

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals	
1.0 VISION & VALUES																									
1.1	David Sugarman	6/30/2014 IO Email	Vision	Looking for an overall Vision of the City in the Plan and cannot locate one. "If and when priorities must be established for funding the PARTS of the Plan, what is the overall city goals and concept that will direct that prioritization?" Continues to look for a statement that describes a "State Capital" city, but unable to find one.			✓																		
1.2	David Sugarman	7/22/2014 IO Email	Vision	Continues to look for an overall Vision of the City in the Plan. Has not been able to find a statement or description of a concept or personality statement for the city.			✓																		
1.3	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Efficiency as Public Services Value	Page 20 – No mention of efficiency in Public Services. Strongly suggest adding this important value.																					
2.0 STREET CONNECTORS & OTHER TRANSPORTATION ISSUES																									
2.1	Megan Moreno	6/25/2014 IO Email	Local Access Streets 20 mph	Supports lowering the maximum speed limit to 20 mph on local access streets and in the City Center.				✓																	
2.2	Patricia Bracken	7/21/2014 IO Email	Against Street Connector in Westbrook Park neighborhood	Connectivity in Westbrook Park neighborhood is a safety issue because the connector would increase traffic volume on a road developed for current residents only.	✓																				
2.3	Russ Irwin	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 7:45 p.m.	Street Connectivity	Business owner supporting the construction industry. Concerns about street connectivity. Don't analyze if there are no objections. Support connected street grids. No need to analyze all connections.	✓																				
2.4	Bethany Wiedner, SWONA	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 7:56 p.m.	Remove Decatur and 16th Avenues as Connectors from the Plan	SWONA voted to remove Decatur and 16th Avenues connections from the map in the Comp Plan in the Transportation Chapter. Inconsistent with language to wait until the West Olympia Traffic Study is complete to decide on these connections. Decatur as major collector shouldn't be included in the Plan. Staff is a proponent for the connections. SWONA feels it has negative impact on the neighborhood. Review T4.21 - traffic volumes. Written comments will be submitted.	✓														✓						
2.5	John St. John,	Oral Comment	Park Drive	Thanked Council for removing Park Drive	✓																				

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals	
	West Brook Park	7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:00 p.m.	Connectivity	connection.																					
2.6	Chelsea Buchanan	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:27 p.m.	Need Additional Public Hearing, Remove Decatur Street Connection	There may be need for an additional public hearing to allow the community time to digest the content of the Comprehensive Plan. Delete the Decatur and 16 th Street connections. Concerns about impacts on walkable community and neighborhood involvement. Not proven it is necessary. The projection of 14,000 additional vehicles per day traveling the connection is far too many for the neighborhood to accommodate.	✓					✓									✓						
2.7	Richard Einhorn, SWONA	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:34 p.m.	Remove Decatur Street Connection	City staff wants to connect Decatur and 16th. Concerns about impacts of connection. SWONA is against it. City Council should listen.	✓														✓						
2.8	Janice Larsen	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:56 p.m.	Remove Park Drive Connection	Thank you for listening and removing the Park Drive connection.	✓																				
2.9	Jerry Parker	7/31/2014 IO Email	Street Connector Drafting Error - Update to PT4.23	P4.23 – At an April 4 meeting of Sophie Stimson (City staff), Roger Horn (Planning Commission) and me (Planning Commission), we agreed on this language for PT4.23: “Address safety concerns on newly connected streets and build any needed improvements at the time when street connections are made. Define what constitutes safety improvements in the Engineering Design and Development Standards.” Believes discussed at staff meeting with Council on April 22. Language should be replaced.	✓																				
2.10	Kathy Harrigan	8/2/2014 IO Email	Remove Decatur St / Fern St Connector from Caton Way	Opening Decatur St SW or Fern St SW is non-viable, ill-conceived and fraught with inaccurate assumptions. The Southwest neighborhood should not be viewed as a drive-through gateway to businesses for out of area drivers.	✓														✓						
2.11	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Speed Limits	PT1.3 lists maximum speed limits for two categories of streets. In appropriate because places where faster speeds can safely be allowed. Soften language with “generally”																					
2.12	Bethany	8/1/2014	Remove	Refers to City Council’s 2004 decision that any	✓											✓			✓						

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals	
	Weidner, SWONA	Email to City Council	Decatur and 16th Avenues as Connectors from the Plan	determination about connecting these streets to Auto Mall completion of West Olympia Traffic Study. Replace Sec. T4.21 from “street classification” to “residential neighborhood conditions” as measure for reasonableness of traffic. Notes contradictions in current version.																					
2.13	Beverly Taylor Hastings	8/5/2014 IO Email	Remove Decatur and 16th Avenues as Connectors from the Plan	Our neighborhood is very walkable and community-oriented. If Decatur and Fern are opened up to through traffic our neighborhood is gone forever.	✓														✓						
2.14	Dennis Bloom, Intercity Transit	8/4/2014 IO Email	Transit and Planning	1. Supports City’s Transportation Mobility Strategy of 2009 – need to revisit now that plan moves away from Urban Corridor concepts. 2. “Complete streets” a workable solution. 3. Encouraged by recommendation that residential density be increased but not the only indicator of what’s needed to support transit. 4. Guiding transit dependent land-use along routes also important – aging population in urban areas. 5. GT18 on future rail stations premature. 6. Encourages inter-jurisdictional coordination of land use along transit corridors.								✓													
2.15	Thera Black, Thurston Regional Planning Council	8/5/2014 IO Email	Regional Transportation Policy, Inconsistencies	Discusses and addresses questions of regional consistency in regional transportation policy. Tone and content of Plan implies: - developing multi-modal transportation supporting land use is a new idea but Olympia was a leader back to 1980s or before. - established neighborhoods denser than newer ones but most are much less dense. Difficult plan to read – several terms/concepts unique to Olympia. Appendix A could be opportunity to show that residents have differing values/opinions. Often-conflicting policies and vaguely specific requirements – how to translate into regulations.	✓							✓			✓										
3.0 VIEW PROTECTION & WATERFRONT USES																									
3.1	Bob Wolfe,	Oral Comment	View	OYC is 110 years old. Vision to be in place							✓		✓											✓	

