

LIST B PROPOSALS

Topic: #B1, Urban Green Space

OPC Sponsor: Judy Bardin

COMPLETED 2/11

Topic: #B2, Cluster Subdivision

OPC Sponsor: Amy Tousley

COMPLETED 2/11

Topic: #B3, Sea Level Rise - Revision to Proposed PN6.5

OPC Sponsor: Judy Bardin

COMPLETED 2/11 – Other Natural Disaster topics tabled

Topic: #B4, Downtown Planning

OPC Sponsor: Rob Richards

COMPLETED 3/4

Topic: #B5, Protect and Preserve Olympia's Single-Family Neighborhoods

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4

Topic: #B6, Public Participation

OPC Sponsor: Roger Horn

COMPLETED 3/13

Non-Consent Item #4 – Public Participation - RECOMMENDATION COMPLETED 2/11

Topic: #B7, Port of Olympia

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kiswa

1. Scope of the topic.

I request adding a chapter on Port of Olympia into the Comprehensive Plan Update. The Port is located inside the city limits, and the relationship of the Port and City has to be described. Tax payers have to benefit from the Port's activity – as requested during public hearing.

Additionally, please clarify the following City statement: "Converting the Port Peninsula (partially into city park - A.K.) would be inconsistent with the established purpose of a legally established unit of government that is unlikely to be eliminated in the next 20

years.” Clarify the “established purpose of the Port”. I demand that its purpose is to serve population, for example by providing water taxi, airline connection etc., instead of conducting “the economic development” using tax money for profit.

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

Lack of clarification contradicts the statement on page 5 of the Comprehensive Plan: “Development (...) does not mean to protect economic development of few.” Currently, our tax dollars support harmful activities of the Port (export of raw material abroad, trucks polluting kindergarten backyard on Plum Street, damage to the roads). It is also alarming that, according to City Council Karen Rogers, the Port is going to take the City to court if Olympia does not cooperate with Port.

It is critical to describe the relationship between the Olympia City/Port in great details to legally protect the City and to be able to take care of this prime piece of real estate inside the city limits.

3. Is this topic addressed in the July Draft? It is not adequately addressed in the July draft.

It is not adequately addressed in the July draft.

4. Provide the specific goal /motion:

Provide a new chapter on the Port of Olympia in the Comprehensive Plan Update.

5. Where should this new or revised language be located in the Plan? CPU.

Topic: #B8, Affordable Housing

Services for the Public Chapter

OPC Sponsor: James Reddick

Adequate and affordable housing is critical to a healthy community. The Growth Management Act directs that planning for housing:

- Encourage affordable housing for all economic segments of the population
- Promote a variety of residential densities and housing types
- Encourage preservation of existing housing stock
- Identify sufficient land for housing, including government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities

The strategies of this chapter depend on well-formulated design standards to promote flexibility and stimulate innovation while preserving and enhancing the character of

neighborhoods. We seek to establish and encourage diversity in housing opportunity and link diverse neighborhoods. With a strong foundation in preserving our heritage, our community can incorporate new housing and other developments in a manner that continues our legacy of well-planned neighborhoods. The housing goals and policies below provide a framework for residential land uses in Olympia's area. The City's related programs for supporting affordable housing are found in the Public Services chapter. An apartment building being added to the City's housing stock.

Many factors contribute to the need for more housing of various types:

- Olympia's growing residential population
- Household incomes vary
- The capitol's legislative session creates a demand for short-term housing
- College students seek affordable housing near transportation corridors and services
- Household sizes are declining
- The proportion of senior citizens is increasing
- **The City should provide annually information to the citizens on affordable housing, family incomes, and market rate housing.**

Olympia is a part of a larger housing market extending throughout Thurston County and beyond. Thus planning for housing is done based on anticipated shares of this larger area. The 2010 Census indicated that Olympia and its urban growth area included almost 26,000 housing units. Of these, as estimated in the TRPC Profile, 57% were single-family homes, 39% were multi-family (shared wall) units, and 4% were manufactured housing. As amended in 2008, the Buildable Lands Report for Thurston County estimates that over 11,000 new housing units will be needed by 2030 to accommodate population growth in the Olympia urban growth area. Of these, about 60% are expected to be single-family homes.

Based on existing zoning and development patterns, that report indicates the area can accommodate almost 15,000 units. In addition to large areas zoned for single-family development, almost 400 acres of vacant multi-family and duplex zoned land is available, and an additional 500 acres of vacant, partially-used, and redevelopable commercial land is also available for new housing. Because Olympia generally allows small group homes and manufactured housing wherever single-family homes are permitted, allows larger group homes by special approval, and does not discriminate with regard to government-assisted housing, foster-care, or low-income housing, the area is expected to be adequate to accommodate all types of housing.

Similarly, the Thurston County Consolidate Plan of 2008 for affordable housing indicates that there is no shortage of land for affordable housing. However, there is a "mismatch" between the availability of affordable housing and the need for such housing, both at the lowest end of the income scale and the upper end of the moderate income bracket. That Plan and the Public Services Chapter describe efforts to close these gaps and make adequate provisions for all economic segments of the community.

