to downtown. Walkable access to fresh food, grocery staples, prescriptions, over the counter medical supplies and items like toothpaste, etc. seem to be missing in downtown Olympia. I believe these would be welcome amenities for people living in apartments (don't own a car or want to drive to run these errands) or people living in senior housing. As a non-downtown resident but semi-regular visitor, I would head downtown more often if I could take care of multiple errands at once (i.e. hit the bakery, grab some q-tips, get that birthday gift, and some groceries for dinner that night). I also appreciate the focus on neighborhood centers - let's create more incentives to eat/shop nearby. It gets people out of their cars and activates neighborhoods. Lastly, I think NIMBYs tend to stereotype middle housing with those 'box store eye sore beige plastic 5-story buildings' overlooking their lawn. It would be great if the initial projects to increase housing in Oly were developed with some care. Housing that reflects the character of the neighborhood/area instead of building the cheapest nastiest option on the block. Great work and loved the story map!

3/08/2021 11:47 AM No more tax breaks for housing development aimed at middle to upper class.

3/08/2021 12:21 PM Dismantle the homeless encampments due to inhumane living conditions.
Work with nonprofits to find solutions.

3/08/2021 12:34 PM Additional work to maintain spaces for other species to live within cities and in underdeveloped areas. Increase in community owned housing. Work with local tribes on discussing land treaties and land back reparations, as well as input on city owned property.

3/08/2021 02:15 PM This survey is a joke. The real problem with affordable housing in Olympia is the cost of permitting, impact fees, whole house sprinkler systems, requirement for engineered drains from roof water and the new energy code. Until the City is open to addressing their contribution to the cost of new housing, new housing will continue to be out of the reach of most people. Until the City is open to addressing their contribution to utility costs, ie; adding City taxes to all utilities not provided by the City and the City's escalating water, sewer, garbage and storm water fees any type of housing including rentals will be out of the reach of many people.

3/08/2021 02:25 PM The only reason why I didn't select DEFINATELY SUPPORT for all is simply a lack of information currently acquired on my part about any particular subject. But at the end of the day I want to help our homeless and struggling population in anyway possible. Thank you for all that you do. Please keep me in the loop; I have been working with the homeless population of Thurston County since 2012. Beau D> Shattuck He/Him Pronouns Thurston County/City of Olympia Housing Liaison

3/08/2021 02:50 PM I would really like to add an adu to my home and being able to get a loan from the city and/or reduction of fees and expensive unnecessary requirements like sprinklers and parking when I'm within a mile of three bus line would really help.

3/08/2021 04:33 PM Young adults getting good paying jobs should be able to afford their own housing. It can't be that over 50% of their paycheck should be going towards rent, making them have to find roommates to split the costs! It's unbelievable what has been happening around here.

3/08/2021 04:46 PM 1) explore guaranteed minimum income as tried in Stockton 2) lobby Congress & President to eliminate the mortgage income tax deduction, at least for high income households. 3) create/assist pathways to home/land ownership for low income minority households 4) reduce the huge excess amount of commercially zoned & developed land and revert to residential zoning/development, and control/slow conversion of land in other jurisdictions to commercial development. 5) preserve historic housing and character of historic neighborhoods...new housing can and should be designed to be compatible rather than intrusive. 6) revive federal public housing construction programs.

Please revoke MFTE for market rate housing.

3/08/2021 04:51 PM

3/08/2021 08:48 PM

While my housing in this community is fairly stable, I am watching many of my friends leave this community due to not being able to find affordable rental housing or not being able to find a pathway toward home ownership in this community. Most of them are living on a single income. It really concerns me that there aren't affordable options in this community for folks on a single income. I don't want to diminish families that are priced out of our area. That, too, is of great concern. I have also watched many families leave the community due to the cost of housing. I have a great fear that with the increase in telework, our community will become made of people that don't work here while the people who work here will flee to larger or cheaper homes farther from Olympia. I don't think that supports the model for growth that many folks want to see here. I'd like to live in community where the people that work in the community can afford to live in the community.

3/08/2021 09:38 PM

The Capital Mall area floods! Also, do not put people into homes/rentals without adequate parking. Causes conflict between residents, and too hard to bring groceries in, move furniture in or out. Provide people with privacy, like fencing/barriers between homes, even a small yard. Despite promises, someone will sublease, violate parking rules, and let their pets and kids run wild. Also, lots of issues with drug users and multiple families moving into low income housing, sometimes 3 or more family units in a 3 bedroom, and all have cars. People use cars because of daycare, employment hours, unsafe alternative transportation- no one wants to go to the dangerous downtown Olympia bus station or even walk through that crime cesspool or get on a Covid bus. Put homes in over by the Capitol building or by the park near Oly high school - less traffic there. Maybe repurpose the old police department and old Thurston County jail into safe warm temporary housing for homeless persons. Transitional housing for recovering sex trafficking survivors would be a great idea - in a different community than where they lived before so they can make a clean break and be safe.

3/08/2021 11:27 PM

The city and county need to bold about the un-housed. It is going to be a long time until there is enough affordable housing built and available (like all the ideas mentioned in the survey) even if regulations and fees are streamlined. The need is huge and immediate. We can all see that without a survey. That is the reality. We have camps all over the place. That is a fact. Why is there not more focus on planning and preparing for this reality? Should we be asking people if they would rather have a condoned or random camp in their neighborhood? I understand the desire to dream big but that means we have people living wherever they can in the mean time, which will be years. We must do better and act more boldly and quickly. Sites need to be identified that are not a wet land, durable tents/shelter and facilities need to be provided. And I'm going to say it.... those who receive these services should give something back and help take care, not just take. Without that there is no investment and buy in. (There is no doubt that people can get

things for free. We see all these things along our roads. There is a HUGE resistance to asking anyone who receives a service to give anything back. When there is no contribution there is no sense of investment, pride, or need to maintain and people will destroy an area). Providing this temporary shelter is a huge investment we need to make as a community. It literally drains my soul to see what looks like a Landfill along I-5. The exposed camps that are piles of garbage cause intense damage to the morale, pride, compassion and sense of well being in our community. I cannot over emphasize what a negative impact a few camps have on an ENTIRE community. I wish we could, as a community, help those people in particular and clean up the insane amount of garbage that has been hauled in. We can't wait for developers to build a few units of low income housing. We need better tents and a garbage limit/system. I know this is a wicked problem but I don't see how what is happening now is the best our city can do for the unhoused or housed. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

3/09/2021 06:27 AM

We need more bathrooms, garbage cleanup, and support for people on the street.

3/09/2021 07:46 AM

While we are building permanent Supportive Housing for our house les Neighbors, we need to have more stable transitional housing until that is accomplished. Get people inside. I don't understand why the City of Olympia Lacey and Tumwater are not purchasing hotels to accommodate people like Seattle is doing. They have been able to get people inside, Provide support systems with meals Etc and really made it work.

3/09/2021 08:56 AM

Senior Housing is too often neglected. Between seniors with extra rooms in their house as their kids leave, and seniors living on SSI who lack funds for an apartment, there is a real need for a program like Home Share that is offered by Senior Services for South Sound. For transparency, I am the Executive Director there! Home Share helps in a very cost-effective and community building way.

3/09/2021 09:30 AM

Glad to see the inclusion of senior housing as a priority, hope to see actions that follow suit. Data shows that seniors are cost burdened & severely cost burdened at nearly the exact same rate as the general population, yet there have been zero public investments in low-cost senior housing in over 20 years. Thank you for your work - excellent materials!

3/09/2021 09:41 AM

City needs to eliminate costly "nice to have" but nonessential requirements, such as fire sprinklers in single family homes. Analyze how the City can make building easier and more affordable.

3/09/2021 01:36 PM

Homeownership is a means to create wealth and equity in housing that has long been ignored and/or undersupported at the local level (as evidenced by the number of renters in Olympia). Homeownership is a means to create equity for low-income residents (who disproportionately represent marginalized groups) if a goal for the city of Olympia is to create a diverse and inclusive community, it should start with an investment in permanently

affordable homeownership. Many types of affordable housing require public investment at multiple points during the project's life cycle. Affordable homeownership projects require a single investment of capital funds that can be leveraged and multiplied at an impressive rate and with a huge social return on investment.

3/09/2021 02:52 PM

I support Homeownership over renting. it builds generational wealth for families and supports better health and educational opportunities to the families that own their homes.

3/09/2021 05:31 PM

I would like to see support for housing land trusts to make homes permanently affordable. I would end all subsidies/tax abatements, etc. to developers of market rate housing. I would put a moratorium on development of market-rate housing, and tie future development to the availability of new low-income housing developed by low-income developers.

3/09/2021 06:13 PM

City of Olympia needs to decrease permit fees, look at cities such as Ft Collins, CO - how they've revitalized downtown and have managed growth.