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals	
	Olympia Yacht Club	7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:05 p.m.	Protection	another 110 years. Green marina and removed contaminated soils. Steel pilings. More than a marina. Protect the environment and water quality. View protections are too specific. Written comments will be submitted.																					
3.2	Stuart Drebeck, OMB, WOBA, Chamber	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:08 p.m.	View Protection	Supports City Manager's recommendations. Biggest issue is view protection, the 26 locations on the map that have views, and the 7 view locations. The view protection prevents the additional 2,750 residential units the City projects for the downtown over the next 20 years. View examples "blanket" downtown (submitted map); raise 35 feet height to 45 feet, works better. Expand urban green space, don't tie urban green space to population growth. 25% open space protected is already enough. Do not expand residential design review. Written testimony to follow.							✓										✓		✓		
3.3	Bonnie Jacobs, Friends of the Waterfront	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:49 p.m.	View Protection, Flood Risk, Liquefaction, Consider Capitol Campus Plans	Waterfront is very important - emphasize it, preserve public access, support water-oriented uses. Along shoreline, need more view protection; address flood risk and soil liquefaction; consider Capitol Campus plans.							✓		✓	✓	✓									✓	
3.4	Allen Miller	7/31/2014 IO Email	View Protection	Important to remember that the historic Wilder and White and Olmsted Bros. City Beautiful Movement plans for the State Capitol Campus are the raison d'être for Olympia and how its core has developed over the last century. Comp Plan needs to reflect the perfection of those plans with the preservation and improvement of both Capitol Lake and the removal of the blighted buildings in the isthmus and its redevelopment as the great civic space intended by the architects ... connecting to the borrowed landscapes of the Olympics and Puget Sound.							✓														
3.5	Adam Frank, Olympia Master Builders	8/2/2014 IO Email	Land use Designation Map, Minimum Densities, Alleys, Design	1. OMB supports the new Land Use Designation map and the greater flexibility for rezones within the land use designations. 2. The market currently does not support 25 units per acre densities. 3. OPC draft required alleys in new residential							✓						✓				✓				

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals	
			Review Jurisdiction, View Protection	developments along arterial and connector streets. LUEC settle on language that requires alleys “where practical” or “where feasible.” OMB takes the position as the City Manager’s recommendation. 4. OMB feels design review should not be extended to any residential properties and limited to commercial and public facilities plainly visible from city streets and freeways. 5. View protection is a major stumbling block to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Plan states directing density downtown, around Capital Mall, and on Martin Way. Residential density will require taller buildings.																					
3.6	Joe Illing, Illing Realty Investments	8/4/2014 Letter	Existing View Protection Policies	Keep existing view policies, which are working. While suggested changes have noble intent, would conflict with City’s and County’s efforts to fight urban sprawl by increasing the center’s density. Slow revitalization. Creation of a committee to revisit view policy adds another level of uncertainty – developers will go elsewhere.		✓					✓					✓									
3.7	Dick Binns	8/4/2014 Letter to City Council	Urban Waterfront & Flexible View Protection	1. Preference for water-oriented uses should be specifically added to defined Urban Waterfront areas. 2. View protection is a valid goal but adopt a general policy of protection and then create a process to define and locate views – be flexible and avoid prohibitions or restrictions. Page 81’s comment that no public buildings be sited within view corridor could mean a public building which could benefit many (library) isn’t built. 3. Capitol Lake – acknowledge needs to be properly maintained until solutions found.							✓		✓												
3.8	Bob Van Schoorl	8/5/2014 IO Email	Urban Waterfront, Flexible View Protection, Sub-Area Plans	1. Waterfront heritage should be principle focus. 2. Preference for water-oriented uses be addressed – consistency with SMP. 3. Support a statement of general policy to protect views and public process to define – needs flexibility. 4. Recognize Capitol Lake as a lake – consistency with SMP.							✓		✓			✓									

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals	
				5. Plan over-uses prescriptive language – should limit to allow for flexibility. 6. Ensure waterfront community represented at sub-area planning for downtown.																					
3.9	Robert L. Wolf, Olympia Yacht Club	8/5/2014 Email to City Council	Consistency with SMP, Water Quality, Flexible View Protection	Ensure the Comp Plan is consistent with the SMP. Improve Bud Inlet water quality. View Protection in Comp Plan to specific. Provide water oriented activities.									✓			✓	✓								
3.10	Walt Schefter	8/4/2014 Email to City Council	Urban Waterfront, Flexible View Protection	1. Preference for water-oriented uses should be specifically added to defined Urban Waterfront areas. 2. View protection should be flexible rather than rigid – general policy and create process to define and locate 3. Capitol Lake – acknowledge needs to be properly maintained until solutions found.							✓		✓												
3.11	George Smith, Olympia Yacht Club	8/5/2014 IO Email	Capitol Lake	Keep the Lake									✓												
3.12	Kathy McCormick	8/5/2014 Email to City Council	Vision for: Transportation, Economy, Affordable Housing; Greenhouse Gas; Land Use; Views	1. Vision: a. Transportation – Street connections linchpin of multi-modal transportation; b. Economy – Will depend on City’s ability to realize goal to focus growth in activity centers c. Affordable Housing – Encourage full range of “gentle density” options in neighborhoods Problem of articulation of vision without key elements to make reality. 2. Reduction of Greenhouse Gases (GN8) – Goals tough to achieve. Regional approach needed. 3. Street connections needed for single vital community, walkability. 4. Views – a number of ambiguous statements 5. Commercial Uses & Urban Corridors – Could be stymied by ambiguous view corridor language. 6. Leveraging Investment – An important goal. Ambiguities will stymie. Must get more downtown housing for range of incomes.	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓													
4.0 URBAN CORRIDORS																									
4.1	Jay Elder	7/22/2014 IO Email	Urban Corridors,	The idea of 3 nodes is good; including 4 th and State Avenues between Plum and Fir in this							✓	✓							✓	✓		✓			