To meet this need, the community will use compact growth to preserve space for future residents and reduce costs of providing public services. To ensure a variety of options, the community will need to allocate sufficient land for a variety of housing including detached homes, duplexes, group homes, small cottages, apartments, special needs housing, manufactured housing, and accessory dwellings. This approach can provide both variety and affordable options. For example, factory-built manufactured housing governed by federal standards and modular housing built to state standards are often less expensive than site-built housing. This Plan provides for these types of units and more luxurious and higher-priced shared-wall housing, including condominiums and townhouses. Housing types and sizes can be blended.

Housing costs in the Olympia area rose rapidly from 1990 until the economic recession of 2008. In general the cost of owner-occupied housing rose more rapidly than income, while rents roughly corresponded to income changes. Those changing costs and availability of land for development, combined with public preferences, resulted in gradual changes in the area's ownership. While county-wide owner-occupancy rose from 65% to 68% between 1990 and 2010, the City of Olympia trended in the opposite direction with owner-occupancy declining from 52% to 50% of all housing units. The type of housing structures being added to the housing stock has varied as a result of similar factors. As a result, multi-family housing county-wide increased gradually from about 16% in 1970 to about 22% by 2010. In the Olympia city limits multi-family structures provided 28% of the housing in 1970, and gradually increased to about 42% by 2010 as most new apartments were being built inside the urban areas.

The following is the proposal from the July Draft. Sponsor's proposes new policy PL13.4 in red.

GL13: The range of housing types and densities are consistent with the community's changing population needs and preferences.

PL13.1 Support increasing housing densities through well-designed, efficient and cost-effective use of buildable land, consistent with environmental constraints and affordability. Use both incentives and regulations such as minimum and maximum density limits to achieve such efficient use.

PL13.2 Adopt zoning that allows a wide variety of compatible housing types and densities.

PL13.3 Encourage 'clustering' of housing to preserve and protect environmentally sensitive areas.

PL13.4 Disperse low and moderate-income and special needs housing throughout the urban area.

PL13.5 Support affordable housing throughout the community by minimizing regulatory review risks, time and costs and removing unnecessary barriers to housing, by permitting small dwelling units accessory to single-family housing, and by allowing a mix of housing types.

PL13.6 Promote home ownership, including by allowing manufactured homes on individual lots, promoting preservation of manufactured home parks and allowing such parks in multi-family and commercial areas, all subject to design standards ensuring compatibility with surrounding housing and land uses.

PL13.7 Allow single-family housing on small lots, but prohibit reduced setbacks abutting conventional lots.

PL13.8 Encourage and provide incentives for residences above businesses.

PL13.9 In all residential areas, allow small cottages and townhouses, and one accessory housing unit per home—all subject to siting, design and parking requirements that ensure neighborhood character is maintained.

PL13.10 Require effective, but not unduly costly, building designs and landscaping to blend multi-family housing into neighborhoods.

PL13.11 Require that multi-family structures be located near a collector street with transit, or near an arterial street, or near a neighborhood center, and that they be designed for compatibility with adjacent lower density housing; and be ‘stepped’ to conform with topography.

PL13.12 Require a mix of single-family and multi-family structures in villages, mixed residential density districts, and apartment projects exceeding five acres; and utilize a variety of housing types and setbacks to transition to adjacent single-family areas.

PL13.13 Encourage adapting non-residential buildings for housing

PL13.14 Provide information about what is affordable housing regarding home owning and apartment renting yearly in the City of Olympia. This should include information regarding the a percentage of annual income limit for affordable housing, what the average family average family wages are yearly in the City of Olympia, and what is the annual market rate housing is yearly in the City of Olympia. The implementation (action) should report yearly on how the city is doing regarding there being affordable housing in Olympia.

Staff Note: *Additional goal and policies regarding affordable housing are in the Services for the Public Chapter. See GS3 and related policies (page 3 of the chapter.)*

☑Topic: #B9, Earthquake Preparedness & Liquefaction

OPC Sponsor: Roger Horn

COMPLETED 3/13/13

Topic: #B10, Index

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kiswa

1. Scope of the topic.

I request adding an index to the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Definition of index: *“in a nonfiction book, alphabetical listing of places, topics and names along with the numbers of the pages on which they are mentioned or discussed, included in or constituting the back matter.”*

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

Clarity of the document is critical. According to the lawyer conducting training for City Planning 2012, it is illegal for jurisdiction to produce documents that are unclear.

3. Is this topic addressed in the July Draft?

It is not addressed in the July draft.

4. Provide the specific goal /motion:

Provide Index and if subjects are scattered thru the whole document - reorganize the content of the main document.

5. Where should this new or revised language be located in the Plan?

At the end of the CPU.

Topic: #B11, How many and where will Olympia people live?

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4

Topic: #B12, Graphics, Visual Images

OPC Sponsor: Jerry Parker

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

☑Topic: #B13, Edits to Transportation Chapter

OPC Sponsors: Roger Horn/Larry Leveen

COMPLETED ON 2/25/13 – WITH SOME PROPOSALS TABLED FOR HDC DISCUSSION

Topic: #B14, Neighborhood Plans

OPC Sponsor: Amy Tousley

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Olympia Planning Commission
FROM: Amy L. Tousley, Planning Commission
SUBJECT: Olympia Comprehensive Plan – Neighborhood / Sub-Area Planning

It was my intent to set aside the topic of Neighborhood/Sub-Area Plans so that the Commission could have an opportunity to assess if the proposed Olympia Comprehensive Plan has established the initial structure for the future development, adoption and implementation of such ancillary documents. This would also incorporate the City's future Implementation Strategy/Action Plan.