3/09/2021 06:35 PM

This process (not the survey itself) is cumbersome for non-techies, particularly figuring out if I was looking at the "storymap" (whatever that is) and then finding the survey - seems to require lots of tabbing & clicking & often finding myself back on the same page. I appreciate text boxes for explanations as everyone's situation is a bit different. Good luck bringing more affordable housing to Oly; I want my kids to be able to live here - just not with me!

3/09/2021 06:39 PM

For many of these questions I indicated some support. However, in some cases I didn't really feel like I knew enough about the question to give more than a tepid response. I definitely support things like backyard cottages, and getting rid of CCRs that that require a minimum house size. I don't think I support developments that are all low income. If I were low income, I'd want to live in the same neighborhoods as everyone else, not in the special "poor peoples" neighborhood. I'd rather see small homes built well and sustainably that big cheaply built developer projects. I like to see projects with character, and I'm wary of developers trying to make a buck. Finally, I absolutely do not support that the city's shoreline master program allows for development of housing along sensitive shorelines. Shorelines should be protected and accessible to ALL. I re ignite that population growth is inevitable and we will have more density. Let it be small, good quality, have character and integrate low income everywhere

3/09/2021 07:54 PM

Housing is a basic need. We need more density, and assistance for low-income citizens. Home ownership isn't the goal. The goal is decent shelter for those who lack it.

3/09/2021 08:39 PM

Remove height restrictions, abolish single-family zoning, make it easier to build rowhouses, mixed use buildings, and affordable condos everywhere. Encourage architectural diversity, invest in better mass transit and pedestrian-centered spaces.

3/09/2021 09:24 PM

Encourage options such as Community Land Trusts/Housing Trust that keeps the land ownership with the Trust and the home ownership with the resident as a long-term affordable housing option. Also models of low-income or supported housing rentals that allow for residents to build equity - <https://renterequity.org/>. Other cities have used these strategies successfully. We must get people out of tents and into decent housing. And it is my hope that we keep a diverse mix of housing to keep Olympia affordable and able to keep a creative, quirky mix of residents who are able to follow their passions. We risk becoming a wealthy enclave as developable land shrinks in the region. I hope we can remain welcoming to all.

3/09/2021 10:59 PM

Hey. So I don't know if you really read these comments. But I was born down town 40 years ago. I've lived in Olympia almost my whole life. I currently live in a tiny house with my toddler during this unending pandemic. I'm on disability and can't even afford an apartment on the \$1014 I get a month, so building this tiny house was my last option to staying connected to my support network. What I really need to happen is for y'all to relax all the rules about tiny homes and just let folks live. It's already stressful, but having to worry about code enforcement or some other bs rule just makes things harder. Y'all literally building 8' boxes for folks to live in, but when I try to buy a tiny sliver of land I'm told I can't park my house on it with out a ton of inspections. I'm literally one step away from homelessness and y'all just gotta make things harder.

3/10/2021 08:43 AM

It's simple. The more the city attempts to regulate free market the more expensive and difficult it becomes to build. If the city would pull their nose out of people's business in regards to what they can build on their properties, how much the gouge for permits, and other requirements such as off street parking, impenetrable surface, and mole studies there would be much more housing available at various levels of price.

3/10/2021 09:11 AM

Please help people afford single family housing over building developments for low income or high income.

3/10/2021 10:26 AM

As much accountability as possible for everyone involved in the process

3/10/2021 10:42 AM

There is a program in New York where they're using the Land Trust model of land acquisition to provide housing (i.e. a Housing Trust). A non-profit can receive grant funds to acquire land where affordable housing can be built. The title/deed on the property would have a restriction that the property can only be used for affordable housing. It's an interesting model that I did not necessarily see captured above. These are complex problems that require sometimes complex solutions so thank you for all you're doing! Some of these ideas are great and I haven't been able to give them much thought, so many of my answers are first instinct. Thanks again!

3/10/2021 11:30 AM

Take a look at existing environmental permitting regulations (EIS, SEPA, EJ) and require a review/analysis of current cultural/community demographics to

ensure new/redevelopment doesn't unjustly impact the existing community. When there is a focus on building expensive fancy dwellings for investment return, the existing community is inadvertently impacted by rising costs (home values and taxes). And eventually the old community gets forced out.

Thanks!!!!

3/10/2021 11:45 PM

Clean up our once lovely city. It is a disgrace, health problems, and eye sore ----- and, we are the Capitol!!!!!!! Pay the homeless \$5.00 (maybe by the pound) to cleanup their camp sites.

3/11/2021 07:57 AM

We should be creating as much density as possible downtown and in surrounding neighborhoods. Lots of units inside big buildings are the most cost effective and environmentally sound way to increase housing supply. Locating these buildings close to downtown helps to create that feedback loop of jobs creation close to homes, and we can stop planning our cities for cars instead of people.

3/11/2021 09:35 AM

More housing downtown for many income levels

3/11/2021 10:05 AM

Please address the lack of safety that is now becoming a "norm" in the Olympia area due to the ever increasing homeless population. Driving through the city there is trash visible in areas which used to be encampments and have since been abandoned. My kids and I routinely run into needles on our walks/bike rides that are just thrown into the sidewalks and/or streets. It's important to provide housing for people in need, but it is equally important to maintain working families in the area and not reduce their home values which those same families worked hard to attain.

3/11/2021 10:26 AM

Stop building million dollar apartments. Stop prioritizing money over people. Stop trying to give people money for having to care about other people and calling it "incentives." Developers shouldn't shouldn't richer while others here suffer. Stop fawning over development, stop accepting money for deals, and give the city back to the people.

3/11/2021 01:31 PM

I am glad you realize that affordable housing in Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater is impossible to find. I have personally experienced this. I am very fortunate to live in an apartment with one roommate in apartments that are "low income". However I pay 50% of my income on rent and utilities. Get this, a 2 bed, 2 bath apartment that is quite old and kind of shabby is \$1029 in rent. I pay half of that and have to put up with a roommate when I would prefer to not have one. Also there is a huge problem, from personal experience, that it is very difficult to find housing that will allow a pet. I have one cat. I have spent hours, probably hundreds of hours searching for housing here in this area. I have had to move 3 times in 7 years due to: 1. Owner of house decided to live there, 2. renting a room from homeowner who had a dog that barked constantly, I couldn't even have a visitor, 3. renting a small cabin on property

3/11/2021 02:37 PM

where the owner spied on me and said hateful things to some friends because they looked poor 4. now my roommate whose name the apartment is in is threatening to kick me out because she doesn't like me and she's a racist and I'm not. I only got this living situation because her son knew the manager of the apartments, low income. I pay 50% in rent yet, before Covid, I got \$30 in WA food stamps. Systems are against poor people.

3/11/2021 03:20 PM

New construction should reflect the neighborhood where it occurs. For example, in Bigelow a developer could build a property that has character similar to existing homes, even those 100 years old like mine. Ranch homes, overtly boxy homes, contemporary homes ala the 1960s are not appropriate for Bigelow.

3/11/2021 03:24 PM

Owning a home in Olympia is rapidly becoming unattainable for my household with a gross income of 140K a year because it is outrageously difficult to be financially prepared with a down payment and other related moving/purchasing costs. Help the houseless and low income first, but don't leave the middle class behind. Don't leave the middle class behind, but don't help us at the expense of the houseless and low income People.

3/11/2021 03:50 PM

Many of these questions are coming from a place of misinformation around the housing crisis and the very essence of poverty. It's not about developing more housing, there's largely enough. It's about 1) making those spaces ethically livable and 2) making them affordable. 80% of my income goes towards housing expenses. This includes maintenance because the "affordable" living space I could find with my spouse is full of mold and leaks that go without repair- or we get charged for those repairs that aren't our fault. There needs to be a cap on how much rent can be depending on the square footage. This is also why I don't believe in housing for "multiple incomes." There has to be a standard, or the living conditions will be horrendous. Reducing parking requirements just make the housing inaccessible. Disabled people, like myself, are among the poorest populations. We also need to be able to park closely to our own apartments. Walking is hard. We have limited mobility. Olympia needs a housing plan that focuses on affordability, not development. Development is expensive, but maintenance saves money. It's incredibly basic knowledge every poor person in this city knows, but you haven't been listening to us. You're too busy calling us terrorists.

3/11/2021 04:52 PM

None of this addresses the true issues here. Housing isn't affordable or accessible. So many poor, disabled, and mentally ill individuals are stuck in abhorrent living situations because landlords do not care. There is plenty of physical housing in most cases, however those places that are open are too expensive or are inaccessible. Maybe focus on fixing those issues, not incentivizing more building when it will continue being inaccessible and unaffordable.