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals
			Zoning Changes, More Visuals, Neighborhoods, HDC, PO/RM	high-rise densification, is not. Maintain zoning changes annually. Accompany Comp Plan changes with digital representations of how a change would look.																				
4.2	Jay Elder	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:19 p.m.	Urban Corridors, Scenic Views	Proposal allows too much height on 4th/State corridor, especially the 70-foot option. Protect State Avenue views. Downtown needs an infusion of development, but we don't need 70-foot buildings along 4th and State Avenues east of Plum. Could lead to historic homes being razed. Fill the hillside with tall buildings and not downtown. Public views of the Capital, Black Hills, the Bay; 70-foot buildings will not allow views. Zoning changes would be easier in the new Plan. We need visual depictions to illustrate the plan.							✓	✓							✓	✓	✓			
4.3	David Schaffert, Chamber of Commerce	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 7:54 p.m.	HDC, Urban Corridors	HDC encourages staff's recommendation, no requirement. Retain 15 units/acre requirement; make 25 units per acre a goal instead. Boundaries are too flexible, need more definition. Eliminate residential from DRB. Restore Capitol Way to Urban Corridor. Written comments will be submitted.								✓									✓			
4.4	Mary Wilkinson	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:31 p.m.	Urban Corridors, Rezone Annually	Opposed to Urban Corridors. Will undermine our hopes to focus density in to high density nodes. Tall buildings impact on neighborhoods - limit to two stories. Density can be created elsewhere. Keep State, Harrison and 4th what they are. Focus on the nodes. Return zoning to the Comprehensive Plan - only allow rezones annually.								✓						✓	✓		✓			
4.5	Mike Gusa, Counsel for 2 of 4 owners RE: 2400 block of State Avenue	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 9:08 p.m.	Urban Corridor	Include 4 parcels in the 2400 block of State Avenue, south side of State in the Urban Corridor. Will submit written comments.								✓												
4.6	Cristina Charney	7/24/2014 IO Email	Urban Corridors, Revitalize Downtown, Height Limits	Show consideration to Eastside neighborhoods as has been shown previously to the Capitol neighborhoods by limiting build heights. Preserve the unique views that greet visitors and residents alike when driving west on State Street.								✓	✓				✓		✓	✓				

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals
4.7	Jim Keogh	7/31/2014 IO Email	Urban Corridors	There are a number of good concepts, development nodes, and the effort to encourage most of the anticipated population growth over the next two decades to occur within the urban growth areas. Urban corridors only really work if the area in question has not already been built out. To encourage acceptable infilling in existing neighborhoods and along traffic corridors going through them, strongly support Design Review Boards.								✓							✓		✓			
4.8	Paul Ingman	8/3/2014 IO Email	HDC/Urban Corridors	It is a mistake to put growth on the backs of working class family neighborhoods and their elementary school zones. Public records show overwhelming number of citizens testified against High Density Corridors (HDCs) to Planning Commission. Research shows that families with children move away from HDCs. Focus downtown.								✓							✓					
4.9	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Urban Corridors	Intro to Land Use and Urban Design Chapter – Change “along urban corridors” to “along some urban corridors” to reflect change in approach to density.								✓												
4.10	Tim Walker	8/5/2014 IO Email	Urban Corridors	Do not need another South Tacoma Way or Sprague Avenue in Spokane. Saying it will give more folks a reason to take mass transit is a bald face lie. Problems of vagrancy, prostitution and tattoo parlors. Focus on the real problem instead of a temporary fix. “This is nothing more than big growth project for developers to make millions on the backs of the tax payer.”		✓						✓												
4.11	Holly Gadbow	8/5/2014 Letter to City Council	Urban Corridors, View Technology, Minimum Densities, Utilities, Process	Supports overall direction, recognizing importance of higher density, mixed use, street connectors. Concerns: 1. Urban Corridors: Don’t reduce amount of density along urban corridors any further; could include higher density along some parts of Capitol Way 2. Views: Remove specific names of simulation software; analysis should be done to determine how much restrictions would inhibit City’s obligations to accommodate growth	✓						✓	✓									✓			