First and foremost, the entire Comprehensive Plan provides a framework for Sub-Area Plans such as the goals and policies in the following chapters:

- Vision and Values
- Public Participation
- Natural Environment
- Land Use and Design
- Transportation
- Utilities
- Park, Arts and Recreation
- Economy
- Public Services
- Capital Facility Plan

Coalition of Neighborhood Associations

In July 2012, the Coalition of Neighborhood Associations (CNA) and the Olympia City Council entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establishing a city-neighborhood association partnership for conducting forums and other activities affecting neighborhoods. This includes the structure for sub-area planning.

The first steps in this forthcoming process will be presented to the Council's Land Use and Environment Committee on May 23rd. The presentation between the staff and members of the CNA will consist of considering the first steps in developing a process for sub-area plans. Status reports of this work will be presented to the Committee on

July 25th and September 26th. I presume the Committee will then provide a recommendation to the Council with formal action taking place afterwards.

Below is an excerpt from the CNA's 2013 Action Plan (see attached). The Action Plan was presented to Land Use and Environmental Committee on January 30th. The excerpt outlines the CNA's proposal for developing the Implementation Strategy and Sub-Area Plans.

B. Comprehensive Plan Implementation Strategy

The Comprehensive Plan's Vision Section provides that "Neighborhood groups [should] take an intimate role in the planning and decision-making affecting their neighborhoods. The vehicle for this will be an Action Plan or Implementation Strategy. When the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Strategy is prepared by the city, neighborhoods will focus on the following key areas:

- *Ensuring that development regulations are made consistent with the Comprehensive Plan*
- *Making city programs more neighborhood centric*
- *Incorporating neighborhoods in the land use decisions of government organizations*

C. Sub-Area Plans

1. A new Organizational Structure for Neighborhoods

CNA has been working to increase the number of areas in the city which are covered by a neighborhood association. In some areas of the city, consolidations of neighborhoods are already occurring. The City's proposed Comprehensive Plan includes neighborhood involvement in land use in the context of 10 sub-areas. CNA will propose a new framework for neighborhoods based on the City of Olympia's sub-area model so that all areas of the city have a neighborhood association point of contact.

2. Working Group for Sub-Area Planning

One sub-area of the city will be selected as a pilot for the sub-area planning process involving neighborhoods and the City Department of Community Planning and Development. CNA will provide assistance to that neighborhood as needed and support the allocation of neighborhood matching grant funds to assist the neighborhood in the planning process. Developing a final sub-area could take 1-2 years.

If deemed appropriate, the Planning Commission as well as other City Citizen Advisory Boards should provide feedback to the Council and CNA regarding the 2013 Action

Plan. To avoid any missteps, it is important that continuity and coordination with the City's master plans and subsequent development regulations and the efforts of the CNA occur.

I believe that there will be a great deal of work accomplished in the 2013 Action Plan and in subsequent years, including answers about how to address certain specifics in Sub-Area Plans, such as:

- Do the Sub-Area Plans contain any regulatory authority?
- What will be the public involvement process in developing Sub-Area Plans?
- How will the City's regulatory framework be integrated toward the implementation of Sub-Area Plans?
- How will it be determined if Sub-Area Plans are consistent with and further the overall Comprehensive Plan for the City?
- What is the overall timeframe for addressing the 12 Sub-Area Plans (A through K, and Downtown)? The CNA indicates that a template will be created for the first plan.
- What are the obligations for implementation of Sub-Area Plans by the City Council? What is the process for the development and adoption (1 to 2 years per plan)?
- In addition to the Neighborhood Match Grants, what other funds for Sub-Area Plans will be used?
- Will there be a Sub-Area Plans for the Urban Growth Area – Thurston County?

Olympia Sub-Area Map

Based on its deliberations, the Commission should consider forwarding a recommendation on whether to accept or amend the proposed Olympia Sub-Areas Map. It is my understanding that the CNA has developed its own map. Although this was not submitted to the Commission during the open record, it will most likely be presented to the Council during its Comprehensive Plan process. The Commission may opt to defer any recommendation on the proposed map due to the proposal by the CNA. However, absent any change, the July Draft proposal will then be forwarded to the Council.

Future Land Use Map

Based on its deliberations, the Commission should consider forwarding a recommendation on whether or not to accept or amend the proposed Olympia Future Land Use Map. This includes any indication on the designation of land use areas as well as neighborhood centers or nodes versus villages. It is important that Commission review the designations and defined terms for the following land use classifications since these classifications will then be used as a basis for the underlying zoning categories.

- Low-Density Housing
- Medium-Density Housing
- Mixed Residential
- Neighborhood Center
- Residential Mixed Use
- Planned Developments
- Professional Offices & Multi-family
- Urban Corridors
- Urban Waterfront
- Central Business District
- General commercial
- Auto Services
- Medical Services
- Industry

Continued on next page ...