3/12/2021 12:03 PM

We neeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeed emergency housing for the unhoused now. Also, if I'm making over 50k a year I shouldn't have to worry about meeting apartment income requirements, but every one bedroom built in the last 4 years is above my price range. How? Who can afford to live there? Not the

service industry folks that work here.

3/12/2021 01:28 PM

Any of the strategies you develop must address the intersection of landlords denying people housing who have conviction histories. You can build housing all day but if landlords won't rent to people with conviction histories it will not help. We over-criminalize and over-incarcerate communities of color then make laws that allow landlords to pull background checks up to 7 years, locking people out of housing for far too long. Additionally, there is no data to prove that having a record has any bearing on whether a tenant pays the rent or is a good tenant. We have to address this hidden issue.

3/13/2021 05:33 AM

Some of these questions seem to assume one size fits all. The answers I gave might apply to my neighborhood but not others. For example when I am lukewarm about more density or more lower income housing it is because I live in a dense downtown neighborhood with apartments and some housing designated for housing authority use. So I may not support more, but might for other neighborhoods in Olympia. Otherwise had fun with the survey
Thanks!

3/14/2021 10:42 AM

The City currently seems rather focused on expensive apartment rental development in Downtown Olympia, which is good, but does not provide the needed diversity in housing opportunities. Expensive apartments in the downtown core, and along West Bay Drive, will not get us to where we need to be. The West Bay Yards Development proposal seems really ill conceived and poorly thought out. There are currently pretty unfriendly walking infrastructure on West Bay Drive, there are no public transportation opportunities present, the current road capacity will not support the number of vehicles associated with such a large development, and given it's location people will need to drive to get to the store, work, and everything else. And the overall lack of adequate sidewalks in Olympia's neighborhoods is something that the needs to be prioritized, along with more alternative transportation opportunities. And, unless you work for State Government, there are limited well paying job opportunities in our area, meaning most people need to commute somewhere... How about planning for light rail to come into Thurston County to address this issue that will only continue to get worse as the area grows.

3/14/2021 11:02 PM

I support creating more economically diverse communities through housing policies. I also support all that's being done to facilitate more ADUs. I also agree with construction of many more tiny homes for the unhoused population. I favor developing housing in some or all of LBA Park (won't happen but still wanted you to know there are some Oly residents who live near that park who would strongly support using some of it for mixed income housing and tiny homes.) FYI I grew up on the West side of Oly from 1971 to 1989 so I have seen so so many changes since then. Many are good, some others, not so much, Thank you for seeking our opinions!

3/15/2021 04:13 PM

We live in Thurston County in unincorporated Olympia but are huge supporters of affordable housing initiatives and incentives. We look forward to downsizing in the future and moving closer to the center of town and to

transit routes. Thanks for doing this!

3/15/2021 04:49 PM

We have been residents in Tumwater for almost 6 years and I work in the home inspection business. The lack of housing in Thurston County is a huge concern for my family and many people I work with in the real estate industry. The current market is causing gentrification and exacerbated the homeless crisis.

3/15/2021 04:57 PM

As a business owner downtown I see a lot of luxury apartments going up from urban Olympia that most cannot afford unless they come larger cities with higher income. While the homeless population continues to grow. I think Olympia needs to shift their focus from allowing luxury apartments to helping address the homeless population struggling with housing and mental health. Human beings are living in deplorable conditions with some resources but it's not enough, yet luxury apartments seem to go up and either sit with empty business space on the bottom or empty apartments. This is a huge problem. We need to take care of our community before we build luxury spaces to enhance the aesthetic of downtown. We need more affordable housing, spaces for low income families and better resources to address mental health and rehabilitation. The homeless population is seen as an eye sore when in fact we forget that these are someone's sons, daughters, mothers and fathers. Everyone deserves adequate care.

3/15/2021 07:19 PM

Many landlords require people to make 4-6x the rent in order to be approved to live in the space. I understand they want security that rent will arrive, but that isn't feasible for many people, especially with low wages and an unstable economy.

3/15/2021 07:23 PM

I also support any programs that assist younger first-time homebuyers. The difficulty of buying a house for younger people is significant.

3/15/2021 08:15 PM

Rent caps if the landlord is not investing in or changing/enhancing their properties. Why is it a landlord is able to rent our a shitty 2 bedroom place and constantly up the rent when no investments or changes have occurred?

3/15/2021 10:27 PM

Loans for individuals trying to purchase, maybe who have good credit and can afford a mortgage...but are struggling to get a down payment saved, etc.

3/16/2021 02:29 AM

On Question 16: Providing land or funding to non-profits is good but that can't be the only strategy. The affordable housing shortage is too big for non-profits or faith-based organizations to handle on their own, although they certainly should be part of the mix. It will also need to be government and even regulated private sector operations. Staffing these organizations with the necessary level of talent and resources will take more than shoestring budgets.

3/16/2021 07:09 AM

The cost of trash pick-up coupled with it only coming every other week is a huge financial burden on our family and not being able to afford the giant trash can means we are living with growing piles of trash we cannot afford to throw away. I've never lived in a city where this was a problem and I wish I

had known how much the city of Olympia charges to do so little before moving here.

3/16/2021 07:48 AM

Full strategic dreaming and planning is essential to successful increased development. Don't just increase density without considering our vision for the community. Walkability, access to transit, healthy food options, neighborhood stores, restaurants and other businesses.

3/16/2021 09:09 AM

There needs to be some monitoring and regulations against who can buy up all this new housing. Too many people who already own homes are buying secondary properties to rent out the spaces, trapping lower-income residents into a renting cycle they can't break out of.

3/16/2021 12:57 PM

Whatever plans that are developed or strategies implemented, you have to make it rewarding for the private developer and builder to build low income housing. There is very limited incentive now.

3/16/2021 03:58 PM

I strongly oppose surrendering impact fees to facilitate increased development. Impact fees are to mitigate for development, so cutting impact fees *and* increasing development is extremely counterproductive.

3/16/2021 04:12 PM

I am disappointed to see that there is no mention in any of your plans about developing mixed income social housing. Instead it's focused on market housing, financial incentives and isolating poor people in low income areas to be stigmatized and neglected. We need solutions that explicitly move housing and the land under it out of the market. Incentives to convert land into CLTs and financing for turning low density lots into slightly higher density social housing that could be developed locally as well as with existing profit and non-profit developers. The plan feels incredibly limited and reliant on for profit housing developers, tilted towards existing homeowners, and with an eye on financial profits instead of housing people. Not a particularly inspiring plan despite a few decent ideas scattered throughout. Little vision in changing the paradigm about how and why we build what we do. We need much better than this.

3/16/2021 04:25 PM

The city must listen to residents and not developers when making decisions on housing density and policy changes.

3/16/2021 04:50 PM

Yes, Please think about building affordable housing between Eastside St. SE, Union Ave., Plum Street, and I-5. The majority of the property is owned by Vine Street Developers. Allow 9 stories of affordable housing in this area. It will not affect anyone view of the Capitol or Downtown Olympia. At 9 stories, it should pencil out for the developer and provide good affordable housing close to downtown.

3/16/2021 05:08 PM

Neighborhoods that already have a range of affordable housing options - apts, duplexes, and affordable small, older homes - should not be upzoned to increase density. Target increases in density to new developments and existing single-family housing areas.

Many proposals seem to sacrifice what Olympia is, in the hopes of bending

3/16/2021 06:34 PM

the market. Extreme density is a punt maneuver, which will likely only leave us with a still costly—but less desirable—housing stock down the road.

3/16/2021 08:03 PM

The city has failed its residents in every conceivable way. I've been downtown 4 years, nothing has changed. This is going to end up being another few million we sink into planning to make a commission on a study to consider the effects of potentially building an extra 3 tiny homes in 2025. I have no faith or confidence this will produce literally any substantive change.