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals	
				<p>3. Lack of Minimum Densities: Concerned can't realize 12 units per acre. Need minimum density requirement or overall density goals can't be achieved.</p> <p>4. Utilities: State that sewer not extended outside UGA.</p> <p>5. Where regulatory language removed from Plan, ensure kept in regulations.</p> <p>6. Comp Plan Process: has gone on too long; Context for Plan not explained. Adopt Plan now and get on with regulations.</p>																					
5.0 CONSISTENCY																									
5.1	Kelly Wood, Attorney, Phillips Burgess, representing the Olympia Yacht Club	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 7:48 p.m.	Comp Plan Consistent with SMP	Examine SMP integration into the Plan; be more specific about retaining Capitol Lake. Ensure that it is fully integrated. Foster the preferences for water-oriented uses. View protection - be careful with view protection - remove the list of examples from the Plan. Adopt the City Manager recommendations. Encourage and foster rather than restrict and prohibit. Needs specificity, timelines, and measurable goals/measures. Will submit written comments.							✓		✓			✓									✓
5.2	Janet Jordan	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:04 p.m.	Zoning should be Consistent with the Comp Plan	Zoning needs to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Update as soon as possible. Prohibit spot zoning.												✓					✓				
5.3	E.B. Galligan, Port of Olympia	8/5/2014 Letter to City Council	Less Prescriptive Language, Recognize Port Planning, Consistency with SMP	<p>1. Overall support for draft, especially values and vision</p> <p>2. Less Prescriptive Language – Policies should be flexible to respond to change and reduce potential for conflict over 20 years</p> <p>3. Recognize Port's Long-Range Planning Efforts – Prior Plan incorporated, none now. Continue to recognize by adding policy in Land Use & Urban Design section</p> <p>4. Ensure Consistency with draft SMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistency of language on urban waterfront, shoreline jurisdiction - Conflict of language on view protection <p>Instead of absolute maximum building heights, broad general policy – implementable on a viewshed basis</p> <p>Specific language for policies addressed in</p>							✓		✓			✓									

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals
				matrix.																				
6.0	SOLAR ACCESS, ENERGY CONSERVATION, SUSTAINABILITY																							
6.1	Loretta Seppanen	7/21/2014 IO Email	Urban Ag	Land Use & Urban Design chapter: Appreciates the addition of fruit and nut trees in Goal 22, Goal 25 and its 11 policies; the recognition of Puget Sound as a food source under Goal 4 and the positive impact of local food production in Goal 8 of the Natural Environment Chapter.					✓															
6.2	Chris van Daalen, NW EcoBuilding Guild	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 7:50 p.m.	Energy Conservation and Sustainability	Goal GL2 favors energy conservation and sustainability. Favors addressing climate change and carbon neutrality by 2050. Examine PN1.5, PN1.9-1.11 that encourage LID and green building and design. LID, energy efficiency and climate change goals and policies are good, encourage district (neighborhood-level) solutions.															✓		✓	✓		
6.3	Thad Curtz	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:36 p.m.	Policies for Solar Access	Keep policies about solar access. PL2.4 et al change from "encourage" to "require" for solar access. 20,000 new residents projected for our area. Utility cost for solar has gone from .21 per kwh to .11 per kwh today to .065 per kwh projected by the Dept. of Energy by 2020. Change the draft to "require" these policies.																		✓		
6.4	Thad Curtz	7/22/2014 IO Email	Policies for Solar Access	Proposed Action Plan: If policy statements in the Action Plan will not have the same legal authority that policy statements in the Comp. Plan do, ensure that any policy commitments that matter get into the Comp. Plan and don't remain in limbo.																		✓		
6.5	Rich Christian	7/24/2014 IO Email	Sustainable Future	Where is a sustainable future ensure by the Comp Plan? Overharvesting is not sustainable. Maintaining status quo is not sustainable. Decide what the future looks like. Look to tourism as a clean, sustainable industry for Olympia.									✓				✓					✓		
6.6	Jeff Jaksich	7/25/2014 IO Email	Sustainability	Concerns ...Olympia's Comprehensive Plan being flawed. Lose much of Olympia's quality of life based on the current expanded Olympia Comprehensive Plan scope and content. Act to protect and create a more sustainable future for our community.																		✓		
6.7	Harry Branch	7/27/2014	Environmental	Regarding environmental concerns ...the City's													✓			✓	✓	✓		

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals	
		IO Email	Concerns	Comprehensive Plan is a stack of meaningless platitudes...not just weak on specifics, they don't exist.																					
6.8	*Clark Gilman, Anne Fritzel BPAC	4/1/2014 IO Email	Environmental Concerns	BPAC supports healthy, affordable, accessible, and sustainable transportation to include transit, walking, and cycling. Promoting bicycle corridors, installing more crosswalks, and adding bus routes, for example. Strengthen policies related to bicycle boulevards. Include signs and markings to direct cyclists through the bicycle network.	✓							✓					✓		✓			✓	✓		
7.0 CRITICAL AREAS, WILDLIFE HABITAT, NATURAL ENVIRONMENT																									
7.1	Kate Gormally	7/3/2014 IO Email	Dog Park	Did not locate reference to an off-leash dog parks in NE city area.																				✓	
7.2	Walt Jorgensen	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:24 p.m.	Urban Corridors, Wildlife Habitat, Need Measurable Goals, Zoning Changes on Annual Basis	Eliminate all Urban Corridors; use dense nodes instead. Keep the half-mile vs. focus on node areas only (consider future market conditions, i.e., will UC attract development away from nodes? Building heights' affect neighborhoods; address neighborhood issues through better design standards/design review. Don't allow rezones except with Plan amendment. Address wildlife habitat. Growth should pay for growth (submitted Question Growth bumper sticker). Content to grow green space and habitat. Need visual depictions of land use policies. What would urban corridors look like? Plan lacks measurable goals.								✓					✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	
7.3	Stephen Bylsma	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:43 p.m.	Protect Heron Rookery Habitat	Dismayed that the herons are not protected. What will the Plan do to protect wildlife in Olympia such as the heron rookery for example. Corridor Study is 20 years old; there is a new approach and language (consistency desired with Olympia CAO and Thurston County CAO). Update Open Space map to reflect new information on wildlife/habitat.													✓						✓	✓	
7.4	Joe Ford	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:46 p.m.	Critical Areas Ordinance	Does not include visual depictions. Need visuals and 3D model; more habitat protection per GMA. Natural environment chapter, CAO- align policies with values and vision chapter.													✓			✓					
7.5	Elisabeth	Oral Comment	Critical Areas	Address wildlife habitat, see PN1.2. Be													✓						✓		