As stated earlier, the entire Comprehensive Plan provides a framework, however the goals and policies listed below should be considered essential in ensuring consistency between Sub-Area Plans established in the City.

Neighborhoods, Villages and Planning Sub-Areas	
GL 17	“Development maintains and improves neighborhood character and livability.”
PL 17.1	“Require development in established neighborhoods to be of a type, scale, orientation, and design that maintains or improves the character, aesthetic quality, and livability of the neighborhood.”
PL 17.2	“Unless necessary for historic preservation, prohibit conversion of housing residential areas to commercial use; instead, support redevelopment and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods to bolster stability and allow home occupations (except convalescent care) that do not degrade neighborhood appearance or livability, create traffic, noise or pollution problems.”
PL 17.3	“Allow elder care homes and senior-only housing and encourage child care services everywhere except industrial areas; but limit hospice care to multi-family and commercial districts.”
PL 17.4	“Support local food production including urban agriculture, and provide for a food store with a transit stop within one-half mile of all residents.”
PL 17.5 “new”	“Encourage development and public improvements consistent with healthy and active lifestyles.”
PL 17.6 “new”	“Discourage ‘fortress-style’ and unnecessarily secure designs that isolate developments and separate neighborhoods.”
GL 18	“Neighborhood centers are the focal point of neighborhoods and villages.”
PL 18.1	“Establish a neighborhood center at each village site, encourage development of designated neighborhood centers as shown on Future Land Use Map and allow designation of additional centers where compatible with existing land uses and where they are more than one-half mile from other commercial areas.”
PL 18.2	“Locate neighborhood centers along collector arterial streets and within

	about 600 feet of a transit stop.”
PL 18.3	“Include housing, a food store, and a neighborhood park or civic green at all neighborhood centers. Allow churches, schools, and convenience businesses and services that cater primarily to neighborhood residents. Prohibit auto-oriented uses. Vary the specific size and composition of such centers for balance with surrounding uses; focus commercial uses on the civic green or park, and limit the size of commercial uses. (Note: a larger urban center is permitted in the Briggs Urban Village.)”
PL 18.4	“Allow neighborhood center designs that are innovative and provide variety, but that ensure compatibility with adjoining uses. Consider appropriate phasing, scale, design and exterior materials, as well as glare, noise and traffic impacts when evaluating compatibility. Require buildings with primary access directly from street sidewalks, orientation to any adjacent park or green and to any adjacent housing, and signage consistent with neighborhood character.”
PL 18.5	“Locate streets and trails for non-arterial access to the neighborhood center.”
GL 19	“Trees help maintain strong and healthy neighborhoods.”
PL 19.1	“Use trees to foster a sense of neighborhood identity.”
PL 19.2	“Identify, protect and maintain trees with historic significance or other value to the community or specific neighborhoods.”
Sub-Area Planning	
GL 20 “new”	“Each of the community’s major neighborhoods has its own priorities.”
PL 20.1 “new”	“In cooperation with residents, landowners, businesses, and other interested parties, establish priorities for the sub-area shown on the Planning Areas Map. The specific area, content and process for each sub-area is to be adapted to the needs and interests of each area. (See public involvement regarding public involvement goals.)
PL 20.2 “new”	“Create sub-area strategies that address provisions and priorities for community health, neighborhood centers and places assembly, streets and paths, cultural resources, forestry, utilities and open space and parks.”

PL 20.3	“Develop neighborhood and business community approaches to beautification that include activities in residential and commercial areas.”
‘Villages’ and other Planning Developments	
GL 21	“Mixed use developments, also known as “villages,” are a planned with a pedestrian orientation and a coordinated and balanced mix of land uses.”
PL 21.1	“Require planned development sites shown on the Future Land Use Map to develop as coordinated, mixed-use projects.”
PL 21.2	“Provide for any redevelopment or redesign of planned developments including the Evergreen Park Planned Unit Development to be consistent with the ‘village vision’ of this Plan.”
PL 21.3	“Require ‘master plans’ for villages that encompass the entire site and specific the project phasing, street layout and design, lot arrangement, land uses, parks and open space, building orientation, environmental protection and neighborhood compatibility measures.”
PL 21.4	“Proved for a compatible mix of housing in each village with pleasant living, shopping and working environment, pedestrian-oriented character, well-located and sized open spaces, attractive well-connected streets and a balance of retail stores, offices, housing, and public uses.”
PL 21.5	“Require a neighborhood center, a variety of housing, connected trails, prominent open spaces, wildlife habitat, and recreation areas in each village.”
PL 21.6	“Require that villages retain the natural topography and major environmental features of the site and incorporate water bodies and stormwater ponds into the design to minimize environmental degradation.”
PL 21.7	“Locate parking lots at the rear or side of building, to avoid pedestrian interference and to minimize street frontage. Landscape any parking adjacent to streets and minimize parking within villages by reducing requirements and providing incentives for shared parking.”
PL 21.8	“Require village integrity but provide flexibility for developers to respond to market conditions.”

