



## Olympia Planning Commission (OPC) Final Deliberation Schedule

For 'Imagine Olympia' - Comprehensive Plan Update

January – March 2013



### Explanation of Schedule:

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

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

Staff is available to help sponsors prepare for topics.

### Staff Contact Info:

Amy Buckler, 570-5847, [abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us](mailto:abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us)

Stacey Ray, 753-8046, [sray@ci.olympia.wa.us](mailto:sray@ci.olympia.wa.us)

Jennifer Kenny, 753-8031, [jkenny@ci.olympia.wa.us](mailto:jkenny@ci.olympia.wa.us)

Todd Stamm, 753-8597, [tstamm@ci.olympia.wa.us](mailto:tstamm@ci.olympia.wa.us)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**List A****January 28, 2013:**

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

**OUTCOME OF CONNECTIVITY TOPIC 1/28/13:**

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

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

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

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

**Continued ...**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## February 11, 2013:

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

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

	<b>Followed by 'List B' Items (See Pg. 12)</b>
--	--

**February 25, 2013:**

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

**March 4, 2013:**

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

A5	<b>Judy Bardin</b> Paul Roger	<b>Views, Heights</b>  Proposal(s) regarding the topic, including  (a) <b>Non-Consent Item #15</b> - Land Use & Urban Design Chapter: <b>(Revised Policy) PL6.10:</b> Identify and designate significant public- viewpoints and – with consideration of trees and other enhancing landscaping—protect, preserve and enhance particular views of the Capitol Campus, Budd Inlet, Downtown Skyline, Mt. Rainier, the Black Hills, Capitol Lake and surrounding treed slopes, and the Olympic Mts., such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capitol Group views of the Olympic Mountains</li> <li>• West Bay Park views of Capitol Group</li> <li>• Existing West Bay Park views of Olympic Mountains</li> <li>• Olympic Way sidewalk and Fourth Avenue bridge viewpoint views of the Capitol Group</li> <li>• Existing Fourth Avenue bridge views of the Olympic Mountains</li> <li>• Upper Sunrise Park views of Mount Rainier</li> <li>• Pacific Avenue sidewalk views of Mount Rainier from Boulevard Road to Steele Street</li> <li>• Priest Point Park views of Capitol Group and Olympic Mountains</li> <li>• East Bay Waterfront Park views of Olympic Mountains</li> <li>• Existing Brawne and Foote intersection view of Budd Inlet</li> <li>• Upper Madison Scenic Park views of Capitol Campus and downtown</li> <li>• Capitol Boulevard west sidewalk views of Capitol Lake</li> <li>• Percival Landing views of Capitol Group and Olympic Mountains</li> </ul> (b) <b>Non-Consent Item #16</b> – Land Use & Urban Design Chapter: <b>(Revised Policy) PL6.9:</b> Preserve and enhance water vistas by retaining public rights-of-way that abut or are within one block of water bodies and by not siting public buildings within associated view corridors.	Olympia’s views make it unique both nationally and within Washington. Views should be preserved for the people of Olympia and Washington and for Olympia’s visitors. Using specified viewpoints may have untoward consequences of eliminating views. Use of visualization software will enhance accuracy in planning building heights so that they do not obstruct views.	T&H, R3, #1  Comb. w/  Non-C, #15, #16	Todd Stamm	(A) FSEIS, p. 96  (B) FSEIS, p. 96  Memo in 10/8/12 OPC Packet  Info Request  Doc. in 11/19/12 OPC Packet
----	-------------------------------------	---	---	--	---------------	--

A2	<b>Sub-Committee</b>  Jerry Roger Paul	<b>Vision &amp; Values Statements</b>  Proposal(s) on the Topic, including:  <b>Non-Consent Item #1 - Olympia's Vision Chapter (Revised Goal) GO1:</b> Olympia is recognized as a model sustainable city through the leadership of the City and other partners."  <b>Non-Consent Item #2 - Olympia's Vision Chapter: (New Policy) PO1.1:</b> Evaluate environmental, economic and social factors, and compare and prioritize relative costs and benefits when making major policy decisions and capital investments.	The Subcommittee was charged with drafting new Vision & Values statements for the Plan. They shared draft language with the Commission on December 17; it was decided the Subcommittee needed to meet again to finalize a proposal.	Non-C #1, #2	Amy Buckler	FSEIS p. 39
<b>Followed by 'List B' Items (See Pg. 12)</b>						

### March 18, 2013:

	<b>'Quick' vote on concepts (see descriptions under List B):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B10: Index</li> <li>• B12: Graphics/Images</li> <li>• B23: Measurable Goals</li> <li>• Language/Voice</li> </ul>
	<b>Final Vote</b>
	<b>Discussion about Transmittal (Recommendation) Letter to City Council</b>  <i>To clarify the elements of the transmittal, and the timeline and procedure for developing the transmittal letter and any individual letters. While the voting needs to be complete by end of March, Commissioners will have time in April to prepare such letters(s.)</i>

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

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

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

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

		<p><b>Motion passed that GU11 and related policies be revised to:</b></p> <p><b>GU 11:</b> The City has used best available information to devise and implement a sea level rise strategy.</p> <p><b>PU 11.2:</b> Coordinate with other key stakeholders, such as downtown businesses, LOTT Clean Water Alliance and the Port of Olympia, environmental and other public interest groups, and downtown residents.</p> <p><b>PU 11.3:</b> Incorporate flexibility and resiliency into public and private infrastructure in areas predicted to be affected.</p> <p><b>PU 11.4:</b> Maintain public control of downtown shorelines that may be needed to serve flood management functions.</p> <p><b>PU 11.5:</b> Engage the community in a discussion of the different mitigation scenarios and adaptation strategies together with the cost”</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