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals	
	Radrick, Black Hills Audubon Society	7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:57 p.m.	Ordinance	consistent with County CAO; add locally important species; use Fish & Wildlife assessment. Wildlife pockets should be updated. Open Space and Environmentally Sensitive Areas map needs to be updated. Will submit written comments.																					
7.6	Bob Wubbena	7/31/2014 IO Email	Urban Waterfront	Opportunity to shape the Deschutes Urban Watershed from Pioneer Park to Priest Point Park in a positive way for the 500,000 people that will inhabit this urban area in the very near future. The City of Olympia's Comprehensive Plan Update needs to reflect the future related to a major part of the City.			✓						✓				✓							✓	
7.7	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Natural Environment	In Introduction to Natural Environment chapter, delete "raise chickens" – not part of the natural environment.													✓								
7.8	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Using Our Land Wisely	Page 39 – Third, fourth and fifth bullets confuse City's role as regulator (vs developer). Use verbs such as "require" and "encourage" instead												✓	✓								
7.9	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Protecting Water Resources	PN4.4 – Change language to "management of the Capitol Lake basin" to make clear that more than the lake to be managed. Capitol Lake may not be there indefinitely.									✓				✓								
7.10	Lisa Riener	8/4/2014 IO Email	Rivers and Streams	All but one river/stream in Olympia is dammed. How is the Comp Plan addressing this problem? Stream estuaries don't appear on any maps. Put them on map and preserve them. Regarding environmental concerns, the City's Comprehensive Plan is a stack of meaningless platitudes... not just weak on specifics, they don't exist.									✓				✓								
7.11	Patricia Holm	8/4/2014 IO Email	Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO)	CAO needs to be updated to include "priority species and locally important species". Consistent with new Thurston County CAO. Current version meaningless because only protects endangered, threatened and sensitive species, which we don't have in city limits.													✓								
7.12	Sandia Slaby	8/4/2014 City Council Email	Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO)	CAO needs to be updated to include "priority species and locally important species". Consistent with new Thurston County CAO. Current version meaningless because only													✓								

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals
				protects endangered, threatened and sensitive species, which we don't have in city limits.																				
7.13	Elizabeth Rodrick, Black Hills Audubon Society	8/4/2014 IO Email	Protection of Wildlife and Habitats	Using "track changes" format, submits suggested language to connect the goals and policies related to wildlife and habitat protection with values and vision.			✓									✓	✓							
8.0 PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS & OUTCOMES																								
8.1	John Epstein	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:40 p.m.	Zoning - Lack of Performance Measures	Too much of a vision statement. Lacks performance measures. How will it be implemented? Zoning should be included in the Plan. How can a Comprehensive Plan not include the downtown? Put Action Plan and Downtown Plan into the Comprehensive Plan (and other subarea plans, too?).																	✓			✓
8.2	John Epstein	8/5/2014 IO Email	Outcomes, Downtown	Does not include clearly stated goals, objectives, timetables, and a built-in evaluation of progress and outcome. Not comprehensive without downtown. Concerned about separating urban growth corridor from urban core.								✓												✓
9.0 ZONING & OTHER LAND USE ISSUES																								
9.1	John Bay	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:15 p.m.	Tanasse Building	Concerns about existing zoning in Comprehensive Plan. Tanasse building example of PO/RM is poor transition zone; lower height limits from 35 to 25 feet; require more residential buffering. Canyon not a gateway. Expand the PO/RM Zone to run to Tullis and cover both sides of State Avenue. Reduce height to 25 feet, should be residential scale. Won't increase density it will destroy our neighborhood.																✓		✓		✓
9.2	Debra Jaqua	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 9:00 p.m.	Include Downtown Zoning Map in Comp Plan	Comprehensive Plan needs to include downtown. Put zoning map back into Comprehensive Plan. Zoning is important and people need to rely on it. Shouldn't be able to be changed easily. GMA doesn't require wall-to-wall people, needs more focus on the natural environment. Sustainability is mentioned as a goal, but how is livability addressed in the Plan? Preserve natural areas.													✓				✓	✓		
9.3	Tim Walker,	Oral Comment	Tanasse	Tanasse building impacts the neighborhood																✓	✓			

