



City of Olympia

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Information: 360.753.8447

Meeting Minutes Land Use & Environment Committee

Monday, August 26, 2013

5:30 PM

Council Chambers

1. ROLL CALL

Present: 3 - Chair Steve Langer, Committee Member Julie Hankins and Committee Member Jeannine Roe

OTHERS PRESENT

Staff Present:

City Manager Steve Hall, Deputy City Attorney Darren Nienaber, Community Planning and Development Director Keith Stahley, Downtown Liaison Brian Wilson, Public Works Director Rich Hoey, Principal Planner Todd Stamm, Associate Planner Amy Buckler, Housing Program Manager Anna Schlecht

Planning Commissioners Present:

Chair Jerry Parker, Carole Richmond, Roger Horn, Vice Chair Judy Bardin, Rob Richards

Guests Present:

Michael Transue, Washington Beer and Wine Distributors Association; Scott DeMartini, Columbia Distributors; Mike Bjerke, Marine View Beverages

2. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Langer called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 3.A [13-0635](#) Approval of July 25, 2013 Land Use & Environment Committee Meeting Minutes

Committee Member Roe noted a change to the minutes to reflect her request that the People's House provide additional information related to the impact of low barrier shelters attracting additional homeless persons from outside the area.

The minutes were approved as amended.

4. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- 4.A [13-0667](#) Alcohol Impact Area Discussion with Industry Representatives

City Manager Steve Hall provided an overview of the issue and provided a summary of the results of the Liquor Control Board (LCB) decision that gave the City additional time to demonstrate the need for an Alcohol Impact Area (AIA) and to continue to work with the liquor industry about their plans and data.

Mr. Michael Transue with Washington Beer and Wine Distributors Association handed out a summary of the Association. Mr. Transue indicated the willingness of the Association to support a voluntary ban. He noted what their key messages were and highlighted a memorandum of agreement with the retailers and pointed out how the voluntary ban is being implemented at the retail level.

Mr. Scott DeMartini with Columbia Distributors explained the City of Seattle's voluntary ban. It disallowed the sale of single sales of beer or wine during certain hours. He noted it was a collaborative effort between the city, distributors, retailers, neighborhoods, and police department. He said the Seattle voluntary ban was quickly adaptable and has now expanded to incorporate liquor (nothing smaller than 750 ml. sold prior to 1:00 p.m.). He added that year to year fortified beer and wine sales were down between 5 and 18 percent.

Mr. Mike Bjerke with Marine View Beverages asked the Committee to consider a better way to accomplish the end result, such as to consider a 1:00 p.m. restriction for single serve sales. He said retailers started with a point of sale (POS) voluntary ban July 1, 2013. He noted single serve sales are down 25 percent within downtown and indicated retailers are pleased with the results with less litter and fewer chronic public inebriants. He reported retailers outside the boundary saw an increase in single serve sales and stated he is working to expand the area of the voluntary ban.

Mr. Bjerke noted they are also developing a training program for retailers similar to what the Liquor Control Board provides for bars and taverns. He explained they are also working on measures for success and progress towards the City's ultimate goal. He added the effort will be more successful if the City and liquor industry work together.

Mr. Transue indicated what is being proposed is adaptable. He said that while training is not required, it is important. He noted the need to translate materials to Korean and the creation of a responsible vendor program -- don't sell to minors, CPIs and those already intoxicated. He mentioned working with the City to expand the Downtown Ambassadors program.

Committee Member Hankins asked about the voluntary period the City had enacted and why retailers didn't participate. Mr. DeMartini responded that retailers didn't feel like they had an option. It seemed like it was all or nothing and they weren't willing to do that.

Committee Member Roe asked how to measure who is buying and who these products appeal to. Mr. DeMartini explained that Steel Reserve is 8 percent alcohol.

He noted they don't have the information broken down and said the CPI focus is on the single serve 16 oz. or 24 oz. sizes. He indicated single serve bottles of spirits are not presently available in downtown and said shoplifting has increased markedly since the initiative went into effect.

Downtown Liaison Brian Wilson explained the City's approach is a brand ban. He said the City is collecting photo evidence of cans found in alleys and other public drinking spots.

Mr. Bjerke said sales data would be made available to the City.

Chair Langer said the City needs good data to make policy recommendations.

Deputy City Attorney Darren Nienaber noted the City of Kent has a voluntary program and said Kent is different than Olympia. He reported Kent lacks a well-defined downtown and has a different set of CPIs. He said the 1:00 p.m. sales rule may not be as effective in Olympia as a result.

Chair Langer asked why only 5 out of 8 retailers are currently complying with the voluntary ban. Mr. DeMartini noted the other 3 are already in compliance. Chair Langer asked why 1:00 p.m. and not 6:00 p.m. Mr. DeMartini responded that the hours were somewhat arbitrary based on school release times and said the hours could be changed. He suggested finding out what works for Olympia.