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

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

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

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
B9	Roger Horn	Earthquake Preparedness & Liquefaction	Address public comments regarding the need for more robust policies.	T&H, R1, #7	Stacey Ray	Info Request Doc. in 10/29/12 OPC Packet
B10	Agnieszka Kizza	Index	The Comprehensive Plan Update needs an index.	T&H, R1, #8	Amy Buckler	
B11	Paul Ingman	<del>How many and where will Olympia people live?</del> <b>PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN: INCORPORATE INTO HIGH DENSITY CORRIDOR DISCUSSION – NOT A SEPARATE DISCUSSION</b>	The Plan should include more information about the target number of people who are expected to live in certain areas of the City (i.e., each sub-area, downtown, along urban corridors.)	T&H, R1, #9	Todd Stamm, Amy Buckler	Info. Request Docs. in 10/29/12 and 11/19/12 OPC Packet  More info to come wk of 1/14
B12	Jerry Parker	Graphics, Visual Images	The illustrations in the July Draft are not adequate.	T&H, R2, #2	Stacey Ray	

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
B13 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Larry Leveen & Roger Horn	Edits to Transportation Chapter	Since there is not time to provide stronger language for the whole plan at this time, consider including the idea in the transmittal letter and use Transportation Chapter as an example.  <b>OUTCOME: See document attached to end of schedule.</b>	T&H, R2, #4; T&H, R2, #7	Sophie Stimson, Amy Buckler	
B14	Amy Tousley	Neighborhood Plans - Framework	Do we have the right policy framework in place for this topic?	T&H, R2, #5	Jennifer Kenny	FSEIS, p. 49  Memo in 10/1/12 OPC Packet
B15	James Reddick	Shoreline Master Program, Restoration Plan		T&H, R2, #6	Todd Stamm	
B16	Agnieszka Kiswa	Environmental Protection – Restoration, Day-lighting creeks, Corridors		T&H, R2, #8	Stacey Ray	Memo in 9/24/12 OPC Packet
B17	Amy Tousley	Capital Facilities Element, 20-year Accommodation of Growth	This element needs to be updated as part of the periodic update.	T&H, R3, #3	Amy Buckler	
B18	James Reddick	Action Plan (Implementation Strategy):		T&H, R3, #4	Amy Buckler	FSEIS, p. 46

#	OPC Sponsor	Chapter/ Topic	Scope of Discussion - See OPC packet for specific proposals.	List(s)	Staff Contact	Rel. Docs
B19	Paul Ingman	<del>Gateways to the City, Civic Boulevards</del> <b>PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN: INCORPORATE INTO HIGH DENSITY CORRIDOR DISCUSSION – NOT A SEPARATE DISCUSSION</b>	Do we have the right policies in place for this topic?	T&H, R3, #7	Todd Stamm	
B20	Judy Bardin	Historic Preservation	Do we have the right policies in place for this topic?	T&H, R4, #1	Jennifer Kenny	
B21	Jerry Parker	Revisions to the Economy Chapter	Address public concerns about the value of this chapter and the City's role.	T&H, R4, #2	Amy Buckler (Stephanie Johnson)	
B22	Roger Horn	Artist Live/Work Space	Do we have the right policies in place to ensure public interest in this concept can be explored in the future?	T&H, R4, #3	Amy Buckler, (Stephanie Johnson)	
B23	Agnieszka Kiswa	Measurable Goals	The Plan needs performance measures.	T&H, R4, #4	Stacey Ray	Memo in 1/14/13 OPC Packet
B24	Paul Ingman	<del>Reduction of Cars &amp; Trucks in Downtown/Environmental Stressors/Health Impacts</del> <b>PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN: INCORPORATE INTO HIGH DENSITY CORRIDOR DISCUSSION – NOT A SEPARATE DISCUSSION</b>		T&H, R4, #5	Sophie Stimson, Stacey Ray	

## **Item A4, Urban Agriculture**

### **OUTCOME FROM 2/25/13: MOTION PASSED TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING:**

#### **Goal**

**1. Add the following policy to GN4 (Natural Environment Chapter):**

PN4.5: Restore and protect the health of Puget Sound as a local food source.

**2. Add the following policy to GN8 (Natural Environment Chapter):**

PN8.7: Reduce energy use and environmental impact of our food system by encouraging local food production.

**3. Alter PR9.1 to state (Parks Chapter):**

Provide opportunities that promote a mentally and physically active lifestyle and healthy food including participation in local food production.

**4. Add the following policy to GL19 (Land Use Chapter):**

PL19.3: Encourage use of appropriate food-producing trees to increase local food self-sufficiency.

**5. Add an entirely new set of goal and policies (Land Use Chapter):**

GL22 Local Thurston County food production is encouraged and supported to increase self-sufficiency, reduce environmental impact, promote health, and the human treatment of animals, and to support our local economy.

PL22.1 The City will actively partner with community organizations to provide education and information about the importance of local food systems.

PL22.2 The City will encourage home gardens as an alternative to maintaining grass/lawn and other landscaping that is either non-productive for local food systems or not supportive of native ecology.

PL22.3 The City will collaborate with community partners to ensure that everyone within Olympia is within biking/walking distance of a place to grow food.

PL22.4 The City will encourage for-profit gardening/farming in the community.

PL22.5 The City will support local food production with its own purchasing power.

PL22.6 The City will allow rooftop food production and consider incentives for providing food-producing greenhouses atop buildings.

PL22.7 The City recognizes the value of Open Space and other green spaces as areas of potential food production.

PL22.8 The City will partner with community organizations to measure and set goals for increasing local food production, and develop strategies to accomplish these goals.

PL22.9 The City will work with other local governments throughout the region to encourage the protection of existing agricultural lands, offer educational opportunities for promotion, and encourage the development of a vibrant local food economy. [Staff to change order of listed so encourage is not redundant.]

PL22.10: Partner with community organizations to provide education to citizens raising animals for food in the City to ensure protection from predators, and to provide sanitary conditions and humane treatment for these animals.