3/16/2021 08:17 PM

My spouse and I are fortunate - we just bought a home in Oly after renting for a year. We get the keys tomorrow. We sold our home in NE Oly one year ago, planning on renting and then buying when we figured out where our next home should be. The real estate market went BANANAS! We didn't know better or we would have stayed in our previous home. We have lived in Oly for 15 years and were afraid we'd never be able to stay in Oly since prices just kept going up and up this last year during COVID. We put 7 offers on 7 homes. We were outbid by folks with CASH!!! Oly is getting a face lift for sure and it'll be interesting to see how it changes with so many folks coming down from Seattle. The face lift isn't even one of diversity. It feels gentrified. We almost moved to another state and would have if my spouse hadn't a secure job working for the State for 15 years and I didn't own a business of 7 years, which I love. We didn't want to leave, but were willing to leave our secure employment just to find a place to live! Our rental is moldy uninsulated 2 bedrooms and \$1850 a month. Fortunately we were able to continue to work during COVID - but so were a lot of other folks (which is great!) but many of those folks are coming to town and have lots of money to spend on the already very low inventory of homes in Oly - middle income homes. I know we are very lucky - we DO have jobs and aren't suffering as much as many are. We have been able to buy a home. Incredibly. But, Oly is getting squeezed in a weird way that is affecting low and middle income home owners. It feels so smarmy. Like real estate sharks in the waters - not a relaxing place to swim anymore. The home we purchased was at the very edge of our possible price range. We will live and work here until we retire and feel lucky that we could get a home in this crazy housing crisis! But we also look forward to moving since Oly is getting pretty funky - we'll see what happens, we have 15 years to go. Maybe it'll get better - it feels so hostile right now. Like a major disconnect on display. Its capacity is really getting squeezed. I don't understand why we can't use the vacant YMCA to help house and resource folks who need it! When I was young and in need, I lived at the YWCA in Bellingham for 8 months. It was a great resource for good folks in need to help them when people needed a little support. There are so many boarded up shops downtown. It's really strange that the Mistake on the Lake and so many other condos are going up but there's also a pop up shanty village around every green space. I don't get it. The system has really failed us. Someone is getting rich and it ain't the people.

3/16/2021 09:44 PM

I consider equal opportunity for housing, diversity in neighborhoods and nearby transit and shopping to be essential elements in developing solutions to our housing crisis. Even more important, however, is ensuring that

farmland, water sources, shoreline, forest and prairie habitat are "sacrosanct;" i. e. are preserved from development and not fragmented into habitat islands. I also think the increasing vulnerability of western Washington to wildfire due to climate change needs to be a consideration. Thank you to all who have worked long and hard on this planning process!

3/17/2021 08:31 AM

Why is the burden of creating homes for low and no income being placed on non-profits and developers? Why isn't the city and county taking the majority of the responsibility to ensure low and no income housing is developed?

3/17/2021 09:15 AM

In theory it would be great for people to afford housing in the areas they worked in, this would be great to reduce the carbon footprint of our community and provide housing. I see a challenge with this though, it is still the individuals have opportunity costs that they must consider when choosing their profession, and where they want to live. Housing is best served by the free market where there are many suppliers and many buyers. Government intervention in housing prices to drive down the price of housing would likely drive more consumers from other areas to move to our community and purchase the lower income housing, especially with the shift in telecommuting for work.

3/17/2021 09:17 AM

Actually use the multifamily tax exemption for affordable housing projects. Make it less accessible to high-end developers who are displacing low-income tenants downtown by installing expensive investment properties. I understand that this is not a panacea, but I feel like I have heard assurances that we need a "diversity" of housing in every municipal and legislative statement on the topic of housing, and yet somehow exemptions meant to decrease the cost of development serve only to create more market-rate and above-market-rate housing in Olympia. Maybe in order to create a "diversity" of housing it would be helpful to leave market-rate and above-market-rate housing off the table for a couple years - if we focus on lower-income housing exclusively for a little while, maybe we can finally bring these things into balance. It would be great to incentivize development so that we end up with as many Merritt Manors as we currently have Views On Fifths and 123 4ths.

3/17/2021 10:50 AM

In-fill by repurposing/remodeling vacant commercial buildings and commercial-zoned property for low-income and affordable housing, rather than overcrowding already dense housing in established neighborhoods. There is an over-abundance of abandoned or empty commercial space that could be converted to desperately needed housing.

3/17/2021 08:04 PM

These programs you're advocating will destroy neighborhoods

3/17/2021 08:44 PM

Make it easier and more affordable to build ADUs. Review all the fees and reduce as much as possible. Don't make people build little bits and pieces of sidewalks. Also, find a way to tax excess profits when people flip houses or when the market bids up properties so much. Its getting out of control. Also -

STOP GIVING LARGE PROPERTY TAX BREAKS for high end apartments in downtown. As a homeowner I don't like subsidizing property tax breaks for high end housing downtown - by now incentives for that are not needed. I wouldn't mind subsidizing lower income tho. Olympia public works are in shambles - street medians are not maintained, street tree wells are horrible, downtown sidewalks and curbs are broken and dirty. Olympia keeps building bump-outs, roundabouts, medians, etc. but does not keep them up. It makes our town look shabby and ugly.

3/18/2021 09:20 AM

Support progressive tax rates (the top income levels should be paying more). Offer lower property tax rates for families with multi-generational housing (incentivize families to stick together).

3/18/2021 12:37 PM

Housing for all! Our primary goal in life is to help eliminate wealth/cost barriers to home ownership. My wife and I were unable to purchase a home in Olympia for many years. Sadly, my wife's mother passed away in 2017 and we inherited her home. The fact that she was able to give us the gift of home ownership is amazing and truly a blessing. It is the only reason I was able to voluntarily step away from my awesome job with The Olympian and pursue larger opportunities in life and be able to volunteer/contribute more to helping others realize home ownership. If I can't help thousands of folks who dream of buying a home actually realize it, what's the point of all this? I want to help folks get stable housing, gain equity, and be able to start their own businesses to ensure our communities thrive locally and our GDP/GNP grows nationally. Entrepreneurs are the future and I want to flood the market with talented people with amazing ideas/ideals. For a grain of salt, the 41-50% of our income towards our home is entirely voluntarily (we pay x5 the minimums each month to pay off the home quickly). We are fortunate to be in a position like this and will only be able to give back more after we stop paying interest to credit unions, etc. Happy to chat anytime -- 360-870-9975, John Canfield

3/18/2021 01:11 PM

Olympia, Tumwater & Lacey should be developing a housing action plan collaboratively. Independent housing plans for each city, and a separate Thurston county plan is unlikely to address the housing inequity and homelessness. Develop incentives to build Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) for existing residents who are zoned at a denser residential dwelling units/lot than is currently in use. In particular, property owners who live within Urban Growth Areas. A grant program and low interest loan program that requires renting the ADU once constructed to those with housing vouchers, and includes a reasonable market assessed rental maximum. There must be some assurance at the back end that the property owner will actually collect rent so the system must include a security account. This will avoid 'ghettoizing' low income housing in development tracts, and increase the appeal to property owners to stay if they are collecting rental income and increasing value of their property.

3/18/2021 01:48 PM

Thurston County makes building housing way harder than it should be. Why would someone build in Thurston County when they have to jump through

hoops and wait an unacceptable amount of time to obtain permits!

Additionally, investors and developers don't want to do business in a city that is overrun by drugs, garbage and rioters that are allowed to continue destroying the city. I think that there are many issues that need to be addressed in order to make investing in Olympia a desirable thing.

3/18/2021 03:32 PM

I've only seen luxury style development in town in recent time, I know that some low income housing has also been created as well, but does not in anyway seem like a 1:1 or even 1:2 ratio as it appears we (the city) need it to be. Out of all the solutions listed above, I think it would be most important to require a proportion of all new multi-unit housing secure a certain percentage of low-income/subsidized units. Sending low-income folks to live on the outskirts of town up Martin Way in a humongous subsidized apartment setup can't be the primary direction that we go if we want to reach equality among all the residents of this town.

3/18/2021 05:21 PM

We don't need any more so called market rate or luxury living type housing whatsoever until we are able to catch up to the needs of the majority of the people. The average person in Olympia has an income far below the area median income. We need to stop using this model as it doesn't accurately represent the majority. I was recently literally told that downtown Olympia is better suited for wealthier people because it's on the water and has amazing mountain views by one of the people I managed to actually get on a phone. I wish I'd written down his name, I wanna say Steve, who admitted to me he was new to the area. How dare he imply that the place I grew from was wasted on me as if the systemic poverty I grew up in and live in still somehow has made me blind to the beauty of my home. Downtown Olympia is losing all it's already existing affordable housing. 5 years ago at least half the rentals downtown were either directly subsidized or private owned below market rate. Now 77% is market rate being built with tax credits (MFTE) that the cost of is put off on taxes to the people. This is wrong. Why have we chosen to rubber stamp through these 8 year MFTE developments for already rich people to get richer when they can afford to support the community and still get an MFTE deal under the 12 year MFTE but have to give back for said deal with 20% units held for affordable housing? When the 123 4th avenue building was going in people worried. Gentrification was trying to move in. Mayor Selby said back then, according to an article I saw in Olympian newspaper, that she would be open to more affordable housing in the future, what happened? The city had the option to require the 12 year MFTE. The people are crying out for affordable housing. Trickle down economy isn't working for anyone but those at the top. Start bubbling up. It's what the average salary deserves. No more median income because it isn't representing the majority of the people. And please be aware many people won't even be aware this survey is out so many of the answers you receive will be from connected people who don't necessarily have the community at large in mind. I'm thinking downtown association, rotary club, etc. . those who want to gentrify because they will pad their already fat pockets. Please stand up for the true majority of the people's needs not the wants of bigger

pockets.