Lake City has a voluntary and mandatory ban downtown. Mr. DeMartini noted that it only moves the problem around; CPIs generally don't purchase multi-packs.

Mr. Wilson responded to questions about single serve containers downtown. He noted a 24 oz. can of Dog Bite sells for \$1.39.

Mr. Transue asked that the industry be allowed to regulate itself. He noted there remain problems in Pioneer Square despite Seattle's ban.

Mr. Wilson provided an overview of the staff data collection.

Chair Langer asked how to enforce a voluntary ban. Mr. Transue noted it's about communication between the City and the distributors. He said in a competitive environment, vendors will self-police.

Committee Member Roe said she was disappointed about the LCB decision and discussed the downtown project. She said Olympia may be different and there is less opportunity for sales to move about. She asked about what happens in October. Mr. DeMartini asked to help understand what success looks like. He suggested the City and distributors work together to find the right measure. Committee Member Roe noted it's about more than just cans; it's CPI and their impact. Mr. DeMartini said to look for another solution. He said he is not in favor of banning certain brands and

noted nothing addresses small bottles.

Mr. Bjerke suggested coming up with measures to ensure a successful process.

Committee Member Hankins asked about how to have an impact and said alcoholism is a disease that doesn't go into remission from 1:00 p.m. until 7:00 a.m. when the ban is not in effect.

Mr. Nienaber asked the industry how they might address sale of multiple packages.

Chair Langer clarified the objective is to reduce the number of CPIs and associated problems and said distributors need to work hard on inappropriate sales. Mr. Transue commented on the benefit of the training program. Chair Langer said he appreciates the open line of communication and agreed to continue the conversation, perhaps expanding it to include on-premise retailers (bars), off-premise, and the community.

The discussion was completed.

4.B [13-0653](#) Comprehensive Plan Update Deliberation Process

Principal Planner Todd Stamm provided the Land Use and Environment Committee (LUEC) with an overview of the topic. He noted concerns about the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) and the ability of trying to move forward with the Comprehensive Plan. He indicated completion in December, 2013 is no longer feasible for the Comprehensive Plan work. He suggested the LUEC extend the target completion date to June, 2014.

Mr. Stamm asked the Committee to support retaining a clear writing consultant.

Mr. Stamm asked the LUEC to provide direction regarding the Planning Commission recommendation, whether to take up both proposals (March and May) or have staff and the Planning Commission continue to work on the May Addendum. He noted a delay until 2014 would allow time to bring the proposal into alignment with Sustainable Thurston goals and objectives.

Chair Langer asked Planning Commission Chair Jerry Parker for input on the staff proposal. Mr. Parker agreed with retaining a clear writing consultant and agreed to continue to work on the May Addendum.

Chair Langer asked Mr. Parker for his thoughts about the May Addendum and how it could be integrated into the Comprehensive Plan update. Mr. Parker noted the proposals contain two maps, one in March and one in May. He said density is more focused on nodes in the May proposal and indicated zoning between nodes is about what might happen between the nodes. He also said there remains clarification work to do.

Commissioner Roger Horn added that if it is to be included in this update, the Planning Commission needs to get started very soon.

Commissioner Judy Bardin indicated the May Addendum includes three zones; low, medium and high density. She noted the use of gateways and tree lined streets and asked who will hear zoning changes. She said there are differences between the two maps.

Mr. Parker noted gateways were part of the March 8 proposal.

Committee Member Hankins asked who would do the clear writing review. Mr. Stamm responded that previous consultants Joy Michaud and Dana Botka would be contacted first to see if they were interested. Committee Member Roe supported the use of a plain talk consultant. Chair Langer asked about the cost, and Mr. Stamm estimated it would cost less than \$3,000.

Committee Member Hankins asked if the Planning Commission has time for this work this year. Mr. Stamm reminded the LUEC that the Comprehensive Plan update deadline is 2016 and that the City will be looking at the Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC) work and incorporating it into the future amendments.

Mr. Parker responded that the Planning Commission could get the work done in January or February, 2014.

Chair Langer asked the Committee to consider the staff questions. He recommended a June, 2014 target, indicating sooner would be better, but no later than June, 2014. He added that the Council is anxious to move forward with the Comprehensive Plan update.

Chair Langer asked if a clear writing consultant should be retained. There was consensus to move forward to retain a clear writing consultant.

Chair Langer asked the Planning Commission to finish its work by early February. Mr. Stamm noted if the Planning Commission doesn't act on the Addendum until February it will impact scheduling a public hearing in early 2014. Mr. Stamm highlighted the opportunity for a check-in during the month of December.