PL22.11: Educate and encourage citizens to purchase from local farms and small producers as an alternative to factory farms that engage in inhumane treatment of animals

**Topic: #B13, Edits to Transportation Chapter**

OPC Sponsors: Roger Horn/Larry Leveen

**OUTCOME FROM 2/25/13: MOTION PASSED TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING**

**- Exception: Highlighted items tabled for HDC discussion.**

**Complete Streets**

Complete streets are those built for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders, as well as cars, trucks and buses. Complete streets are needed to increase the number of people walking, biking and using transit, while meeting the safety needs of motor vehicles. Complete street policies complement other goals related to economic vitality, reducing congestion, increasing land-use density, minimizing environmental impacts, and providing people more opportunities to be physically active.

**Rationale:** Suggestion by Thera Black. Also consistent with BPAC comment about the need for Climate Change to be addressed in the Transportation Section of the Comprehensive Plan.

**Goals and Policies**

**GT1: All streets are safe and inviting for pedestrians and bicyclists. Streets are designed to be human scale, while accommodating motor vehicles, and to reinforce and encourage safe driver behavior.**

**Rationale:** Suggestion by Thera Black. Consistent with policies in this section addressing transportation safety.

**PT1.2: Build streets to be as narrow as possible in individual lane width and overall width, to discourage speeding, while facilitating the movement of larger vehicles, as needed to the level appropriate for the area uses.**

**Rationale:** Narrow lane widths “calm by design”. It is an important concept that we should embrace and state in the Comp Plan.

**PT1.3: Establish speed limits to create a safe environment for pedestrians and bicyclists, while maintaining motor vehicle traffic flow. Speed limits shall not exceed 35 miles per hour on arterial and major collector streets and 25 miles per hour on neighborhood collector and 20 miles per hour on local access streets, and in the City Center.**

**\*Put in letter that this might be able to be addressed through sub-area planning**

**Rationale:** Slower speed will protect children, bicyclists, pets, and people backing out of driveways. Many local access streets don't have sidewalks resulting in pedestrian use of streets.

**PT1.4: Mitigate the impacts of high traffic volumes by creating buffers between pedestrians and motor vehicles with on-street parking, street trees, and planter strips, building wide sidewalks, and creating interest along the street with amenities and building design. \* Put in letter that City might consider buffers for bicycle lanes**

**Rationale:** Street trees also serve as a buffer and physically protect pedestrians. Research has shown that street trees reduce accidents (Speck, Walkable City, p. 225).

**PT1.7: Use medians for access control and to keep the number of motor vehicle lanes to a minimum. ~~Use medians for pedestrian crossing islands, and to enhance the beauty of a street.~~**

**PT1.75: Use medians for pedestrian crossing islands, and to enhance the beauty of a street.**

**Rationale:** Arguably not terribly substantive. Consider splitting up those two sentences into two different policies to reflect their different foci.

**PT1.8: Build streets in a grid pattern of small blocks to allow streets to be narrow and low-volume, encourage walking, and to provide travelers with a choice of routes.**

**Rationale:** Provides a more complete list of reasons for this policy.

**PT1.95: Require consolidation of driveways and parking lot connectivity for adjacent commercial areas to facilitate access from one site to another without having to access the roadway.**

**Rationale:** New policy. Allows for movement from one store or development to another without having to enter and exit the roadway. Providing such access reduces congestion on roadways and encourages non-motorized mode use.

**~~PT1.11: Recognize the unique character of a street and the unique use of a street by pedestrians, bicyclists, or transit. Consider modified street design to enhance the function for all modes and to support the unique identity of a street.~~**

**Rationale:** Combining concepts for clarity — simply “recognizing” doesn't lead to a substantive result for the community.

**PT1.12: Provide adequate street and public pathway lighting for the safety of all modes in a manner that reduces light pollution.**

**Rationale:** Add public pathways so that they will be lighted for safety and invite use.

**GT2: As new streets are built or existing streets are reconstructed, multimodal features will be**

added. Features defined for different types of streets are specified in the [City of Olympia Engineering Design and Development Standards](#).

**Rationale:** Making the verb tense consistent with other goals. Note: the other underlined text isn't a change, but how the draft itself is formatted, because it is a hyperlink to the document in question.

**PT2.1: Build arterial streets to serve as primary routes connecting urban centers and the regional transportation network. These streets include bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips, and pedestrian crossing features and other amenities that support pedestrian comfort and safety, and in dense areas, a high-quality streetscape.**

**Rationale:** To clarify that all such streets should be complete streets, not just “dense areas” which is a somewhat vague term in this context (as is “high-quality streetscape”). [Staff consider changing “and” to “to”](#)

**PT2.2: Build major collector streets to connect arterials to residential and commercial areas. These streets include bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips, and pedestrian crossing features, and in dense areas, a high-quality streetscape.**

**Rationale:** Similar to the above change, it clarifies that all such streets should be complete streets, not just “dense areas” which is a somewhat vague term in this context (as is “high-quality streetscape”).

**PT2.3: Build neighborhood collectors to provide circulation within and between residential and commercial areas. These streets include sidewalks and planter strips. Selected neighborhood collectors include bike lanes, or signs and markings to designate a bike route (see Appendix D: Bike Network Map and List). These streets may also include pedestrian crossing features, and in dense areas, a high-quality streetscape.**

**Rationale:** Provides a link to help understand which neighborhood collector streets are slated for bike lanes, though the rationale for *when such streets are slated for lanes* is not apparent in the Olympia Bicycle Master Plan. Also makes a similar change to dense areas, as above.