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals
	Bigelow Neighborhood Resident	7/22/2014 Public Hearing 9:11 p.m.	Building	and is an example of poor planning.																				
9.4	Paul Ingman	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 9:03 p.m.	Protect Single-Family Neighborhoods	Protect single-family neighborhoods. Don't put growth in neighborhoods or near elementary schools. Non-single-family development makes areas less livable.															✓		✓			
9.5	Jane Stavich, Chambers Basin Drainage District Chair	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 9:06 p.m.	No Growth in SE Olympia	Still losing wetlands and forest. SE Olympia is not the place to focus growth - ecological functions are broken (specifically referring to Chambers Basin area).													✓				✓	✓		
9.6	Velerie Krull	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 9:13 p.m.	Zoning	Protect natural environment and public input. Keep "zoning" in the Plan. SWONA needs to be listened to. Don't overrule the neighborhoods. Don't put profit ahead of sustainability. Growth is not always good. Lack of stability will not go away with more traffic. What is the driver?	✓												✓		✓		✓	✓		
9.7	Adam Frank, OMB	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:12 p.m.	Protect Construction Flexibility	Adopt City Manager's recommendations. Whole Plan should be less prescriptive and allow adapting to "market." Protect flexibility to adapt to the needs of the market.																	✓			
9.8	Travis Skinner	7/23/2014 IO Email	Walkable Communities	Walkable communities are the access to commercial businesses within walking distance of neighborhoods. Good examples are the Westside Food Co-op and Sage's/The Page Street Café.															✓					
9.9	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Neighborhood Centers	In Land Use and Urban Design Chapter, Neighborhoods section – Neighborhood centers concept is one size fits all approach. Strongly suggest wording to indicate that existing neighborhood centers may deviate from description which applies to new ones especially RE dense housing and parks. See PL 221.3.															✓		✓			
9.10	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Density and Transit	PL17.3 encourages denser development to support transit. This seems backwards. Land use shouldn't be gerrymandered to make transit efficient.					✓															
9.11	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Density Calculation	"Future Land Use Designations" Table on page 124 – There is no definition of "units per acre". There are many ways to measure density. Needs a definition of how units per acre will be measured.								✓									✓			

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals
9.12	Benjamin D. Ruder – for Governor Stevens Neighborhood Association	8/4/2014 IO Email	Zoning Classification	Thanks to the Council for responsiveness to community’s concerns and removing Governor Stevens from Urban Corridor. Neighborhood should not be considered for 6-12 housing units per acre zoning or multi-family structures (especially small apartment buildings). Request exemption until full dialogue.								✓							✓		✓			
9.13	Cristiana Figueroa-Kaminsky	8/4/2014 IO Email	Land Use Recommendations & Wildlife Habitat Acquisition	Natural Environment Chapter – Conserve and acquire open areas for habitat Land Use Chapter – specify subarea plans be constrained by physical capabilities to support growth; utilize high density nodes, not urban corridors, to implement GMA; put zoning back into Comp Plan; visualization tools needed as primary tool to communicate zoning changes to public								✓					✓	✓		✓	✓			
9.14	Michael G. Gusa	8/4/2014 Letter to City Council	Change from R6-12 to Urban Corridor	For 2403 State St NE and 2427 State St NE, requests zoning change from R6-12 to Urban Corridor/Urban Corridor High Density. Treat these properties consistent with neighboring properties to be used as professional offices		✓						✓				✓					✓			
9.15	Joseph Ford and Mary Wilkinson	8/5/2014 IO Email	Urban Corridors, Zoning in Comp Plan, Natural Environment, Measurable Goals, Subarea Planning	1. Urban corridors undermine high density nodes and overwhelm neighborhoods. 2. Removing zoning from the Comp Plan is bad planning – “the single element of the current draft most destructive to actual ‘comprehensive planning’.” 3. Need visual depictions of each zoning area. 4. Natural Environment Chapter is inadequate – take time to do it right. 5. Lacks measurable goals. 6. Ensure strong sub-area planning & specify that sub-area plans are constrained by physical capabilities of area to support growth						✓		✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
9.16	John McKinlay	8/5/2014 IO Email	City Manager Land Use Recommendations, View Corridors	Supports the City Manager’s recommendations on minimum densities, alleys, and design review – ignored by draft. Creation of view corridors a concern – criss-cross in high density areas, inhibit reasonable use of private property and development encouraged by City. Replace PL8.1-8.5 with provisions consistent with Plan’s density goals and objectives.							✓					✓								
9.17	Carl See	8/5/2014	Urban	1. Supports removal of Capitol Blvd in								✓							✓		✓			

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals
		IO Email	Corridor, Neighborhood Centers, Flexible Land Use Map, Sub-Area Planning	southeast Olympia from Urban Corridor. 2. Support plans for locating a neighborhood center at Wildwood Building. 3. Supports plan for flexible land use map. 4. Supports proposal for sub-area planning as means of broadening conversation on city planning – City need to support process with funding for staff and provide clear expectations.																				
9.18	John Bay	8/5/2014 IO Email	PO/RM Zone at State & 4th	Avoid a “canyon of 3-6 story buildings” at this gateway to the city. Expand PO/RM district so both sides of street in zone & State to Tullis. Reduce height limit to 25’. Put in Residential Scale Commercial Dev’t Design District like Capitol Way south of the capitol.								✓							✓		✓			
9.19	Sherri Goulet	8/5/2014 IO Email	Urban Corridors, Zoning in Comp Plan, Natural Environment, Measurable Goals, Subarea Planning	1. Density should be in dense nodes, not urban corridors. 2. Put zoning back into Comp Plan 3. Needs content related to open areas for wildlife habitat 4. Needs more visuals 5. Lacks measurable goals. 6. Sub-area plans should be constrained by physical capabilities of area to support growth						✓		✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
9.20	Heather L. Burgess, Thurston County Chamber of Commerce	8/5/2014 Email to City Council	Incorporation of Business and Property Owners in Language Throughout, Soften Directives, Reinstate Earlier Version of Urban Corridor, Density Targets & Views	Annotated comments provided on: 1. Involving all stakeholders, including business and property owners, in public participation 2. Encouraging protection of natural environment instead of requiring it 3. Encouraging/discouraging land use practices rather than requiring/prohibiting 4. Chamber support for re-zoning criteria for low density neighborhoods and land use designation 5. Setting goals for high density instead of mandates 6. Honor long-standing commitment to regional Urban Corridor planning by reinstating ¼-mile width and Capitol Way to Urban Corridor 7. Revise PL 6.1 and PL 6.2 under design review process 8. Density targets at odds with new view		✓					✓	✓				✓	✓				✓		✓	