3/18/2021 08:38 PM

It would have been nice to have known a year or so ago, that you were working on a plan such as the one we have now been made aware of - and I found out about it from someone on the Nextdoor Neighborhood Blog, just this evening (3/18/21)! I did not find out about it from The Olympian, or any of the mayors of the towns involved in the process...

3/18/2021 10:04 PM

The problem Olympia has is it is becoming such an unsafe environment not only due to homeless, but to radical opinions that hard-working people will continue to avoid it due to safety issues. Nothing in this survey addresses this.

3/18/2021 10:35 PM

Low income housing is well intentioned and yet so misguided. Please stay out of the real estate market in our great little city!

3/19/2021 10:08 AM

Infill of existing residential areas is preferable to expanding into currently undeveloped or low development areas

3/19/2021 01:52 PM

The last thing this city needs is more "low income housing" where it is starting at 1200 a month for a studio And really the other last thing this city needs is more high rise condos that are topping out on Tacoma/Seattle prices and just sitting vacant except for the squatters. How about the city focus on the middle class? Those that are holding this city together? Stop pandering to bend over backwards to give handouts based on the middle class's taxes.

3/19/2021 06:20 PM

Improved availability and access to mental health services is critical for a portion of the homeless population. I am also committed to creating housing for homeless women and children and feel this population should be a priority. Studies show that foster children that leave placement and become homeless reduce their risk for chronic homelessness if they can find stable housing soon after becoming homeless.

3/20/2021 09:12 AM

We also need to take care of the mental health issues that live on our streets. If we can help the people who can work and be part of the community that is a start but the people who have mental health and drug issues that cannot work/or won't participate in making a better community need a place to be so that they are safe, fed and warm and not sitting on the corners or in tents discarding garbage and drug paraphernalia and stealing from business and families that work hard for their money. The tax payers have to look at or pay to clean up their mess. If they are not willing to get help then they need to move on to another city besides Thurston County. This all started in the 1990's when they shut down our mental health institutes because they were not "Humane" I don't think what we are seeing now is humane, at least there they had medication, food, a bed to sleep in and were housed and yes that was a better use of our tax dollars.

3/21/2021 12:42 PM

Affordable housing won't be built by private developers because there's not enough profit. The newly adopted Housing policies are incentivizing developers to buy lots in the City to tear down or renovate houses so they

can make a profit, as shown by the increased valuations for land on the West side and concomitant devaluations of structures. My daughter can no longer afford a home in Olympia. The City is prioritizing any kind of development. That is WRONG. The City is prioritizing profit driven development and has been captured by development and commercial forces to the detriment of its citizens. That is WRONG. The City should prioritize diverse income housing in all neighborhoods and not allow any tax breaks for market rate housing.

3/21/2021 03:33 PM

Over regulation & huge fees are the main cause of this problem. Private enterprise, without such expensive regulation will provide adequate housing for all. Government doesn't belong in the housing business- have you learned nothing from the huge government "projects" in the past. They create misery for all.

Density is good but the devil is in the details.

3/21/2021 07:00 PM

We have a housing crisis which severely impacts low income citizens. This needs to change but not at the expense of destroying the environment.

3/21/2021 07:14 PM

Rely less on "incentivizing": the private sector by reducing their fees and taxes and redirect their tax revenue to subsidizing housing. Developers will build here without the subsidies and they won't build lower income housing. Protect low-density neighborhoods. They are not a problem, they are a defining strength of Olympia. Increase lower-income and density by fostering increased construction of ADU's. They can be made to be compatible with SF neighborhoods. While you plan for a future population, think about respecting the people who live here now and who made Olympia a place that others want to live in the future.

3/21/2021 08:22 PM

Thank you for your time:)

3/22/2021 02:00 PM

We need to develop with the future of the environment in the forefront of our thinking. You talk about a lot of incentives for the developers ~ what about for the good of humanity? Or for the good of our community? I believe we must be transparent when we're talking about profit margins. I'm a bit tired of developers walking away with a payload while the rest of us deal with their mistakes ~ especially in terms of infrastructure. Please, let us develop with a high level of forethought. Thanks!

3/22/2021 03:19 PM

Do not wall off our waterfront, with buildings. Invest in open space. Whatever is done for housing/increasing density needs to be paired with open space, parks, walking paths. Quality of environment, quality of life. Cut the light pollution, dim and hood street lights. Thanks for asking for my input.

3/23/2021 11:17 AM

I think the City of Olympia would be a great candidate for a pilot program of Universal Basic Income (UBI) so that the homeless population could afford rent and the UBI would go back into the local economy. I also believe that

3/24/2021 08:57 PM

tiny house villages that are rent to own could be a great low income option. Not in a religious facility and not regulated like the other free tiny house villages for the homeless. These would be geared toward single workers and low income households. What incentives are there for making the building more eco friendly? Can the city encourage low flow toilets, energy efficient appliances etc. Are there incentives for hiring local contractors and shopping from local lumber/building supply stores and keeping the money even more local that way? I would love to be involved further with helping address Olympias housing and homeless crisis. Please feel free to reach out at glory805@gmail.com. Thank You, Glory Nylander

3/25/2021 12:49 PM

When it's time to downsize (soon!), we would strongly consider cooperative housing or townhouses, particularly if there were high quality options. New development should be very dense and located close to major transit routes.

3/25/2021 12:58 PM

MORE ASSISTANCE FOR THE UNHOUSED POPULATION. The cost of living is too high here for even just a tiny studio apartment! i would be homeless if I didn't live with my sister.

3/25/2021 01:11 PM

Much of the pressure on housing costs in Olympia is being driven by Seattle/King County not providing enough affordable housing. It's bad for us here in Olympia from both a housing and transportation perspective as a result. I urge you to work with Seattle and King County, through the courts if necessary, to take responsibility for and fix their housing issues. No matter how much additional housing you create here in Olympia, you will never satisfy the demand until Seattle/King County fix their issues first

3/25/2021 02:59 PM

The housing crisis in Thurston County is acute and worsening each year. Property taxes are out of control and my adult children with govt jobs are unable to afford most houses or find affordable housing for rent. Not sure what the solution is but this action your organization is embarking on is a good starting point.

3/25/2021 03:37 PM

Most people start out renting apartments/homes and have roommates until they have worked themselves up financially to owning homes. Home ownership is not a right, it is a goal. High density causes infrastructure problems with traffic, pollution, schools, etc. Cutting down every tree and building on every foot of land is not smart planning. The best way to help the homeless (that are committed to helping themselves) is by getting them into apartments and helping them get work. Things earned are appreciated, free is not.

3/25/2021 03:37 PM

My family and I know how fortunate we are to have stable housing in a lovely neighborhood. The economic disparities in our community continue to grow and we (our city, county, state, and federal governments) have to quickly take steps to create more opportunities for all people to have stable housing.

3/25/2021 03:38 PM

Increase the level of police funding to keep all neighborhoods safe from theft, drugs, vandalism, and other crimes.

- 3/26/2021 07:29 AM
Until Affordable Housing is offered to Working Class, the cycle of real poverty- those who pay outrageous rents every month- will never be broken. There is no way a person making \$80K can buy a \$375,000 house and then be expected to fix it up. That's what this market demands. 'Affordable Housing' isn't a term for Transients- it's for people who have worked everyday and are productive in your community.
- 3/26/2021 08:27 AM
Reduce requirements for fire sprinklers in new ADUs. Reduce fees for ADUs - keep making it easier for homeowners to establish them.
- 3/26/2021 08:28 AM
I would like to see incentives for developers to include a certain percentage of low-income units but only if they keep them that way for at least 20 years, to be reviewed at that time for possible changes. Making it anything less than that incentivizes landlords finding ways to kick low income tenants out as soon as they know they can start renting the property for more money.
- 3/26/2021 08:36 AM
My biggest worry about developing more affordable housing is that emphasis will be placed on single family home ownership which has been artificially propped up in this country for the last century. I also worry that developing housing for a "variety of incomes" is code for a few low income units and a bunch of middle to high, so it's harder to support statements like that when there is no policy detail attached. I'm also wary of building out when we need to focus on building up. One of the best things Olympia could do is make it easier for ADUs to be built, offer grants or easy loans for homeowners to develop ADUs but with the requirement that the unit must be rented for 10% under market for a certain number of years. We would jump on the chance to build an ADU and gladly rent it, it wouldn't even have to make money, just pay for itself. If the City offered grants for that, it would offset the cost, you could require a rental cap as a condition of the grant, my payment to the bank would be less and I could and would have to, charge someone less rent. Especially if it wasn't a huge hassle to build them, the city could even offer 3 pre-approved building plans.
- 3/26/2021 08:55 AM
I agree with the need to develop new and affordable housing, but I also want to be careful to avoid urban sprawl, especially into natural areas (like Missiom Creek or Scatter Creek).
- 3/26/2021 09:05 AM
While I understand the need for affordable housing and for high-density housing, I live on the westside and don't believe the current road/traffic infrastructure can support it. We also have already lost a lot of the "charm" of west olympia in recent years. I would rather see more ADUs, single-family, duplex, triplex options as opposed to the HUGE apartment complexes that continue to pop up on the westside. As well as thoughtful development of parks, village-type atmosphere, walkability in high density neighborhoods.
- 3/26/2021 09:18 AM
Let's keep Olympia blended with many socioeconomic groups.
- I think we need more PUBLICLY OWNED low income housing. Tax credit

3/26/2021 10:41 AM

housing is inadequate for very low incomes.