**PT2.4: Build ~~small~~ local access streets to provide direct connections to properties within neighborhoods. All new local access streets include sidewalks and planter strips. Local access streets may include signs and markings to direct cyclists to the larger bicycle network.**

**Rationale:** Improving clarity of policy. [Idea for letter: Water infiltration systems as part of planter strips on all classes of streets](#)

**PT2.5: Provide transit stops and service accommodations, based on Intercity Transit's criteria.**

**Include sidewalk access to all designated stops and consider pedestrian crossing improvements to facilitate access, including mid-block crossing islands on high volume streets.**

**Rationale:** Ensuring safe movement to/from bus stops is essential for supporting transit use.

**PT2.6: Install or Allow-allow traffic-calming devices on local access, neighborhood collector, and some major collector streets, where speeds, volumes and other conditions indicate a need. Consider pedestrian, bicyclist and transit bus safety and access when installing traffic calming devices.**

**Rationale:** Allow implies the city just gives permission to neighborhoods or developers. The city also installs traffic calming.

**PT2.7: Add-Allow on-street parking ~~to on~~ local access and neighborhood collector streets, when absolutely needed ~~to serve as a pedestrian buffer and to~~ provide direct access to properties.**

**Rationale (Leveen):** Space for cars is a “societal bad”, just like stormwater and it should be dealt with “on-site” (i.e. on the property itself) to the greatest degree possible. On-street parking adds impervious surface, and when unused, makes roadways wider, encouraging speeding. To best calm streets and support pedestrians, install vegetation buffers which are continually present, and make a street nicer to be along, not by providing pavement for a car that might or might not be there.

**Rationale (Horn):** “Allow” rather than “add” eliminates the need “when absolutely needed.” Lots of people park on the street in established neighborhoods; the way it reads, it sounds like that permission will be taken away. I don’t think parking on local streets is necessarily a bad.

**PT2.8 Prioritize adding Build-bulb-outs at street corners for shorter pedestrian crossings and traffic calming on existing arterials and major collectors with on-street parking. Consider building bulb-outs on local access and neighborhood collector streets with on-street parking where overall narrowing of the street is not possible. ~~Build bulb-outs on local access and neighborhood collector streets with on-street parking. Add bulb-outs to existing arterials and major collectors with on-street parking.~~**

**Rationale:** We shouldn't have to bulb out low-speed, low volume streets. With limited dollars, we should prioritize more dangerous streets for such pedestrian crossing improvements.

**GT3: Streets allow the efficient delivery of goods and services.**

PT3.1 Design streets to allow the efficient and safe delivery of goods and services, providing access for buses, commercial trucks, emergency and other public service vehicles at an appropriate scale for the local uses.

~~PT3.2: Provide access on all streets for public and commercial needs, while keeping street widths as narrow as possible to maintain a human-scale environment. Designate and enforce appropriate linear curb space for loading and unloading of commercial vehicles in urban areas.~~

**Rationale:** Arguably the struck text is redundant (see prior policy). Written testimony pointed out that appropriate loading/unloading zones was not addressed in the Comp Plan.

PT3.3: Consider large ~~truck~~ vehicle movement in the design of arterial and major collector streets, particularly at intersections and on streets in industrial zoned areas and mixed use areas.

**Rationale:** Delivery trucks that service stores should be considered in street design. Written testimony spoke to intersections being limiting factors for large vehicles. Two intersections in particular have been cited as reasons IT is not using three-bike capacity racks on their vehicles (Columbia and 5<sup>th</sup> and Harrison & Division).

PT3.4: ~~Encourage~~ Require alleys and retain alleys as public right-of-way.

PT3.5: ~~Encourage~~ Require alleys behind lots fronting on arterials and collectors, so that houses or businesses can face the street, sidewalks are continuous, and vehicles can access properties from behind.

**Rationale:** Using “encourage” guarantees us nothing. If we want alleys, they should be required.

PT3.55: Maintain functionality of alleyways for delivery and service vehicles by ensuring they are not blocked by trash receptacles, cars or other obstructions.

**Rationale:** New policy to help ensure the alleys we have and require are actually usable for the purposes intended. This allows delivery vehicles to exit the street, which reduces friction/congestion, and assists commerce by allowing convenient access for deliveries.

~~PT3.6: Provide access to individual properties from the smallest type of street when a lot fronts more than one street.~~

**Rationale:** Policy is redundant. Policy PT1.9 (see citation below) does a better job addressing Access Management without being overly restrictive. Corner lots (e.g. Grocery Outlet plaza at Harrison & Division, the former K-Mart on Martin & Sleater-Kinney) and “through-lots” (e.g. Hardel on Harrison, which goes all the way to 4<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW) would be unduly affected, possibly stifling (re)development. The specifics of the access management policies can be handled through the development code and the EDDS. Again, we suggest retaining the following policy:

**PT1.9: Minimize driveway curb cuts along major streets to reduce conflicts between vehicles and bicyclists and pedestrians. Use shared driveways, or provide access off side streets and alleys.**

GT4: The street network is a well-connected system of small blocks allowing short trips that are direct for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, motorists, and all types of service vehicles.

**PT4.1 Connect streets in a grid-like pattern of smaller blocks. ~~Idea~~ Block sizes should range from 250 feet to 350 feet in residential areas and up to a maximum of 550 500 feet along arterials.**

**Rationale:** Provides more explicit direction on the size of blocks consistent with block spacing criteria and tables in EDDS. Large blocks in residential neighborhoods impede pedestrian movement and create longer trips to get to transit and services.

**PT4.3: Build new street and pathway connections so that people walking, biking, or accessing bus stops have direct short-route options, making these modes more inviting.**

**Rationale:** Includes non-motorized pathways. Also, gets at the policy's point better – not short trips, but direct ones.

**PT4.8 Build new arterials, major collectors and neighborhood collectors based on the general location defined on the Transportation Maps in Appendix B. ~~and using the guidance~~ Require use of the [Engineering Design and Development Standards for such roadways](#).**

**Rationale:** The EDDS are not a suggestion. They are our standards.

**PT4.10 Require that ~~Ensure~~ new developments connect to the existing street network and also provide for future street connections to ensure the gridded street system is built out concurrently with future development.**

**Rationale:** Clarifies and strengthens connected streets policy. Developments should not be permitted if they do not connect to the existing street network. Furthermore such developments should have to provide connections for future development so that connections are as obvious as possible for potential residents; these should never be a surprise.