PL 21.9	“Limit each village to about 40 to 200 acres; require that at least 60% but allow no more than 75% of housing to be single-family units; and require at least 5% of the site be open space with at least one large usable open space for the public at the neighborhood center.”
PL 21.10	“Require that 90% of village housing be within a quarter mile of the neighborhood center and a transit stop.”
PL 21.11	“Provide for a single ‘urban village’ at the intersection of Henderson Boulevard and Yelm Highway; allowing up to 175,000 square feet of commercial floor area plus an additional 50,000 square feet if a larger grocery is included; and requiring that on 505 of the housing be single-family.”
Public Participation and Partners	
GP 4	“Sub-area planning conducted through a collaborative effort by community members and the City and is used to shape how neighborhoods grow and develop.”
PP 4.1	“Work with neighborhoods to identify the priorities, assets and changes of the designated sub-area(s), as well as provide information to increase understanding of land-use decision-making processes and the existing plans and regulations affecting sub-areas.”
PP 4.2	“Encourage wide participation in the development and implementation of sub-area plans.”
PP 4.3	“Define the role that sub-area plans play in City decision-making and resource allocation.”
PP 4.4	“Allow initiation of sub-area planning by either neighborhoods or the City.”
PP 4.5	“Encourage collaboration between neighborhoods and City representatives.”

Topic: #B15, Shoreline Master Program, Restoration Plan

OPC Sponsor: James Reddick

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B16, Environmental Protection – Restoration, Daylighting Creeks, Corridors

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kiswa

1. Scope of the topic.

Day-light creeks in Olympia - as an environmental demonstration project. Restoration of creek in Elma, Washington, is a good example to follow. This project would:

- Bring attention to salmon protection (food protection) and environment in general;
- Generate landmarks in Olympia; and
- Generate public works.

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

Recent events related to the climate change force us to reconsider our impact on environment. Forcing fish to swim inside the dark pipes is an example of negative impact that we have on environment and is has to be reversed.

Is this topic addressed in the July Draft?

It is not addressed in the July draft.

Provide the specific goal /motion:

Start with reopening of the Creek along Cherry Street, creating a bike route along the creek/along the City Hall and connecting it with the Port area.

Where should this be located in the Plan?

Two chapters: Environmental and Park/Recreation.

Topic: #B17, Capital Facilities Element

OPC Sponsor: Amy Tousley

Continued on next page ...

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Olympia Planning Commission
FROM: Amy L. Tousley, Planning Commissioner
SUBJECT: Olympia Comprehensive Plan – Capital Facilities Plan

My intent for setting aside the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) was for the Commission to have an opportunity to discuss the City's current strategy for ensuring compliance with the Growth Management Act.

Below is the current proposal outlined in the July Draft. This should also be considered as the documentation for evaluating impacts within the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). There are other policies in the proposed plan which affect the implementation of the City's CFP in addition those below cited in the EIS.

Review of the CFP element of the Comprehensive Plan will not be part of the Planning Commission's public process and review in 2012.

The CFP goals and policies will be reviewed by the Planning Commission in 2013. The Commission will review these goals and policies in conjunction with their review of the 2014-2019 CFP (6-year planning document). Their review will include a public hearing, followed by a recommendation to the City Council.

Beginning in 2014, the entire CFP element - background, goals, policies, and 6-year financing plan - will be located in one PDF document. This webpage will link to that PDF.

Final Environmental Impact Statement

- Section 3: Policy Regarding Maintenance and Operations
Policy PN 2.7 Practice maintenance and operations that reduce the City's environmental impact.
- Section 4: Policies Regarding Public Infrastructure Investments
Goal E4 The City achieves maximum economic, environmental and social benefit from public infrastructure.
- Policy PE 4.1 Design infrastructure investments to balance economic, environmental social needs, support a variety of potential economic sectors, and shape the development of the community in sustainable patterns.

Policy PE 4.3 Base public infrastructure investments on analysis determining the lowest life-cycle cost and benefits to environmental, economic and social systems.

Growth Management Act

RCW 36.70A.070 - Mandatory Elements.

(3) A capital facilities plan element consisting of: (a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities; (b) a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities; (c) the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities; (d) at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and (e) a requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent. Park and recreation facilities shall be included in the capital facilities plan element.

RCW 36.70A.120 – Planning activities and capital budget decisions – Implementation in conformity with comprehensive plan.

Each county and city that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall perform its activities and make capital budget decisions in conformity with its comprehensive plan.

Recommendation:

For me, I strongly believe that there is a requirement for ensuring compliance with the sections cited above. The key to ensuring compliance will be the timing of the Commission's review of the 2013 amendments of the goals and policies as well as the 2014-2019 CFP.

The Council should not take formal final action on adopting the updated Comprehensive Plan without the integration of the 2013 amendments. These actions could take place concurrently.

It is my recommendation that the March transmittal to the Council refer to the existing Volume Three: Capital Facilities Plan along with the current 2013 to 2018 Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan since these are documents currently adopted. As indicated in the July Draft, the Commission will forward a recommendation on any proposed amendments to the Council in 2013. I realize that this has already been discussed, however I believe it is important to refer to these documents to ensure that they are part of the Commission's 2013 Work Program especially in the early part of the schedule.