3/26/2021 05:11 PM

There needs to be more affordable housing in Olympia but development and building more homes I dont see as the answer. Take vacant buildings and make them affordable housing. Like the big building by Bayview and Capitol Lake.. that would have been GREAT affordable housing, close to the bus stops and many downtown jobs. Too much new downtown condos for the wealthy!!!

3/26/2021 05:45 PM

Need more direct funding for low income and homeless individuals to obtain or maintain housing

3/26/2021 09:47 PM

Low oncoming housing needs private green/outdoor space and community gardens. The outdoors as part of a living situation should just be a privilege of wealth. Sidewalks and bike routes need to be part of any housing plan.

3/27/2021 10:32 AM

I think that it would be great to work with developers to build extremely small studios spaces to make affordable, functional, healthy spaces where no subsidy is needed.

3/27/2021 03:21 PM

Olympia is too expensive. Our children will never be able to own houses here. Prices are way overpriced. It's great for us homeowners but terrible for young people. But I can't move either everything is so expensive.

3/28/2021 08:40 AM

I understand there are limitations to what the City can do as opposed to what other levels of government can do (county, state, federal). I support the City taking an active role in educating residents about these constraints and the roles different levels of government play and advocating for changes at these other levels of government which would support more equitable and affordable housing here in Olympia. I would also love for the City to be bold and creative and not rely so heavily on existing dominant models of housing that rely on the market.

3/28/2021 08:56 AM

I am a local Realtor and the biggest is problem that is driving our housing prices up is that there are not enough home's for sale. THE PERMITTING PROCESS, GOPHER LAW, and PERMITTING COSTS are entirely to blame for this issue. The exorbitant permitting costs make it impossible for affordable homes to be built. If it costs \$80,000-90,000 to develop a lot including permits and studies and requirements, then a more expensive house has to be built to help the contractor recover that cost. In addition the amount of time required to get through the permit process and the red tape is making small builders not want to build here and so they build in other counties. This is a fact. This issue has to be addressed to resolve the problem.

3/28/2021 10:53 AM

1. Enact affordable housing/linkage fee. 2. End tax breaks and impact fee discounts on market rate housing.

3/28/2021 02:07 PM

While I support density I do not support new construction in neighborhoods that go far above market rate and that no infrastructure like roads or schools

do not match

3/28/2021 04:30 PM

We have too much population, and should not be developing more housing. If we build it, they will come. We need to reduce the population in Thurston County, and all public efforts should be focused on population reduction, not developer subsidies. The best solution to our housing shortfall is to ask Congress to close Joint Base Lewis McChord. That would dramatically reduce pressure on the housing market, reduce traffic on I-5, and reduce certain types of crime.

3/28/2021 06:31 PM

I don't like the "missing middle" plan (now dormant) that would have required re-zoning residential properties to allow 2-, 3- or 4-family housing practically anywhere in the city. Such zoning is appropriate ON A BUSLINE but not on the next two or three blocks out. Denser zoning should be encouraged in places where it would be helpful, that is, in big transportation corridors. The hinterlands (away from the buslines) should be considered "commons," areas that are not being milked for every penny of profit but are there for the benefit of low-income people to pay what they can afford.

3/28/2021 07:34 PM

I think this is already being worked on, but mixed use corridors of 2-4 story buildings on Harrison. Same thing on Pacific in the vicinity of Ralph's. Also would like to see further easing of ADU rules and the ability to include 2 to 4 plexes in most neighborhoods. And while you are at it can you abolish HOAs except for minimum required maintenance of common areas? :)

Optional question (180 response(s), 136 skipped)


Question type: Essay Question



Select Language




Powered by [Google Translate](#)



- [Home](#)
- [City of Olympia Website](#)
- [About Engage Olympia](#)
- [All Projects](#)

Search

- [Sign in](#)
- [Register](#)



[Home](#) » [Housing Action Plan](#)

Housing Action Plan



What's happening?

The City of Olympia is developing a Housing Action Plan to identify actions it can take to increase the supply, diversity and affordability of housing.

This is a continuation of ongoing work. Some of Olympia's previous actions include a voter-approved Home Fund to create permanent supportive housing, adopting more flexible codes to encourage accessory dwelling units and a tax exemption to incentivize the development of multi-family housing.

[Learn more by reviewing this storymap.](#) It provides a high level overview of our region's housing needs, identified strategies and how creating new housing fits into Olympia's Comprehensive Plan vision.

Open House

In case you missed our open house on April 7, you can view the presentation and question/answer period below. The presentation provides a high level overview of the strategies and actions proposed to meet Olympia's housing needs. The FAQ is posted in the right column of this page. Thanks to everyone who attended.

- [View the recording](#)

More information

In 2019, the Washington State Legislature passed HB 1923, aimed at encouraging cities planning under the state Growth Management Act to take actions to increase residential building capacity. These actions include developing a housing action plan "...to encourage construction of additional affordable and market rate housing in a greater variety of housing types and at prices that are accessible to a greater variety of incomes, including strategies aimed at the for-profit single-family home market."

Funded by a state grant and in recognition of the cross-jurisdiction need for affordable housing, the Cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater choose to collaborate with Thurston Regional Planning Council to develop a draft Housing Needs Assessment and draft Action Plan. The Needs Assessment projects housing needs over 25 years and provides important demographic and market data to guide our actions. The draft Housing Action Plan identifies strategies and a menu of potential actions; it is intended as a draft for the cities to use in developing individual housing action plans. We also conducted a survey of landlords and rental property owners to better understand housing costs.

Between January 15 and June 15, each city is carrying out their own public review process to identify actions to include in their city-specific plans. Although we are each adopting a separate plan, some of the actions may be approached regionally by all cities working together.

The Olympia Planning Commission held a public hearing on May 17 and will provide a summary of all comments received to City Council.

Next steps

The City Council will review the draft plan on June 22.

- [View the draft Olympia Housing Action Plan](#)

SURVEY	COMMENTS
---------------	-----------------

CLOSED: This survey has concluded. See document Library for survey report.

Housing Survey

The survey closed on Sunday, March 28.

[Take Survey](#)



Who's Listening

Amy Buckler

Strategic Projects Manager
City of Olympia








Phone (360) 280-8947


Email abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us





Documents

- [Olympia Housing Action Plan Public Hearing Draft \(1.35 MB\) \(pdf\)](#)
- [Engage Olympia Housing Survey Report \(807 KB\) \(pdf\)](#)
- [Housing Needs Assessment \(1.88 MB\) \(pdf\)](#)
- [Landlord Survey \(1.48 MB\) \(pdf\)](#)
- [Issues Affecting Housing Availability and Affordability \(5.91 MB\) \(pdf\)](#)

Lifecycle

-  **Assessment of regional housing needs**
Spring-Fall 2020
-  **Regional stakeholder committee input**
Summer/Fall 2020
-  **Regional Housing Forum**
January 2021
-  **Regional Housing Action Plan & Landlord Survey**
Fall/Winter 2020/21
-  **Online public feedback**
March 2021

Explore the storymap and take a survey
-  **Public Open House (online)**
April 7, 2021, 5-6:30 pm

Learn more about Olympia's housing needs, strategies and proposed actions. Participants must [register in advance](#).
-  **Public comment period**
April/May 2021 Provide written comment to help shape action priorities. Also, there will be a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) comment period.
-  **Planning Commission Public Hearing**
Monday, May 17, 6:30 p.m.
-  **Land Use & Environment Committee Update**
May 27, 2021
-  **Land Use & Environment Committee Recommendation**
June 17, 2021

**City Council adoption**

June 2021

FAQs

What is affordable housing? Is that the same thing as low-income housing?

What is the relationship between living in close proximity to transit and housing affordability?

Can you explain what the City considers to be frequent transit?

You report that wages are not rising at the same pace as housing costs. Does the plan address wages?

What do impact fees fund and how do these mitigate the impact?

There are Impact Fee Exemptions for some new housing units. Who pays for the schools, streets, and parks needed to serve these new housing units?

What is the Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE) and how is it being used?