PT4.11: Retrofit existing development into a pattern of short blocks.

**Issue:** We are unclear what staff is proposing in PT4.11. Was it intended to be “use eminent domain to retrofit *now*”, or “retrofit where possible, such as when redeveloping an area”?

**PT4.13: Build an adequate network of arterials and collectors to discourage heavy traffic volumes on local access streets. [For more information see: as identified in Appendix B: Transportation 2030 Street Capacity and Connectivity Project List and Maps. – Consider using this format where Appendix mentioned in other policies]**

**Rationale:** Provide the reference so the public knows what to expect.

**PT4.14: Build a dense grid of local access and collector streets to provide multiple points of ingress/egress from a neighborhood, and so that local traffic does not have to use arterial streets for trips within the neighborhood.**

**Rationale:** A dense grid of local and collector streets provides more than just the ability to get to points *within* a neighborhood. It provides redundant exits and entries as well.

**PT4.15: ~~Discourage~~Disallow cul-de-sacs, and ~~o~~Only allow cul-de-sacs their use as the result of topographic and environmental constraints. Cul-de-sacs that are built should have a maximum length of 300 feet and be built with pedestrian and bike connections to adjacent streets, or to destinations such as schools, parks and trails wherever possible.**

**Rationale:** Cul-de-sacs are the bane of good land use and transportation planning. Comp Plan language should be very strong on this, only allowing exceptions in extreme circumstances. The “*where possible*” phrase acknowledges that some constrains, such as topography might make requires bridges over ravines.

**GT5: Pathways enhance the transportation network by providing direct and formal off-street routes for bicyclists and pedestrians.**

**PT5.2: Require new development to ~~look for opportunities to~~ provide pathways and connect to adjacent developed properties in order to provide direct bicycle and pedestrian routes. These will be at the same interval spacing as street spacing requirements or at closer intervals.**

**Rationale:** “Super blocks” are a barrier to movement. Development layout should enable one to move across or through to get to uses within, or on the other side. ‘Looking for opportunities’ does not direct that indeed the connections are made. Recent large developments have not provided numerous connections. This policy language needs to be strong enough to inform and direct that connections are made.

**PT5.4: The City will coordinate with the State regarding increasing bicycle and pedestrian permeability of the Capitol Campus.**

**Rationale:** New policy. Currently, the Capital Campus is a significant impediment both for north-south and east-west travel for both modes. The campus should instead be a resource for these modes, but requires dedicated attention by both parties to achieve this result.

GT7: Impacts of new development on the transportation system are addressed by establishing level-of-service standards that indicate when improvements are needed.

**\*PT7.1: Measure level-of-service using the average vehicle volumes that occur during the highest volume consecutive two-hour period. Use the two-hour level of service as a screening tool to determine capacity needs at intersections and along streets. Consider location efficiency in this calculation to remove disincentives for development along Urban Corridors where increased density is desired.**

**Rationale:** This is a recommendation of the Urban Corridors Task Force report.

**PT7.2: Determine the need for, and feasibility of, motor vehicle capacity improvements by considering street hierarchy and street spacing criteria; environmental, social, and urban form impacts; cost; and physical constraints.**

**Rationale:** Cost should also be considered. Other measures may be more cost-effective.

**PT7.25: Consider signal upgrades and signal timing as standard elements in addressing congestion.**

**Rationale:** New Policy. In every analysis, we should consider these cost-effective, congestion-reducing strategies as an alternative to, or adjunct to, building additional capacity.

**PT7.3: ~~Ensure that n~~No street will exceed the width of five general purpose auto lanes (two in each direction and a center turn lane) mid-block when adding capacity to the street system. Turn lanes may be added as appropriate, with careful consideration of pedestrian and bicyclist safety at intersections.**

**Rationale:** Clarifies and strengthens policy.

**PT7.4 Consider roundabouts as a strategy to maintain mobility where appropriate along a street with ~~minimizing street widening.~~**

**Rationale:** Original wording is vague. Changes make it more succinct.

PT7.5: Establish and maintain appropriate level-of-service using the following guidelines; (see street

system maps in Appendix B and Corridor map in Appendix H):

- Level-of-service E will be acceptable on arterials and major collectors in the City Center and along Urban Corridors
- Level-of-service D will be acceptable in the rest of the City and Urban Growth Area
- Higher levels of service may be maintained in parts of the City because of low-traffic demand
- For some intersections, level-of-service is F is acceptable
- **On Strategy Corridors, where widening is not an option, levels-of-service may ~~exceed~~ fall below adopted standards**

**Rationale:** Clarification of policy intent. “Exceed” implies LOS is better than the adopted standard.

**GT8: The impacts of new land-use development on the transportation system are mitigated appropriately.**

**Rationale:** Not mitigated by just any means – for instance we don't widen roads past 5 lanes.

**PT8.1: Require mitigation for new developments so that transportation level of service does not fall below adopted standards except where adopted policies allow.**

**Rationale:** The City has policies to not widen roads beyond 5 lanes, and will not knock down buildings in downtown to widen roads.

**PT8.2: Construction of improvements or contribution of funds may be required of new development to help the function and safety of the street, such as installation/upgrades/timing/re-timing of traffic signals, installation of bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, turn pockets, special lanes for buses and conversion of signalized intersections to roundabouts.**

**Rationale:** Tools for addressing traffic impact are should be more comprehensively listed.

**GT9: In designated Strategy Corridors, when road widening is not an option, mobility and system capacity is ~~added~~ increased through increasing the addition of walking, biking and transit trips facilities, supportive land use, and by eliminating system inefficiencies.**

**Rationale:** You can't add walking and biking trips, but you can add facilities to encourage them. Even so, without supportive land use, such as short block spacing and mixed-use zoning, bike/walk/bus trips will not materialize. There is a greater context to “if you build it they will come”.

