

MINUTES OF MEETING

Olympia Planning Commission Meeting
Wednesday, July 25, 2012
Olympia City Hall, Council Chambers
601 4th Avenue East
Olympia, WA

Call to Order

Chair Tousley called the meeting to order at 6:29 p.m.

Attendance

Members Present: Judy Bardin, Roger Horn, Paul Ingman, Agnieszka Kiswa, Jerome Parker, Larry Leveen, James Reddick, Rob Richards, and Amy Tousley

City of Olympia Staff: Associate Planners Amy Buckler and Stacey Ray, Planning Manager Todd Stamm, Julieann DeSalvo, Transportation Director David Riker, and Senior Planner Sophie Stimson.

Others: Tom Gow, Recording Secretary, Puget Sound Meeting Services

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS:	
Acceptance of Agenda:	Approved as amended.
Discussion: Format for August 1 & 8 OPC Meetings:	Agreed to move forward without assistance of a facilitator.
Reports:	Agreed to reschedule the July 27 Leadership Team meeting.
Draft Letter to Land Use and Environment Subcommittee:	Agreed to review final letter at the Commission's August 1 meeting prior to forwarding to Councilmember Langer.

Acceptance of Agenda

Chair Tousley reviewed the agenda and requested the inclusion of an update by staff on the role of the Supplemental EIS on the comprehensive plan. Under committee reports, Chair Tousley added a discussion on a letter from Comprehensive Plan Subcommittee members Ingman and Parker to Councilmember Langer.

Commissioner Leveen moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to approve the amended agenda. Motion carried.

Announcements

Commissioner Leveen reminded everyone of the Squaxin Island Indian Tribe's 2012 Canoe Journey at the Port peninsula on July 29. A 1 p.m. a ceremony is scheduled. The landing and celebration is a community-wide experience and everyone is encouraged to attend.

Chair Tousley reported the public hearing on the Trillium comprehensive plan amendment has been rescheduled to August 20. The applicant has requested additional time to address some issues.

Public Communication

There were no public comments.

Public Hearing on 'July Draft' of Comprehensive Plan Update

Chair Tousley reviewed the public hearing process for receiving public testimony on the comprehensive plan update.

Over the weekend, the community received a flyer announcing the public hearing as a hearing on the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). This public hearing is on the update of the comprehensive plan and not the SMP. The flyer was not sent by the City and is not an official publication or part of the official notice released by the City.

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of Meeting
July 25, 2012 Page 2 of 22**

The Commission adopted several options for receiving testimony. One option is receiving testimony individually or from one or two citizens with a 10 minute limit, to include Q&A with the Commission. Another option includes a panel of 3-4 citizens with a 15 minute limit. Each option includes time for the Commission to ask clarifying questions of citizens providing testimony. The public hearing may be extended to Thursday, July 26, if needed. The final public hearing will be held on October 29.

All emails received by the Commission from the community are being forwarded to staff and will become part of the public record.

Chair Tousley opened the public hearing at 6:38 p.m.

Dennis Bloom, Planning Manager, Intercity Transit, PO Box 659, Olympia, said the City Council, Planning Commission, and City staff provided opportunities to involve the public over the last several years and encouraged interested citizens to participate in the comprehensive plan update. City staff should be commended for those efforts. Two elements of the comprehensive plan that he would like to address is the Transportation and Urban Land Use Design sections. Intercity Transit submitted a number of specific comments to the City on the transportation section of the April draft and provided specific details about the Transportation and Urban Land Use Design sections at public meetings and at in-house staff reviews. Many of the comments have been incorporated within the draft. He reiterated Intercity Transit's support in principle of the elements of the transportation mobility that the City Council approved in 2009. Many are now incorporated in the current comprehensive plan draft. The strategies suggest land use changes that support building density along certain corridors and it also anticipates a higher volume of transit service. This includes land use for proximity improvements to encourage people to walk, bike, and utilize transit. In addition, passenger amenities that provide shelter from the elements and improve safety and accessibility for riders, as well as, improving operations have been included. In turn, the City anticipates enhanced transit service in the form of more frequent fixed route service. It's important that land use codes are implemented allowing those types of developments to occur. In practical terms, there is still a need to work through the particulars of such an effort. Intercity Transit is a public agency and relies on consistent local sales tax revenue. Bus fares alone do not generate the operational requirements for the system. A healthy economy goes a long way in ensuring services is sustainable. Additionally, by Board policy, consideration of service changes affecting 15% of Olympia routes requires public review. This also includes environmental review required by the federal government to consider potential impacts at the economic and community level so that services are equitably considered. Ultimately, the Transit Authority has the final say on what is approved. There is a need to work through the particulars of how something like a community transit network, as suggested by the sustainability mobility strategies effort, might come together including how such service will be covered and maintained.

As for the remainder of the Transportation Land Use Design sections, Mr. Bloom pointed out several other areas of concern. "Complete streets" is a good workable solution; however, there are operational considerations for transit buses that are 30 to 40 feet long traveling in 10-foot wide travel lanes. Generally, the agency tries to have far-side section bus stops and adding bike lanes in the appropriate corner radius dimensions to accommodate turning movements for buses needs to be considered. There have been instances in the service district where a new pedestrian corner bulb-out has unintentionally made it impossible for a turning bus at that street. As more jurisdictions add those features, the agency is finding it difficult to maintain existing routes.