One of the potential actions in the Plan is a Tenant Opportunity to Purchase ordinance (TOPO). Would this be optional for the builder/owner, or is participation mandatory?

What public incentives or subsidies are available in Olympia to encourage low-income housing?

Rather than reducing parking requirements, has the City considered building stacked garages for parking, or units with parking below, and the housing above?

What is the City doing to encourage accessory dwelling units?

Has the City considered allowing Tiny Houses on Wheels as a form of an Accessory Dwelling Unit?

How many houses of all kinds should we be building per year? How are we doing at providing the units needed to meet our population growth and demographics?

Does Olympia allow single-room occupancy units?

Does Boardwalk Apartments downtown still subsidize seniors? I thought their tax incentive ended 4-5 years ago.

Are there opportunities for disabled and low income individuals to get into homeownership and help with down payments?

What kind of opportunities exist for converting empty commercial spaces around town into housing? Are there any state/federal grants available to help make this happen?

Is there going to be any use of the American Rescue stimulus going to be used towards housing and what is the city planning to do in regards with that?

Why does the City of Olympia mandate sprinklers in new developments?

Will low-income housing be cheaply made?

How is Home Fund being used to address homelessness?

Is there a way neighborhoods can help the City to increase affordable housing?

Why can't I house a person in a temporary RV on my property?

What are the main reasons for lower levels of housing production (relative to population)?

How is racial equity addressed in this Plan?

Can the city require developers to include affordable units in multifamily units?

What is the City doing to encourage more energy efficiency?

Are camps are considered "households"?

Does the plan separately address manufactured housing. Inside manufactured housing communities or outside?

Who comprised the stakeholder committee for the Housing Action Plan?

How are builders encouraged to build a variety of types of housing rather than just the large, single family homes that seem to be the dominant type of construction?

What is the plan to address the homeless crisis? I don't see that in this plan.

[Terms and Conditions](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Moderation Policy](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Technical Support](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Cookie Policy](#)





Land Use & Environment Committee

Scope of Housing Feasibility Study

Agenda Date: 5/27/2021
Agenda Item Number: 6.B
File Number: 21-0533

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

Title

Scope of Housing Feasibility Study

Recommended Action

Committee Recommendation:

Not referred to a committee.

City Manager Recommendation:

Briefing only. No action requested.

Report

Issue:

Whether to discuss a scope of work for a Housing Feasibility Study.

Staff Contact:

Cary Retlin, Home Fund Manager, Executive, 360-570-3956

Presenter(s):

Cary Retlin, Home Fund Manager, Executive

Amy Buckler, Strategic Project Manager, Community Planning & Development

Background and Analysis:

Staff were directed to develop a scope to consider what it will take for significant residential development, including preserving and constructing more low-income affordable units in Olympia's High Density Neighborhood Areas. The City is interested in considering ways to add and encourage affordable housing units without creating unintended consequences that discourage housing production.

Staff have prepared a draft feasibility study to begin this process. More analysis may be required later to assess additional tools. Staff recommends starting with the Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE) because it is one of our most powerful incentives for unsubsidized housing development.

This study will conduct a proforma analysis of up to three different redevelopment sites within each geographic area specified:

- Existing MFTE areas; Downtown and adjacent east and west corridors

- The Capital Mall High Density Neighborhood Area
- The Pacific/Martin Way Triangle High Density Neighborhood Area

The study will use applicable building types to identify economic factors that affect residential development feasibility in these areas, including the addition of units affordable to low-income households. It will analyze Olympia's MFTE program and how this can best be structured to achieve an increase in residential development, including private sector development of units affordable to low-income households in each area and look at options related to SB 5287 (which passed this spring) as part of this consideration.

This discussion will also include an overview of changes to the Multifamily Tax Exemption Program resulting from the passage of 5287 during Legislative session.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

Affordable housing and increased housing options are a priority for the community.

Options:

1. Provide feedback and direction to staff to finalize the scope of the study.
2. Provide feedback and direction to staff to refine the scope of the study and return for to the committee for further discussion.
3. Take other action.

Financial Impact:

The City Council has set aside up to \$50,000 to complete a feasibility analysis to forward implementation of Olympia's draft housing action plan.

Attachments:

Draft Feasibility Study

Housing Feasibility Study Concept

The City Council has set aside up to \$50,000 to complete a feasibility analysis to forward implementation of Olympia's draft housing action plan. The plan recognizes an urgent need for more housing supply in the city, including increasing the number of units affordable to low-income households. The City wants to structure its zoning, regulations and incentives in a way that encourages needed housing development. As a first step, this feasibility analysis will help the City determine how best to structure the multifamily tax exemption (MFTE) and understand its effect on the likelihood of encouraging private sector development, including both market rate and low-income affordable units, within specific areas.

Main Questions

What will it take to get significant residential development, including preserving and constructing more low-income affordable units, in Olympia's High Density Neighborhood Areas? How can Olympia influence our local housing market to include affordable units without unintended consequences?

We will start to get at these questions with this study but subsequent analysis may be required to assess different tools. Staff recommends starting with the multifamily tax exemption because it is one of our most powerful tools, we think it needs to be restructured to maximize outcomes and doing so is already on our work plan. Once the MFTE variable is established it will be easier to further assess how it works in conjunction with other tools.

Concept for Analysis

- Conduct a proforma analysis of up to three different redevelopment sites within each geographic area specified:
 - Existing Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE) area: Downtown and adjacent east and west corridors
 - The Capital Mall High Density Neighborhood Area
 - The Pacific/Martin Way Triangle High Density Neighborhood Area
- Use applicable building types to identify economic factors that affect residential development feasibility in these areas, including the addition of units affordable to low-income households.
- Analyze Olympia's multifamily tax exemption program and how this can best be structured to achieve an increase in residential development, including private sector development of units affordable to low-income households, in each area. Look at options in the statute related to SB 5287 as part of this consideration.
- Include analysis of adaptive reuse of commercial to residential use in applicable locations.
- Integrate and summarize the information from the feasibility studies and the development proposals and describe the development planning implications of the findings.

Questions

- How should Olympia's multifamily tax exemption (MFTE) be tailored (% of units, AMI threshold, other eligibility criteria, etc.) in each geographic area to maximize outcomes?
- Specifically, the current maximum income threshold for using Olympia's 12-YR MFTE is 115% of area median income. The City wants to lower that threshold. What is the lowest income threshold we can establish in each geographic area and maintain a viable program?
- In each area, how well could [the current or a newly tailored MFTE program] work alone or in combination with other existing incentives such as a density bonus, 80% impact fee exemption or parking exemption (where applicable) to encourage inclusion of low-income affordable units?
- Does Olympia still need the 8-year MFTE in downtown in order to encourage mixed use, market rate housing development?
- Could the 8-year program be structured to include an affordability element?
- Does Olympia need the 8-year MFTE in the other geographic areas in order to encourage mixed use, market rate housing development?

DRAFT



Land Use & Environment Committee

Approach to Rental Housing Outreach

Agenda Date: 5/27/2021
Agenda Item Number: 6.C
File Number:21-0532

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

Title

Approach to Rental Housing Outreach

Recommended Action

Committee Recommendation:

Discussion only. No action requested.

City Manager Recommendation:

Discussion only. No action requested.

Report

Issue:

Whether to discuss the scope and approach for the rental housing community outreach.

Staff Contact:

Cary Retlin, Home Fund Manager, Executive, 360.570.3956

Presenter(s):

Cary Retlin, Home Fund Manager
Christa Lenssen, Housing Program Specialist

Background and Analysis:

Staff will provide the committee with an update on statewide changes to the Residential Landlord Tenant Act recently signed by the Governor, a brief history of this topic, and options for next steps on engaging the public on actions Olympia could take relevant to renter protections.

Past Tenant Protection Conversations with the Land Use and Environment Committee (LUEC) and City Council

In May 2019, City of Tumwater staff approached Olympia, Lacey, and Thurston County to propose a cross-jurisdictional approach to exploring renter protections. Tumwater staff shared a long list of tenant protections that served as the beginning of potential changes that could be considered. That list was ranked by the Tumwater City Council based on impact and ease of adoption. The LUEC reviewed that list in August and made their own rankings with many overlaps.

In October 2019, the LUEC reviewed and revised a list of the Tumwater protections and ranked them

based on what appears most ready for consideration for adoption. Many of those items have been adopted in other cities. Just causes for terminations of tenancy were on that list.

In October 2019, the Washington Community Action Network and local tenants rallied outside City Hall and spoke to the City Council about renter protections. They also proposed renter protections for Olympia that included just causes for terminations and evictions.

In March 2019, the LUEC hosted a community meeting on rental housing at Washington Middle School to kickoff discussion of potential code changes related to tenant protections. The meeting was well attended by tenants, property owners, and some property managers. The format of the meeting had to be changed to accommodate a tenant group protest at the beginning of the meeting so that property managers and others could share their perspective.