There is a lot of work ahead for the Commission and it is essential that this component be given a high priority. It is hoped that the scope of work will recognize the continued efforts by the Commission to develop a Long-term Capital Facilities Planning, Strategies and Priorities document which will hopefully be part of the final adopted Comprehensive Plan.

<http://olympiawa.gov/documents/OlympiaPlanningCommission/2011/Comp%20Plan%20CFP%20Update%2001052011/UpdatedCPVol3CFP.pdf>

<http://olympiawa.gov/city-government/~media/Files/AdminServices/CapitalFacilitiesPlan/2013-2018%20CFP/2013%20Final%20CFP-rs.pdf>

Listed below are the adopted goals and policies in the Olympia Comprehensive Plan:

GOALS AND POLICIES	
<p>The goals and policies set out in this section implement the State Growth Management Act requirements and Thurston County County-Wide Planning Policies. Unless otherwise noted, the City of Olympia--or Thurston County where indicated take responsibility for implementing the following goals and policies:</p>	
GOAL CFPI*	To annually develop a six-year Capital Facilities Plan to implement the Comprehensive Plan by coordinating urban services, land use decisions, level of service standards, and financial resources with a fully funded schedule of capital improvements.
<p>The Capital Facilities Plan is the mechanism by which the City and County schedule the timing, location, projected cost, and revenue sources for the capital improvements identified for implementation in other Comprehensive Plan elements. These capital facilities will be integrated into the Urban Growth Management Areas as urbanization occurs.</p>	
POLICIES:	
CFP 1.1*	<p>Provide needed public facilities and services to implement the Comprehensive Plan, protect investments in existing facilities, maximize the use of existing facilities, and promote orderly compact urban growth. This Capital Facilities Plan:</p> <p>a. Is subject to annual review and adoption respectively by the planning commissions and City Council or Board of County Commissioners, as appropriate;</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; c. Defines the scope and location of capital projects or equipment; d. Defines the project's need and its links to established levels of service, Comprehensive Plan goals and policies, facility plans, and other capital facilities projects; e. Includes the construction costs, timing, funding sources, and projected operations and maintenance impacts; f. Establishes priorities for capital project development; g. Includes a twenty-year forecast of future capital facilities needs, and an inventory of existing capital facilities; h. Monitors whether, or to what degree, land use and capital facilities goals are being achieved; and i. Is coordinated with Thurston County, school districts, telecommunications carriers, and private utility providers.
CFP 1.2	Encourage active citizen participation throughout the process of developing and adopting the Capital Facilities Plan.
CFP 1.3*	Support and encourage joint development and use of cultural and community facilities with other governmental or community organizations in areas of mutual concern and benefit.
CFP 1.4	Emphasize capital improvement projects which promote conservation, preservation, or revitalization of commercial, industrial, and residential areas in Olympia and its Growth Area.
CFP 1.5	<p>Evaluate and prioritize proposed capital improvement projects using all the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is needed to correct existing deficiencies, replace needed facilities, or provide facilities needed for future growth; b) Eliminates public hazards; c) Eliminates capacity deficits; d) Is financially feasible; e) Phasing and priorities are established in the Comprehensive Plan;

	<p>f) Site needs are based on projected growth patterns; g) Serves new development and redevelopment; h) Is compatible with plans of state agencies; and i) Local operating budget impact is acceptable.</p>
CFP 1.6*	Adopt by reference, in the appropriate chapters of the Comprehensive Plan, all facilities plans, their level of service standards, and future amendments. These plans must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
CFP 1.7	Adopt by reference the annual update of the Capital Facilities Plan as part of this Capital Facilities element.
CFP 1.8	Adopt by reference the annual update of the Olympia School District Capital Facilities Plan as part of this Capital Facilities element.
GOAL CFP2*	To meet current needs for capital facilities in Olympia and its Growth Area, correct deficiencies in existing systems, and replace obsolete facilities.
<p>It is a major challenge to balance existing capital facilities needs with the need to provide additional facilities to serve growth. It is important to maintain our prior investments as well as serve new growth. Clear, hard priority decisions are facing City and County policy makers.</p>	
POLICIES:	
CFP 2.1*	Give priority consideration to projects mandated by law and those by State and Federal agencies.
CFP 2.2	Give priority consideration to projects already initiated and to be completed in subsequent phases.
CFP 2.3	Give priority consideration to projects already initiated and to be completed in subsequent phases. Give priority consideration to projects that renovate existing facilities, preserve the community's prior investment or reduce maintenance and operating costs.
CFP 2.4	Give priority consideration to projects that remove existing capital facilities deficiencies, encourage full use of existing facilities, or replace worn-out or obsolete facilities.