The report was discussed and continued to the City Council due back on 9/10/2013.

4.C [13-0595](#) ORAL REPORT - Status Reports and Updates

Downtown Master Plan

Mr. Parker noted the Downtown Master Plan would be adopted as a separate plan. He added that a group should be created to scope the Downtown planning effort. Mr. Parker and Associate Planner Amy Buckler distributed a proposal for consideration by the Planning Commission. He recognized that Judy Bardin, Carole Richmond and Max Brown prepared the proposal. Mr. Parker summarized the two proposals - one

from staff and one from the Planning Commission for scoping the Downtown Master Plan process.

Mr. Parker noted the Planning Commission discussed the two proposals, considered the number of participants, and prefers two Planning Commission representatives. Committee Member Roe suggested a member to represent the Economic Development Council (EDC).

Ms. Bardin responded that the Planning Commission knows this work and should be well represented. She added this was originally part of the Planning Commission's work plan.

Mr. Hall indicated the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee has an interest in the Downtown Master Plan as well.

The LUEC and Commission discussed the number of members and in the end agreed to not alter the Planning Commission proposal.

Committee Member Hankins reminded everyone this is only scoping and to only use what was proposed by the Planning Commission.

Chair Langer said the item would move forward with consensus and he would report out at the September 10, 2013 City Council Meeting.

The discussion was completed.

Downtown Ambassador Program

Mr. Rob Richards, with Capital Recovery Center, noted the team has two new tools, a soda blaster and a pressure cleaner. He noted the green machine is coming soon.

Mr. Richards reported the focus has changed from alleys to sidewalks where efforts are more visible. He added that the ambassadors are dedicated to customer service. He introduced Renata Rollins as the new Downtown Ambassador field supervisor and said Chelsea Baker would be joining her in the field. He also noted they have new uniforms with a new logo. Mr. Richards explained "operation deep clean".

Committee Member Hankins reflected upon her experience with ambassadors in Washington, DC and commented that the City of Olympia is on the right path. She noted it took 15 years to significantly impact Washington, DC and said it may take an equally long time here. She expressed appreciation for the Downtown Ambassadors' efforts and indicated the program will make a difference in the downtown.

Committee Member Roe thanked Mr. Richards for the overview and for his handout explaining "operation deep clean". She said she was looking forward to the 2014 budget process and hoped to add people to the clean team program.

The discussion was completed.

Low Barrier Shelters

Housing Program Manager Anna Schlecht provided a status report on the three issues the Committee requested further information about:

1. Shelter program design and function
2. Operation plan & rules
3. Stakeholder feedback

Ms. Schlecht reported the People's House is still developing their program design and management plan. She noted the People's House is looking at a number of shelter models including: the Seattle Downtown Emergency Service Center (DESC), the Povarelo Center in Missoula, Montana, and several shelters in Vancouver, BC. She added that the City facilitated a meeting with the Tacoma Mission to discuss that shelter's history, design and operations. She said the People's House will continue to examine these other models.

Ms. Schlecht reported the People's House is conducting an active community outreach effort and announced the next forum is scheduled for September 16.

In recognition of the coming winter season and the need to provide a cold weather overflow shelter plan, Interfaith Works is working with other community partners to develop an interim plan.

The County has awarded \$400,000 to this shelter program conditioned upon the People's House working with Olympia officials and other stakeholders to identify a suitable location. Communication on the progress of this effort to identify a suitable location will go through LUEC and then to City Council. The Council will then communicate with County officials regarding the County's grant conditions. Interim communication would be appropriate to provide the County with a status report.

Committee Member Roe said the shelter proposal needs to be clarified. Terms like low barrier and program design need to be defined. She asked for more information about sex offenders who would be sheltered there, specifically how People's House would manage the different levels of sex offender (level one, two and/or three) populations. She wondered how shelter staff would know if sex offenders were at the shelter if no identification were required for shelter entry.

Committee Member Roe asked if City Council must approve the location before People's House is funded by the County. She asked about how long efforts would be made to make the 10th Avenue location work before moving on to consideration of another location.

Ms. Schlecht reported that based on feedback received, Interfaith Works is looking at a number of potential locations. As directed by Council, staff provided assistance in examining a broad number of locations. She reported People's House continues to

look for a suitable location based on their operational criteria and community stakeholder feedback.

Committee Member Roe said the City lacks a clear definition of a low barrier shelter and City Council has not yet had a meeting that explained what a low barrier is. She noted part of the confusion with the process has been how it evolved. She stated that Council may need a briefing on what a low barrier shelter is and asked what the best management practices are. She stated the City Council needs more information in order to be comfortable with this concept.