**PT9.2: Review and update concurrency ordinances as appropriate to implement multimodal and system efficiency strategies in Strategy Corridors. (See Concurrency Report explanation in Appendix A.)**

**Rationale:** It's not just multimodal strategies, but whole system efficiency too. For example, if traffic signals are not timed properly, the overall system efficiency drops.

**GT10: System capacity improvements ~~move~~ focus on moving people and goods more efficiently, minimizing congestion is minimized by replacing car trips with walking, biking and transit trips, and by increasing system operational efficiency and reliability.**

**Rationale:** More inclusive and clearer language. There is an important difference between system capacity and system efficiency.

~~GT12 Growth will be concentrated in our urban areas, making walking, biking and transit viable modes for more people.~~

~~PT12.1 Promote infill and densification, in order to reduce motor vehicle trips and make the best use of the multimodal transportation network.~~

~~PT12.2 Use zoning to create housing near places of employment, allowing people to live closer to where they work, reduce trip lengths and increase access to walking, biking and transit.~~

**GT12: A mix of strategies is used to concentrate growth in the City, which both supports and is supported by walking, biking and transit.**

**\*PT12.1: Consider upzoning areas in the downtown core and along parts of the Urban Corridor, and downzoning areas in the periphery of the City.**

**\*PT12.2: Consider a geographically-influenced impact fee structure to incentivize (re)development in the downtown core and along parts of the Urban Corridor.**

**\* PT12.3: Consider incentives to address the specific challenges downtown redevelopment faces.**

**\* PT12.4: Promote infill and densification in close-in neighborhoods, activity centers, and downtown, in order to reduce sprawl, to reduce motor vehicle trips and make the best use of the existing transportation network.**

**\* PT12.5: Allow residential uses in commercial and employment areas in order to reduce commute and errand trip distances and increase the feasibility of alternatives to driving alone.**

**\* PT12.6: Allow neighborhood retail in residential areas to reduce commute and errand trip distances and increase the feasibility of alternatives to driving alone.**

**Rationale:** Decades of using the July Draft policies have not resulted in directing growth to the core of the City. A more sophisticated approach is needed to effectively incentivize (re)development and infill in these areas. The policies we propose are responsive to the “best available” information from regional studies (Urban Corridor Task Force), yet are not overly prescriptive.

**GT13:** Greater density along priority ~~h~~Bus ~~e~~Corridors optimizes investments in transit and makes transit an inviting mode of travel. (See Appendix H, the Corridors map for Bus Corridors.)

**PT13.1:** ~~Achieve~~Encourage transit-supportive density and land-use patterns along priority ~~h~~Bus ~~e~~Corridors, through zoning, incentives and other regulatory tools.

**PT13.2:** Guide transit-dependent land uses to locate on priority ~~h~~Bus ~~e~~Corridors. This includes schools, public services, major employers, and senior and multi-family housing.

**Rationale:** “Bus Corridor” is a term with a specific meaning in the Comp Plan — not all bus routes are Bus Corridors. Including “priority” helps reinforce this idea.

**\*PT14.1:** Retrofit City streets in Urban Corridors to City Street Standards to attract new development and increase densities.

**Rationale:** Typo. Also, questions to clarify the intent were asked of staff: Is the intent that the City will do/pay for this? When as standalone projects or during street overlays?

**\*PT14.2** Request the State of Washington include Urban Corridors in the State’s preferred leasing area, so that state buildings are easily accessible by walking, biking and frequent transit.

**\*PT14.3:** Encourage public agencies to build in the Urban Corridors, so that they are easily accessible by walking, biking and transit and support the City's transportation-efficient land use goals.

**Rationale:** To be explicit that public agencies as major employers are partners in helping to implement the Comp Plan. Can we instead require that public agencies do this? Also, perhaps this policy should be combined with “PT25.3 Work with the State to locate new worksites in the dense urban area, in locations that are accessible by frequent transit and that allow employees to more easily walk and bike.” GT14 is about Urban Corridors, and GT25 is about encouraging non-SOV commute modes.

**\*PT 14.4:** Partner with the cities of Lacey and Tumwater to pursue the ~~land use and transportation measures identifies for the Urban Corridors~~ the coordinated transportation and land use objectives associated with the region's premier transit corridors of Martin Way, east 4th and State Avenues, Pacific Avenue and portions of Capitol Way/Boulevard.

**Rationale:** Emphasizes the coordination of transportation and land use, and the importance of these corridors to achieving transformative change.

GT16: Bus corridors have high-quality transit service allowing people to ride the bus spontaneously, and easily replace car trips with trips by bus.

**PT16.1: Develop a system of bus corridors with fast, frequent and predictable service. Transit service should operate at least every 15 minutes on weekdays where supported by land use.**

**Rationale:** Not reasonable to expect 15 minute service on every route. Focus should be on trunk routes.

**PT16.2: Increase the density and mix of land uses along bus corridors to support high frequency service.**

**Rationale:** This is a land-use oriented policy and belongs in Goal 13 (see above) – unless the two goals are combined.

**PT16.7: ~~Reduce~~ Eliminate minimum parking requirements along bus corridors.**

**Rationale:** We need a more aggressive approach than just reducing parking requirements in order to achieve the densities along bus corridors.

**PT16.8: Give priority to sidewalk investments and mid-block pedestrian crossings that enhance access and safety on high frequency Bus Corridors.**

**Rationale:** New policy to provide pedestrian enhancements provide important support for safe access to transit on Bus Corridors.

GT17: Intercity Transit's short- and long-range plans are supported.

**PT17.1: Support Intercity Transit's existing and planned services and facilities by ensuring that street standards, system operational efficiencies, land uses, and ~~building placement site design~~ support transit along current and future routes.**

**Rationale:** A more complete and accurate listing of the city-controlled factors that affect transit.

**PT17.5: ~~Work with~~ Require new development to provide facilities to support the transit rider, as they walk or bike to and from stops. These include such things as transit shelters, awnings, bike parking, walkways, benches, and lighting.**

**Concern:** If we want something, it should be required.

GT18 The region is prepared to advance high-capacity transportation.