GOAL CFP3*	To provide capital facilities to serve and direct future growth within Olympia and its Urban Growth Area as these areas urbanize.
<p>It is crucial to identify, in advance of development, sites for schools, parks, fire and police stations, major stormwater facilities, greenbelts, open space, and road connections. Acquisition of sites for these facilities must occur in a timely manner and as early as possible in the overall development of the area. Otherwise, acquisition opportunities will be missed, with long-term functional or financial implications.</p>	
POLICIES:	
CFP 3.1*	Provide the capital facilities needed to adequately serve the future growth anticipated by the Comprehensive Plan, within projected funding capabilities.
CFP 3.2*	Give priority consideration to projects needed to meet concurrency requirements for growth management.
CFP 3.3*	<p>Plan and coordinate the location of public facilities and utilities in advance of need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Coordinate urban services, planning, and standards by identifying, in advance of development, sites for schools, parks, fire and police stations, major stormwater facilities, greenbelts, and open space. Acquire sites for these facilities in a timely manner and as early as possible in the overall development of the area. b. Provide capacity to accommodate planned growth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Assure adequate capacity in transportation, public and private utilities, storm drainage systems, municipal services, parks, and schools; 2) Protect groundwater supplies from contamination and maintain groundwater in adequate supply by identifying and reserving future supplies well in advance of need.
CFP 3.4*	Design and establish a Concurrency Management System to determine whether or not adequate capacity of concurrency-required public facilities is available to maintain the level of service standards for each proposed new development. The system may reserve the capacity that is needed for approved development commitments and permits until such time as the capacity is needed and used.
CFP 3.5*	Use the type, location, and phasing of public facilities and utilities to direct urban expansion where it is wanted and needed. Consider the

	level of key facilities that can be provided when planning for various densities and types of urban land use.
CFP 3.6*	Provide adequate levels of public facilities and services, in cooperation with Thurston County, prior to or concurrent with land development within the Olympia Urban Growth Area.
CFP 3.7	Encourage land banking as a reasonable approach to meeting the needs of future populations.
CFP 3.8	Coordinate future economic activity with planning for public facilities and services.
GOAL CFP4*	To provide adequate funding for capital facilities in Olympia and its Growth Area to ensure the Comprehensive Plan vision and goals are implemented.
<p>The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that the Land Use element be reassessed if funding for capital facilities falls short of needs. The intent is to ensure that growth does not occur if the capital facilities needed to serve that growth are not provided. Capital Facilities Plans developed after the advent of the GMA will always balance costs and revenues. Many options are available that fall into five general categories: increase revenues, decrease level of service standards, decrease the cost of the facility, decrease the demand for the public service or facility, and others.</p>	
POLICIES	
CFP 4.1	Manage the City of Olympia's fiscal resources to support providing needed capital improvements. Ensure a balanced approach to allocating financial resources between: (1) major maintenance of existing facilities, (2) eliminating existing capital facility deficiencies, (3) providing new or expanding facilities to serve growth.
CFP 4.2	Use the Capital Facilities Plan to integrate all of the community's capital project resources (grants, bonds, city funds, donations, impact fees, and any other available funding).
CFP 4.3	Ensure consistency of current and future fiscal and funding policies for capital improvements with other Comprehensive Plan elements.
CFP 4.35	To the extent possible growth should pay for growth. Developers who install infrastructure with excess capacity should be allowed latecomers agreements wherever practical.

CFP 4.4	<p>Pursue funding strategies that derive revenues from growth that can be used to provide capital facilities to serve that growth in order to achieve and maintain adopted level of service standards. These strategies include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Collect Impact Fees: Transportation, Parks and Open Space, Fire Protection and Suppression, Schools. b. Allocate sewer and water connection fees primarily to capital improvements related to urban expansion. c. Develop and implement other appropriate funding mechanisms to ensure new development's fair share contribution to other public facilities such as recreation, drainage, solid waste, and congestion management services and facilities (car/van pool matching, transit shelters, bike racks, street trees, and sidewalks).
CFP 4.5*	<p>Assess the additional operations and maintenance costs associated with acquisition or development of new capital facilities. If accommodating these costs places an unacceptable burden on the operating budget, capital plans may need to be adjusted.</p>
CFP 4.6*	<p>Promote efficient and joint use of facilities through such measures as interlocal agreements and negotiated use of privately- and publicly-owned land for open space opportunities.</p>
CFP 4.7*	<p>Explore regional funding strategies for capital facilities to support comprehensive plans developed under the Growth Management Act.</p>
CFP 4.8*	<p>Investigate potential new revenue sources for funding capital facilities such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Growth-induced tax revenues b. Additional voter-approved financing c. Regional tax base sharing d. Regional cost sharing for urban infrastructure e. Voter-approved real estate excise transfer tax f. Street utility g. County-wide bond issues
CFP 4.9	<p>Use the following available contingency strategies should the City be faced with capital facility funding shortfalls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Increase Revenues Bonds</u>