In May 2020, staff brought the LUEC draft markups of potential code changes relevant to just cause and vacate notice timelines. Further action was postponed allowing for more community conversation - ideally when social distancing guidelines had been relaxed.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

Potential changes to Olympia Municipal Code's Unfair Housing Practices (OMC 5.80) are a topic of significant interest to renters and rental housing owners and operators within the city and around Thurston County. Any work on this topic will draw a great deal of local and regional attention and public engagement.

Thurston Regional Planning Council estimates that 53 percent of Olympia households are renters.

Options:

1. Direct staff to proceed with public engagement plan discussed
2. Modify public engagement plan discussed
3. Take other action

Financial Impact:

Up to \$50,000 in 2020 funds carried over to 2021 may be used to contract consulting support of focus groups or other public engagement.

Attachments:

Code Changes Discussed in Other Cities

	Renter Protections in Other Cities	Examples of Existing Ordinances in WA
A.	Installment payments for move-in fees and deposits	Burien, Seattle
B.	Prohibition on specific retaliations	Federal Way, Seattle
C.	Info on rights and programs required	Burien, Tacoma
D.	Just causes for evictions (nonpayment of rent, noncompliance with lease, chronic late payments...notice can vary for each cause)	Burien, Federal Way, Seattle, Bellingham...
E.	Penalties to landlords specified	Bellingham, Seattle
F.	Limits to nonrefundable fees, security deposits, and pet deposits	Seattle
G.	Relocation/displacement assistance program	Tacoma
H.	Landlord registration	Bellingham, Lacey, Seattle
I.	Rent increase notice from 60 to 90 days (if 10 percent or more)	Kenmore



Land Use & Environment Committee

Future Development Agreements Process

Agenda Date: 5/27/2021
Agenda Item Number: 6.D
File Number:21-0523

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

Title

Future Development Agreements Process

Recommended Action

Committee Recommendation:

Not referred to a committee.

City Manager Recommendation:

Discussion only. No action requested.

Report

Issue:

Discuss process for consideration of potential future development agreements.

Staff Contact:

Leonard Bauer, Director, Community Planning and Development. 360.753.8206

Presenter(s):

Leonard Bauer, Director, Community Planning and Development

Tim Smith, Planning and Engineering Manager, Community Planning and Development

Background and Analysis:

Legal Requirements for Development Agreements

Chapter 36.70B.170 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) authorizes cities to enter into a written development agreement with a property owner. Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 365-196-845 provides additional guidance for cities. The City of Olympia's procedures for development agreements are contained in Chapter 18.53 of the Olympia Municipal Code (OMC).

The Municipal Research and Services Center (MRSC) website includes a useful overview and examples of development agreements (attached).

Olympia's Process for Development Agreements

Consideration of a development agreement may be initiated by City Council or council committee, or requested by the planning commission, City Staff, or the property owner. Development agreements are not required by the City.

Any person intending to propose a development agreement must first meet with City staff for purposes of discussing parameters of the proposal and understanding the applicable procedures. Because they are negotiated agreements between the City and a property owner, development agreements are typically the subject of multiple discussions before being filed as an application with the City.

A development agreement is one of the few tools in the Olympia Municipal code that allow projects to be phased over several years. Development agreements may address a wide variety of topics, including but not limited to installation of public improvements, land acquisitions or dedications, payments for public benefits or mitigation, housing affordability, and public access or open space.

Following is a brief summary of additional procedures and requirements for proposed development agreements:

- The City Council is the authority to make a final decision on a development agreement.
- The City Council must hold a public hearing on the development agreement. Notice for the public hearing is provided consistent with the City's public notice requirements (OMC 18.78.040).
- A development agreement must be heard by the City Council prior to consideration of any application for development.
- A development agreement must be consistent with existing City regulations as they would apply to the development. It may address methods for achieving the development standards and other applicable requirements, vesting of the development-to-development standards, the time frame of the agreement, and any mitigation measures to address potential impacts of the agreement.
- A development agreement must reserve authority to impose new or different regulations to the extent required by a serious threat to public health and safety.
- Development agreements are recorded with Thurston County and remain in force and applicable to the property according to the terms of the agreement, even if the property is sold or transferred to another party.

Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):

Development agreements would be of interest community-wide, particularly the neighborhood in which the subject property is located.

Options:

Following discussion, Committee members may wish to:

1. Recommend a referral from City Council to consider amendments to OMC 18.53
2. Provide guidance to staff regarding topics to consider in future development agreements.
3. Discuss further at another time.

Financial Impact:

This is for discussion only with no immediate impacts. If amendments to OMC 18.53 are proposed, additional resources would be needed for Olympia Planning Commission and City staff work programs.

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

Attachments:

MRSC web page

Development Agreements

This page provides an overview of development agreements for local governments in Washington State, including examples from cities and counties.

Overview

A development agreement is a voluntary contract between a local jurisdiction and a person who owns or controls property within the jurisdiction, detailing the obligations of both parties and specifying the standards and conditions that will govern development of the property. Although the agreements are voluntary, once made they are binding on the parties and their successors.

A development agreement provides assurances to the developer that the development regulations that apply to the project will not change during the term of the agreement. The city or county may require conditions to mitigate project impacts, as well as clarification about project phasing and timing of public improvements. [RCW 36.70B.170](#) describes the type of development standards that are appropriate in a development agreement.

Statutory Authority / Legal Requirements

The Local Project Review Act ([Ch. 36.70B RCW](#)), enacted in 1995, provides specific authority and direction for development agreements. In particular, see [RCW 36.70B.170 - .210](#) and [WAC 365-196-845](#).

Local jurisdictions must hold a public hearing prior to approving a development agreement and may only impose [impact fees](#), dedications, mitigation measures, and standards as authorized by other laws. [RCW 36.70B.180](#) addresses [vested rights](#) under a development agreement.

Examples of Development Agreements

Smaller Projects

- [Gig Harbor Development Agreement \(2000\)](#) - A particularly useful template for a development agreement in Washington
- [Bellevue Draft WR-SRI 120th LLC Development Agreement \(2009\)](#) - Phased master development plan for 36 acre mixed use "catalyst" project located in area targeted for revitalization and future light rail service
- [Issaquah Highlands Drive Transit Oriented Development Agreement \(2007\)](#) - Agreement for 155-unit transit oriented development project with affordable housing

- Mill Creek Development Agreement for Town Center, Phase III (2005) - Nicely done, well organized agreement to assure development of a site consistent with the town center master plan
- Redmond Development with Microsoft Corporation (2007) - Development of a secondary Microsoft campus in an area subject to a building square footage cap. Addresses density transfer, transportation demand management, and transportation improvements.
- Snohomish County and Community Transit Development Agreement for Swift BRT (2009) - Bus Rapid Transit station design features, an "essential public facility"

Large or Complex Projects

- Black Diamond The Villages MPD Development Agreement (2011) - 1,200 acre phased, mixed use planned community, includes affordable housing targets and significant trails and open space
- Des Moines Development Agreement (2007) - Redevelopment of a blighted area into an urban community with significant commercial development and regional transportation linkages
- Everett Riverfront Redevelopment Agreement (2009) - Cleanup and redevelopment of riverfront brownfield sites into commercial and residential uses
- Issaquah Lakeside Industries Development Agreement (2012) - 123-acre master planned community in the form of an urban village. Involves reclamation of mineral resources site, hillside development, and affordable housing requirements.
- Redmond Development Agreement with Group Health Cooperative (2011) - Approving development agreement for property owned by Group Health to turn into a planned mixed use development with 1.4 million sq. ft. of commercial space
- Tukwila Development Agreement for Tukwila South Development (2009) - 10 million square foot master-planned, mixed use development adjacent to regional shopping mall

Amendments, Extension Agreements, and Termination Agreements

Long-term development agreements sometimes require changes as market conditions or other conditions change. Similarly, a developer may need to terminate an agreement if unable to secure financing, or if he wants to do something entirely different with the property. Either party may seek to terminate an agreement if the terms of the agreement have not been met. Most agreements provide some flexibility for such changes, if the parties agree.

Examples

- Bremerton Termination Development Agreement for Port Blakely Properties (2011) - Terminated agreement at request of the developer who wanted to pursue different development of property
- King County and Issaquah Third Amendment to Grand Ridge Joint Agreement (2010) - Three-party development agreement amendment involving expanded urban growth area, additional open space, and transfer of development rights
- Vancouver Development Agreement Extension between the city and Dale A Haagen and Jaana H. Haagen (2012) - Staff report and amendment extending expiration date of prior agreement because of economic uncertainty

Follow us:

© 2021 MRSC of Washington. All rights reserved. [Privacy & Terms](#).