**PT18.3** Integrate land use and high-capacity ~~transit~~ transportation planning so that dense urban centers are developed around future rail stations.

**Rationale:** We think this was the policy Dennis Bloom from I.T. meant to refer to in his testimony.

**PT18.4:** Encourage the Washington State Department of Transportation and the Thurston Regional Planning Council to ~~increase~~ identify and address deficiencies in regional commuter services.

**Rationale:** These agencies are not transit service providers, but can play a role in supporting regional commuter services.

**PT 18.5: Achieve the land use necessary to support high capacity transportation.**

**Rationale:** New policy. High capacity transportation will only happen if it is significantly supported by proper land use. Ask Thera for clarification.

**GT19:** The rail system is a cost effective and efficient method of moving materials ~~regionally~~ long distances.

**PT19.1:** Work with regional partners and the Washington State Department of Transportation to support and expand freight rail to and from the region in Washington State ~~the region, because it can be efficient and extend the life of the street system.~~

**Rationale Leveen:** Using the word “region” doesn’t accurately represent how rail is used – for long-distance freight movement, not intra-county transport.

**Rationale Horn:** Seems too broad. Suggest the following alternative:

Work with regional partners and the Washington State Department of Transportation to support and expand freight rail to and from the region in Washington State ~~the region, because it can be efficient and extend the life of the street system.~~

GT20: Walking is safe and inviting, and more people walk for transportation.

**PT20.8: Allow payment of a fee-in-lieu for sidewalks in certain instances so that sidewalks and other pedestrian improvements can be constructed in the locations they are most needed.**

**Rationale:** This is an entirely new policy, suggested by BPAC, that would allow flexibility to help ensure that developer contributions provide facilities that serve the community's highest need.

GT21: Sidewalks make streets safe and inviting for walking.

**PT21.2: Focus City sidewalk construction on major streets, where heavy traffic volumes and speeds make it difficult for walkers to share space with motor vehicles. Priorities for sidewalk construction are based on street conditions, presence of transit and proximity to destinations.**

**Rationale:** Providing pedestrian access to transit is crucial.

GT22 Pedestrian crossing improvements remove barriers for walkers on major streets, especially wide streets with high-vehicle volumes.

**PT22.1: Build new streets and retrofit existing streets with crossing islands and curb bulb-outs to increase pedestrian safety. ~~for pedestrians trying to reduce a pedestrian's exposure to motor vehicles as they cross the street.~~**

**Rationale:** Minor change. Pedestrian exposure is the same regardless of whether or not a crossing island is present. However, refuge islands break up the task of crossing multiple lanes of traffic into two significantly easier tasks, which increases safety.

**PT22.3: Add safe mid-block crossings for pedestrians to new and rebuilt streets existing streets. This is especially important on major streets that have long distances between signalized crossings, and those with high frequency transit service.**

**Rationale:** Safe pedestrian crossings are important facilities that support transit.

**PT22.5: Consider use of pavers or colored, patterned concrete on crosswalks in commercial or mixed-use areas to increase the motorist awareness and safety of pedestrians, and to improve the appearance of an area, when doing so will not negatively affect cyclists or pedestrians.**

**Rationale:** Pedestrian awareness is not the target of distinctive walking surfaces; motorist awareness of the potential presence of pedestrians is. The new phrase refers to the unfortunate experience the City had with stamped concrete *sealer* in the Gateway Corridor project; the sealer was removed because it caused cyclists to slip and fall. Aesthetics are a secondary benefit, and are less important than providing safe surfaces for non-motorized users.

**PT22.6 Consider the needs of the elderly and disabled in all crosswalk design and signal timing.**

**Rationale:** New policy. Even though there are standards addressing ADA, we should be explicit that these citizens' needs should be considered.

GT23: Streetscapes buffer walkers from motor vehicle traffic, enhance the experience of walking, and increase the attractiveness of an area.

**PT23.3: Provide sidewalks of sufficient width to ensure adequate space for all appropriate streetscape elements** ~~Build wide sidewalks in densely populated areas to create more public space and support active street life. In these heavily-peopled areas, install benches, artwork and other features to make streets interesting and inviting, while maintaining safe walking surfaces and adequate space for those in wheelchairs.~~

**Rationale:** Policy focus is on ensuring adequate space for streetscape elements with context sensitivity – sidewalks in outlying neighborhoods might only warrant street trees, whereas sidewalks in the downtown might include more elements to support the greater number of pedestrians and diversity of activities on urban sidewalks (gathering spaces, newspaper vending, bicycle parking, etc). The last phrase is an acknowledgement that safety and accessibility should trump aesthetics (e.g. mosaics on the sidewalks of the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bridge are very slippery, and are a nuisance to pedestrians in wet weather).

**PT23.4: Require continuous awnings over the sidewalk along building frontages in densely developed areas to protect pedestrians from weather, and encourage them everywhere else.**

**Rationale:** Awnings are a crucial element of “pedestrian habitat” and they are needed in many areas. Rain does not just fall in “densely developed areas”.

**GT24: Bicycling is safe and inviting, and ~~more~~ many people bike for transportation to meet their travel and activity needs.**

**Rationale:** More explicit than “transportation.”

**PT24.1: Retrofit streets to provide safe and inviting bicycle facilities. Use the Bicycle Master Plan (2009) to guide facilities development, but look for other opportunities to provide bicycle facilities where possible.**

**Rationale:** Recognizes that on-the-ground opportunities may arise that the Bicycle Master Plan did not foresee.

**PT24.2: Build bike lanes on new major streets: arterials, major collectors and selected neighborhood collectors. Bike facilities planned for specific streets are defined in the Engineering Design and Development Standards.**

**Rationale:** Minor change to make the underlined text be a hyperlink to the EDDS, as was done elsewhere in the Transportation Section.