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals
				protection goals and policies – delete policies PL 8.1 – 8.5 and replace with single policy calling for public process to identify and preserve views 9. RE Urban Green Space and Tree Canopy – delete PL 7.2 and 7.3 – inconsistent with GMA 10. Transportation – multiple policies recommended for change. Multiple examples of language change in “track changes” format																				
9.21	Stuart Drebick, Adroit Contractors	8/4/2014 IO Email	Inconsistencies, Soften Directives	Development inconsistencies: plan for growth management vs. roadblocks to development, especially where development is to happen. Words like “required”, “must”, “shall”, and “will” are code language not planning language. Annotated commentary provided on individual policies and on 2/25/2014 staff report.		✓						✓				✓	✓		✓		✓			
10.0 MORE TIME NEEDED																								
10.1	George Smith, Myra Downing, Olympia Yacht Club	6/16/2014 IO Email	More Time Needed	Adoption of a plan which will control and influence the city’s growth and development for the next twenty years should not be taken lightly.						✓														
10.2	Lisa Reiner	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:01 p.m.	More Time Needed	Need more than one Council public hearing. Add illustrations of Urban Corridor vision; need nodes not corridors; address open areas; acquire wildlife habitat; address sea level rise and liquefaction; delete Economic Development Chapter especially condemnation by CRA.		✓				✓		✓	✓				✓			✓			✓	
10.3	Theresa Bergman	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:22 p.m.	More Time Needed	One public hearing is not enough; need a second public hearing. Work on Downtown Plan now.						✓											✓			
10.4	Patricia Tinsley	8/5/2014 IO Email	More Time Needed	Plan should span 100 years, not 20 Need to focus on vitalizing downtown before moving high density and commerce into neighborhoods. Citizens not the enemy. Don’t wall off our view and divide neighborhoods with high density housing.						✓	✓								✓		✓			
11.0 ECONOMY																								
11.1	Olympia Arts	7/15/2014	Vision	There is a link to the economic impact of		✓	✓																	

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals
	Commission submitted by Stephanie Johnson	IO Email		music in local economy. Propose two policy changes to Economy Chapter PE10.1 and PE10.2. Propose PE10.1 to read, "Continue to provide programs and services that support visual and performance arts activities in Olympia." Propose PE10.2 to read, "Actively support local art galleries, museums, arts and entertainment facilities, live music venues, arts organizations and businesses."																				
11.2	Bob Jacobs	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:52 p.m.	Annual Rezones, Economy Chapter	Good or at least acceptable. Plan is too flexible. Rezones should be annual. Remove Economy Chapter. Do not stimulate growth. Zoning map should be in the Plan. Adding 20,000 people will be a challenge. Costs of growth. Private investment stimulates growth.		✓												✓			✓			
11.3	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Economic Diversification	Page 19/20 – No evidence that diversification of the economy via establishment of new businesses would economy less vulnerable to downturns in state government. Remove this and similar statements. GL10 speaks of diversifying the local economy – a self-defeating goal. Suggests deleting. PL10.1 encourages industry that diversifies and strengthens economy. In our economy, diversification will weaken economy. Suggests concept of diversification be deleted.		✓																		
11.4	Bob Jacobs	8/4/2014 IO Email	Economic Development and Growth	In "A Healthy Economy Enhances our Quality of Life" section, statement "Economic development does not mean 'growth'...." Not useful. Should say what the authors think economic development means.		✓																		
11.5	Bob Jacobs	8/4/2014 IO Email	Retain Language Proposed for Deletion	Last paragraph in "Community Investment" (listed as change to be deleted): Retain language if Economy chapter retained. One of most sensible statements in chapter. Equivalent to what the CRA would allow.		✓																		
11.6	Bob Jacobs	8/4/2014 IO Email	Examples of Why Economy Chapter Should be Deleted	Under Goals and Policies of Economy Chapter – Items which illustrate why chapter should not be published because they are simplistic, unjustified and unclear: PE2.1 – Focuses only on positives not whole picture		✓																		

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals
				PE2.4 – Why diversify? PE2.5 – What does “support employers” mean? PE7.2 – What does “market Olympia’s advantages mean? Why? How? PE7.3 – Why a “more active city role in stimulating development”? How avoid compromising role as regulator? Delete chapter.																				
11.7	Bob Jacobs	8/4/2014 IO Email	Question Data on Tourism	A Diverse Economy chapter – Figures on revenue seem unlikely. Analysis gives sweeping generalities which sound good but are misleading. If keeping in, give overall impact of tourism, e.g., wages, seasonal unemployment, traffic, social services.		✓																		
11.8	Bob Jacobs	8/4/2014 IO Email	State Government as Economic Driver	Port of Olympia section under Olympia’s Economic Profile – First bullet statement that state government “will not be a driver of the regional economy in the near future” is wrong. Perhaps authors meant driver of employment growth.		✓																		
11.9	Bob Jacobs	8/4/2014 IO Email	Renovation / Reuse of Buildings	PE8.4 – Not always true. Avoid sweeping statements. Use “often”.		✓																		
11.10	Bob Jacobs	8/4/2014 IO Email	Advantages and Disadvantages of Private Investment	Statement under “A Healthy Economy Enhances our Quality of Life” on increasing our revenue base is incomplete and misleading. All advantages and disadvantages should be mentioned. All too common in the public sector to look only at financial benefits to government. Research indicates investment in local community produces financial loss for government.		✓																		
11.11	Bob Jacobs	8/4/2014 IO Email	Infrastructure’s Impact	End of “A Healthy Economy Enhances our Quality of Life”, statement: “infrastructure is critical to our ability retain (sic) attract businesses” – more general statement preferable, e.g., “infrastructure is critical to our ability to serve residents and businesses.”		✓																		
12.0 UTILITIES																								
12.1	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Drinking Water Quality Standards	PU7.2 speaks of compliance with state/federal water quality standards and is not sufficient. Drinking water has chemicals																				