Mr. Hall reminded the LUEC of the joint Council and County Commission meeting where the County identified a low barrier shelter as one of five top priorities in the Homeless Coordinator's Gaps Analysis.

Committee Member Roe asked if the City can tell the County what our priorities for homeless shelters are.

Mr. Hall reported \$400,000 has been set aside for People's House by the County, subject to the condition that the People's House work with the City and community to find an acceptable location. The proposed shelter will also need to go through the conditional use permit (CUP) process. He said it was appropriate to ask for examples of best management practices. He suggested working with the County Homeless Coordinator to coordinate this briefing.

Ms. Meg Martin noted the DESC in Seattle might also serve as a useful model.

Committee Member Roe said the City needs to be better informed about the proposed shelter before determining what can be supported. She noted the Council needs to be better educated about this subject.

Chair Langer addressed the issues of shelter design, function, rules and neighborhood feedback. He stated a viable model from another city would be useful in presenting a clear picture. He suggested the City not take any sites off the table at this point until all the options are understood. He suggested the safety issue needs to be examined from a wider perspective. Homeless people need a safe place to be. He asked whether the rest of the community is safer if the homeless are in the shelter versus unsheltered. He suggested asking the County Commissioners to keep \$400,000 in play for a low barrier shelter as the process of examining locations, shelter program design and related issues continues. He noted Interfaith Works has worked hard to develop their proposal and deserves the City's support. He stated a longer term solution is needed.

Chair Langer reminded the Committee 59 shelter beds will be lost this fall/winter. At this time there are no formal plans or funds in place for cold weather overflow shelter previously offered by Salvation Army or Interfaith Works, the two organizations that have historically provided these 59 cold weather shelter beds.

Ms. Martin explained there are not enough faith communities to support the shelters. Historically, the faith communities have hosted the location and provided the trained volunteer staff for the Interfaith Works rotating shelter program. She also said the shelter clientele has changed and their needs are higher. Ms. Martin stated Interfaith Works needs more time for the People's House to get open.

Committee Member Roe asked if the Council can establish City guidelines for these shelters. Mr. Hall responded that the Council could identify the type of low barrier shelter it could support. Examples of the potential types of low barrier shelter could be provided by the County or Interfaith Works.

Committee Member Roe said the dynamic of the community dialogue would change if the City defined or limited who the users would be.

Committee Member Hankins asked who these shelters are designed to serve. Once the homeless group(s) to be served are determined, criteria can be formed and a location discussed.

Ms. Martin responded that the proposed low barrier shelter concept is based on the needs of the community of homeless people themselves, and Interfaith Works has information clarifying those needs from a survey of homeless people.

Committee Member Roe said she was not sure this should be a broader community discussion. She suggested looking to the experts and to those most directly impacted. Who are the homeless and what are their greatest needs? The Council needs a more focused discussion with the County, City staff and Interfaith Works.

Committee Member Hankins encouraged the LUEC not to cut the public out of the process of evaluating potential locations for the proposed shelter. She commented that the public is expressing concerns about both the shelter and the process.

Ms. Martin responded that the next People's House public forum on September 16, 2013 will be more focused on education.

Committee Member Roe suggested the need for a way to develop appropriate parameters for a low barrier shelter.

Mr. Hall said the People's House needs to find an appropriate site that the City Council can support. He stated the program first needs to be clarified and then they should work to identify an appropriate site.

Chair Langer thanked those in attendance for coming. He noted the need to keep the County in the lead for responding to homelessness. He emphasized the County will provide \$400,000 to this shelter and the City is only providing \$35,000. He stated sex offenders are part of the community already and they need to be accounted for

and sheltered. A well-managed shelter will ensure they (sex offenders) are safer and so is the broader community.

Committee Member Roe stated she was not trying to demonize anyone, but said allowing level 3 sex offenders (into a shelter) is not right. She commented that as a parent, she couldn't support level 3 sex offenders near the St. Michael's day care and school.

Ms. Jessica Archer with the Concerned Eastside Neighborhood noted the People's House was a proposed low barrier shelter without constraint. She encouraged them to consider their impact on schools. She asked if her neighborhood would be safer if people who would go to a low barrier shelter were located close to schools.

Mr. Hall said staff would contact the County about best management practices, get a definition of low barrier shelters, and arrange for the County Homeless Coordinator to make a presentation on the subject to the LUEC. Mr. Hall summarized the issues for the next LUEC discussion on this topic as follows:

- 1) Receive information about low barrier shelters from the County Homeless Coordinator.
- 2) Receive a report from the People's House on their program model, operations plan and intended clientele.
- 3) Consider whether a) the Council should establish its own criteria for a low barrier shelter (i.e. program model; operating plan, location); or, b) wait to vote yes or no on the People's House proposal.

The discussion was completed.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.