PT24.4: Explore the use of bicycle boulevards to support novice and family bicycling - streets with low volumes and special accommodations for bicycling.

**PT24.45: Ensure that pedestrian crossing islands provide adequate refuge space for family cycling.**

**Rationale:** New policy. The demographics of the cycling public is changing – more families are biking. Family cycling often involves either longer wheelbases (adult cyclist pulling a child trailer or trailer-cycle), or a “flock” of one or more adults with one or more kids on separate bikes.

**PT24.9: Encourage Partner with businesses, schools, developers and employers to support bicycling through effective site and building design and provision of end-of-trip facilities and promotion of bike use.**

**Rationale:** We will have more success if we actively engage these entities to support cycling. Encouraging them relies too much on hope. Coordination is needed to best integrate developments of all types with the surrounding community, and to help achieve land use and transportation goals for the City.

**PT24.11: Encourage Educate drivers about and enforce regulations that protect the safety of bicyclists and pedestrianswalkers.**

**Rationale:** Wrong verb. Following laws is not optional for drivers.

GT25: Walking, biking, riding the bus and carpooling are inviting for trips to work or school. Fewer drive-alone trips will reduce pollution, energy consumption, and the growth in traffic congestion.

**\*PT25.3: Work with the State to locate new worksites in the dense urban area, in locations that are accessible by frequent transit and that allow employees to more easily walk and bike. Minor Concern: Perhaps this policy should be combined with “PT14.3Encourage public agencies to build in the Urban Corridors, so that they are easily accessible by walking, biking and transit.” GT14 is about Urban Corridors, and GT25 is about encouraging non-SOV commute modes.**

**PT25.4: Encourage all employers in the City to reduce employee drive-alone commute trips. Provide specific emphasis for worksites in the City Center.**

**Rationale:** Combining the above policy with PT25.6 (see below).

**PT25.5: Provide infrastructure to support walking, biking, transit, and ridesharing for commuting.**

**Rationale:** TDM is not just about commuting, but for errand trips too.

~~**PT25.6: Work with employers and employees of the City Center to create programs that reduce drive-alone commuting.**~~

**Rationale:** Combining the above policy with PT25.4 (see above).

**PT25.10: Encourage employers to allow telecommuting and compressed work weeks to eliminate commute trips.**

**Rationale:** Allowing employees to work fewer, longer days is an important CTR strategy.

~~**PT25.12: Encourage and**~~**Require end-of-trip facilities, such as clothes lockers, showers and bike parking for walking, biking and transit users at schools and worksites.**

**Rationale:** Have clear language with teeth. An exception to this change might be that encouragement is aimed at schools and worksites that do not have to comply with any specific code – that is, to provide these facilities regardless of not being required to. Policy 24.7 could address provision of such facilities when *required*, or they could be combined or further differentiated so as not to appear overlapping at all. “PT24.7 Require new commercial developments, public facilities, schools, and multi-family housing to provide end-of-trip facilities for bicyclists, including covered bike racks and lockers.”

PT25.13 Encourage walking, biking and ridesharing programs at schools to reduce congestion near schools, introduce children to transportation options, and, at high schools, reduce the need for parking. Encourage walking and biking so students get more exercise.

**PT25.14: Develop mutual policies with the school districts to site new schools in locations where students can easily walk or bike to school, and where school employees and students can use transit to commute to and from the site. Consider multi-story buildings on smaller lots, multi-story sites to accommodate capacity needs closer to the urban core and to reduce disruption to the street grid.**

**Rationale:** Correcting a typo. Also introducing the idea that multi-story school designs can help reduce sprawl and reduce the impact of a campus on the street network.

GT27: Transportation facilities and services are funded to advance the goals of the City and the region.

**PT27.1: Plan and prioritize projects consistent with available and projected funding to advance the community’s transportation vision.**

**Rationale:** Many projects will be planned based on assumptions of future funding, not just what's available.

**PT27.2: Utilize master plans, subarea plans and facilities programs to identify system needs and funding strategies, evaluate competing priorities and trade-offs and define short-term actions.**

**Rationale:** We need clear and strong language that directs the City to evaluate the costs and benefits of transportation projects.

**PT27.7: ~~Encourage~~Partner with community organizations to help complete ~~priority~~ projects.**

**Rationale:** It is unlikely that community organizations are going to significantly contribute to major PRIORITY projects. Rather, it will likely be smaller projects, but let's not even limit or specify what partnerships can achieve.

**PT27.10: Of all potential transportation expenditures, maintenance of the City's existing transportation system is the highest priority.**

**Rationale:** New policy. Prioritizing maintenance is a choice the City must actively make. This policy clarifies that it is in fact the highest priority.

**PT 27.11: Enhancing transportation system operational efficiency is a high priority for City funds.**

**Rationale:** Some projects provide no extra capacity, nor safety improvement, but are worthwhile nonetheless because they allow us to get more out of whatever system we have (e.g. traffic signal improvements, extended green time for transit).

GT29: Olympia engages with neighboring jurisdictions to advance common goals and solve regional problems.

**PT29.2: Establish and maintain compatible street standards with Thurston County and the cities of Lacey and Tumwater.**

**Rationale:** The county controls standards in the UGA and should be consistent in contiguous areas.

**PT29.3: Work with the cities of Lacey, Tumwater and Thurston County on ~~bus~~ Transite-Corridor development.**

**Rationale:** Prefer terminology that is consistent with neighboring jurisdictions.

**PT29.6: Coordinate with the Port of Olympia on truck access routes and freight rail. Work with the Port of Olympia, as needed, to address air and water transportation needs.**

**Rationale:** Rail was left out. Coordination is important because trains must travel slowly through downtown Olympia and they disrupt the street grid in the heart of the city.

|

|