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals
				not regulated. Strongly suggest the public be regularly informed RE all pollutants, resulting problems, measures to reduce.																				
12.2	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Fiber Optic Conduit	GU22 – Wonders if wise goal because of fast changes in infrastructure. Wonders if should be dropped.																				
12.3	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Appendix A Redundant with Main Text	Appendix A contains redundancy with previous sections. Combine information																				
13.0 PARKS, ARTS & RECREATION																								
13.1	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Parks for Existing Population	PR1.1 – Delete “attract tourism and private investment to Olympia”. Parks and recreation programs should primarily serve existing populations.																				
13.2	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Ballfields	Page 291 – Under heading of “Community Parks”, critical to add current and needed numbers of ballfields (rectangles and diamonds)																				
13.3	Brian Faller, LBA Woods Park Coalition	8/5/2014 IO Email	City Acquisition of Habitat and Recreational Trail Areas	1. Natural Environment Section: Should reflect that important part of land stewardship to acquire natural habitat within city and recognize that new development will result in loss of existing habitat and trails. Map of open space and environmentally sensitive areas missing data surrounding LBA Woods. Recommended language in “track changes” version. 2. Public Health, Parks, Arts, and Recreation Section: Include role of wildlife habitat and trails. Should refer to 2015 PAR Plan (not 2010 PAR Plan). Clarify definition of “open space”. Need to consider newer research. Acknowledge potential use of utility tax for open space acquisition. Recommended language in “track changes” version.													✓						✓	
14.0 MISCELLANEOUS																								
14.1	Ilene Le Vee, League of Women Voters	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:14 p.m.		Will submit written comments																				

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals	
14.2	Mike Reid, Port of Olympia	Oral Comment 7/22/2014 Public Hearing 8:31 p.m.		Will be submitting written comment.																					
14.3	Rich Christian	7/24/2014 IO Email	Master Plan vs. Comprehensive Plan	"The great cities of the world all followed a master plan, not a state required comprehensive plan."			✓						✓				✓							✓	
14.4	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Remove Photos	Photos are costly and provide no information.																					
14.6	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Unincorporated Islands	PP7.4 – Obsolete. The city has/will soon eliminate all unincorporated islands.																					
14.7	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Map Accuracy	Page 69 – Paragraph on Future Land Use Map states that map boundaries are approximate. "I suggest most strongly that these lines be exact."																	✓				
14.8	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Numbers Accuracy	Page 115, Sub-Area Planning – 12 planning areas of five to ten thousand residents each would be 60,000 to 120,000.															✓						
14.9	Bob Jacobs	8/3/2014 IO Email	Policy Numbering Error	PU11.6 appears twice. PU11.8 is a repetition of one of the PU11.6 texts.																					
14.10	Bob Jacobs	8/4/2014 IO Email	Table Missing Heading	Page 310, under Olympia's Economic Profile – Table needs a heading. Perhaps "Thurston County Employment Data, 2012"		✓																			
14.11	Tim Walker	8/5/2014 IO Email	Downtown, Look of Comp Plan, Who Benefits	The Plan says nothing about downtown. Unclear what the end product will look like. Who will benefit from Comp Plan?																					
14.12	Kroydan "Kraig" Chalem	8/5/2014 IO Email	Public Information and Participation	Improve public engagement and involvement in process by: using cross-referencing in Comp Plan, allowing public access to Zoom & permit tracking systems, host on-going education classes, train staff to better articulate City goals and policies.																					
14.13	Thera Black	8/5/2014 IO Email	Approaches: To Urbanism, Data, Equitable Process	"The Plan seems to imply that increasing urbanism is a problem to protect people from, not the foundation for strategic solutions that help us achieve many of our shared goals." Plan prescribes details not backed up by market analysis or feasibility to determine if details are counterproductive. Plan reads																					

	Commenter	Comment Date	Topic	Summary of Comments	Street Connects	Economy	Vision & Values	20 mph Local Access Streets /Speed Limits	Urban Agriculture	More Time Needed	View Protection	Urban Corridors	Waterfront	Liquefaction	Sea Level Rise/Flooding	Consistency	Critical Areas, Wildlife Habitat Natural Environment	Rezones Annually	Neighborhoods	More Visuals	Zoning	Solar Access, Conservation, Sustainability	Open Space	Measurable Goals			
				more like a plan for downtown and established neighborhoods. Social equity: most future housing will be outside of the gateways, excluding the majority of people moving here. Comp Plan process dissuades people from staying involved with a small number of participants dominating. Where is voice of business community?																							
15.0 SAFETY																											
15.1	Dean Schwickerath	8/5/2014 IO Email	Safety Consistency	City lacks consistency over providing safe neighborhoods and zoning for densities. City's responsibility to provide safe conditions for citizens. Traffic volumes. Need safe travel paths and sidewalks. Address abandoned vehicles. Address homeless situation/homeless camps.	✓			✓												✓							