	<p>General Revenues Rates User Fees Change Funding Source(s) Establish a Street Utility</p> <p>b. <u>Decrease Level of Service Standards</u> Change Comprehensive Plan Change Level of Service Standards Reprioritize Projects to Focus on Those Related to Concurrency</p> <p>c. <u>Decrease the Cost of the Facility</u> Change Project Scope</p> <p>d. <u>Decrease the Demand for the Public Service or Facility</u> Moratorium on Development Develop Only in Served Areas Until Funding is Available Change Project Timing and/or Phasing</p> <p>e. <u>Other Considerations</u> Developer Voluntarily Funds Needed Capital Project Develop Partnerships with Lacey, Tumwater, and Thurston County (The metropolitan service area approach to services, facilities, or funding) Regional Funding Strategies Privatize the Service Mitigate under SEPA</p>
CFP 4.10	Secure grants or private funds, when available, to finance capital facility projects.
CFP 4.11	Maintain the City of Olympia's A+ bond rating by limiting bond sales.
GOAL CFP5*	To ensure the Capital Facilities Plan is current and responsive to the community vision and goals.
<p>The role of monitoring and evaluation is vital to the effectiveness of any planning program, particularly for the Capital Facilities element. Revenues and expenditures are subject to economic fluctuations and are used to predict fiscal trends in order to maintain adopted level of service standards for public facilities. This Capital Facilities Plan will be annually reviewed and amended to verify that fiscal resources are available to provide public facilities needed to support adopted LOS standards.</p>	
POLICIES:	
CFP 5.1*	Monitor the progress of the Capital Facilities Plan on an ongoing basis,

	including completion of major maintenance projects, expansion of existing facilities, and addition of new facilities. Evaluate this progress with respect to trends in the rate and distribution of growth, impacts upon service quality, and Comprehensive Plan directives.
CFP 5.2*	Review, update, and amend the Capital Facilities Plan annually. Reflect in the amendments the rates of growth, development trends, changing priorities, and budget and financial considerations. Make provisions to reassess the Comprehensive Plan periodically in light of the evolving Capital Facilities Plan. Take appropriate action to ensure internal consistency of the elements of the plan.
CFP 5.3*	Coordinate with other capital facilities service providers to keep each other current, maximize cost savings, and schedule and upgrade facilities efficiently.
CFP 5.4*	The year in which a project is carried out, or the exact amounts of expenditures by year for individual facilities may vary from that stated in the Comprehensive Plan due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Unanticipated revenues or revenues that become available to the city with conditions about when they may be used, or b. Change in the timing of a facility to serve new development that occurs in an earlier or later year than had been anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) denotes text material adopted by Thurston County as the joint plan with Olympia for the unincorporated part of the Olympia Growth Area.

Topic: #B18, Action Plan

OPC Sponsor: James Reddick

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B19, Gateways to the City, Civic Boulevards

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4

Topic: #B20, Historic Preservation

OPC Sponsor: Judy Bardin

COMPLETED 3/13/13

Topic: #B21, Revisions to the Economy Chapter

OPC Sponsor: Jerry Parker

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B22, Artist Live/Work Space

OPC Sponsor: Roger Horn

July Draft Goal and Policies:

The Parks, Arts and Recreation Chapter of the July Draft includes the following goal and policies. It is one of two goal sections on Arts. The other goal in the section (GR7) pertains to placement of public art.

GR8: Arts in Olympia is supported.

PR8.1: Pursue a regional community arts center.

PR8.2: Pursue affordable housing and studio space/rehearsal space for artists

PR8.3: Encourage broad arts participation in the community.

PR8.4: Provide opportunities for the public to learn about and engage in the art-making process.

PR8.5: Provide opportunities that highlight the talent of visual, literary, and performing artists.

PR8.6: Provide technical support to arts organizations.

PR8.7: Formalize a theater and entertainment district.

PR8.8: Create a range of opportunities for the public to interact with art; from small workshops to large community events.

PR8.9: Encourage early arts education opportunities.

Sponsor Proposals:

PRs 8.1, 8.2, 8.7, and 8.9 are new policies. I propose changes to PR8.2 and PR8.7, as follows:

PR8.2: Pursue affordable housing and studio space/rehearsal space for artists, including support for, or participation in, establishing buildings or sections of buildings that provide living and work space exclusively for artists.

Rationale: Buildings with artist live and work space have been established in many cities. These buildings provide affordable housing for artists, but also have had a positive effect on the communities in which they are located. They attract young, vibrant residents; host numerous arts events; revitalize old, underused buildings; can maintain the affordability of housing spaces; enhance the community's awareness and enjoyment of the arts; bring activity and liveliness to the surrounding area. A non-profit organization called the Olympia Artspace Alliance is working on establishing this type of facility in the City.

PR8: Establish a theater and entertainment district in Downtown Olympia.

Rationale: "Establish" is a stronger term that may create more momentum toward creating a theater and entertainment district in the city. Downtown has many art galleries, theaters, and music venues; linking these establishments as a theater and entertainment district, if only to create a stronger identity and market their offerings, would provide a boost to downtown. Downtown is the logical location for such a district; the policy should explicitly say so.

Topic: #B23, Measurable Goals

Entire Plan

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kizza

1. Scope of the topic.

I am asking to introduce the set of Measurable Goals to the Comprehensive Plan Update.

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

To be useful, a goal has to be specific and measurable. For example, new development along busy streets has to meet requirements of green buffer. Large development has to have access to the parkland area - goal: 3 acres per 1000 people, maximum distance – half mile.

3. Is this topic addressed in the July Draft?

It is not adequately addressed in the July draft.

4. Provide the specific goal /motion:

When possible, provide measurable goals.

OPC Final Deliberations
Comprehensive Plan Update
Date: March 11, 2013

5. Where should this new or revised language be located in the Plan?

Next to goals.

Topic: #B24, Reduction of Cars and Trucks Downtown

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4