Residential density indicators, such as number of housing units per acre can be an insufficient indicator of transit-supported land use. There are a number of discussions underway in the land use transportation world today on the appropriate density needed for transit service. In general, diversity of uses along a corridor and in proximity to the corridors, which incorporates good design and provides a network of street connectivity including sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike paths, is a better indicator for sustaining a transit route. Guiding transit-dependent land use to locate along transit routes is important, such as schools, public services, major employers, and senior and multi-family housing. In particular, there is recognition that within the draft plan, the future of Olympia becoming more urban will also face an aging population and in turn that will influence transportation options available to the public.

Another section that needs clarification is GT18 involving high capacity transportation. There's a reference to developing land use associated with high capacity "transit plan," which should be corrected to state, "transit planning." The notion of future rail stations within that same section within Olympia might be more "cart before horse" since previous work at the regional level makes it clear that more analysis will be needed before a real vision of what that might mean is identified. Finally, transit levels are multijurisdictional and city limits do not dictate the level of service of a route. Instead, there is a complexity of who, what, where, and when service along a street is influenced, such as housing density, employment, and commercial centers that can be major trip generators. Intercity Transit encourages interjurisdictional coordination of land use efforts along specific sets of corridors to improve service efficiencies including traffic chokepoints, traffic mitigation impacts, and land-use development. Mr. Bloom thanked the Commission for the opportunity to comment.

Commissioner Parker asked Mr. Bloom to submit a written copy of his comments. Mr. Bloom affirmed the request.

Thera Black, Senior Transportation Planner, Thurston Regional Planning Council, 2424 Heritage Court SW, said she has a marked copy of the latest draft that she will provide to the Commission. Her comments pertain to urban corridors, land use, system efficiency, and geometric design. She began her comments focusing on multi-modal. As a regional transportation planner she was pleased to see efforts to develop a transportation element that was very multi-modal focused. Multi-modal is the notion of providing for the movement of people more so than vehicles and she appreciates the emphasis on bicycle and pedestrian access and transit. One thing that she didn't see was more specificity. The vision and the aspirations are laudable and are very worthy, but the region has spent 20 years trying to do a lot of this and she believes the region is moving to a place where it's beyond just encouraging but needing to get into some nitty-gritty details, if for no other reason, then to set realistic public expectations. The concepts espoused in the plan and the ability to leave the car at home and walk instead of driving or having frequent transit service instead of driving is very much dependent on the built form. There are areas in Olympia, particularly in the urban corridor where biking, transit, and walking can be viable over time if the region is successful with land use. The draft implies that it's possible to walk or take transit anywhere in the City instead of driving, and frankly she does not believe that is true as most of southeast Olympia will continue to be auto-oriented because it's primarily single-family residential. That is the danger in relying on land use density as the primary determinant of transit service. Twenty+ years of experience has proven that the region needs more than 7+ units per acre of residential. What's required is the proximity of uses and critical mass. That is where the notion of urban corridor comes into play. Ms. Black referred to concerns expressed during the Monday night public hearing about how urban corridors are addressed in the plan. The work resulting from the regional Urban Corridors Task Force could have included greater specificity in the plan to distinguish urban corridors from the old high density corridor concept. The intent of the urban corridor is trying to create targeted districts on the corridor. Those neighbors that live in the Carlyon and Governor Stevens neighborhoods don't really need to worry because that is not low hanging fruit. The district that the City of Olympia has identified is along Martin Way as a place where if efforts are expended, the City might be able to create the kind of environment attractive for urban infill and redevelopment. That is not envisioned for the Carlyon neighborhood at this point. Greater specificity in the plan would help to better align the intent with the regional concept of the notion of linear communities.

As the City talks about land use and creating compact and walkable streets, it's very important to be careful regarding intersection geometry. Although it's possible to design every intersection that works great for pedestrians, it could discourage transit access as well as the ability for delivery and service trucks to get in and out. Complete streets that don't serve complete neighborhoods are a huge missed opportunity. If Archibald Sisters cannot receive their goods then the area is not mixed use. It's important to be very careful as the process moves forward to balance the desire to create a safe pedestrian environment with the kinds of conditions that will be necessary to generate the activity for pedestrians.

Ms. Black said she would like to see the Transportation section not treated as a silo issue, but instead reflected throughout as to what it requires to support pedestrians and transit. Although, the plan speaks about the need for bike lanes and sidewalks there are also land use elements that will generate trips. For those that live in an outlying area, the notion that they will be able to leave their car behind and walk is unrealistic. It could be realistic along the Martin Way, downtown, or Capitol Boulevard corridors. A greater distinction could be made

and policies created to clarify where that makes sense and where a little bit more specificity could provide more realism to the public about what the expectations are about the future and not just a pie-in-the-sky vision.

Something that was missing tremendously in the plan was any recognition of the importance of operations and system efficiency. She is uncomfortable with the notion that congestion can be solved and doesn't believe that's accurate. The region will likely increase mobility and access; however, solving congestion will likely not be possible. The current system is likely what the City will have to work with. There may be a few more connections and some widening, but for the most part, the next 20 years will focus more on how to use the existing system more efficiently. The key to that is operation. It was addressed in the plan to some extent, such as transit signal priority, but there are other tools as well including access management as one example. Olympia already has demonstrated access management in parts of downtown where it has restricted left turn movements during certain hours of the day. There may be a need to think about that more seriously at other intersections, particularly intersections impacting transit where buses must wait 2 to 3 signal cycles for cars to turn left. It may be time to start discussing some access management issues. Signal timing and signal coordination is another one. It is time to elevate the importance of operations in both the comprehensive plan and increasing its priority in terms of internal funding decisions. It's a very important part of making the system work efficiently for everyone who uses it.

Ms. Black referred to mitigation fees, what developers pay for, and how the City expects to mitigate impacts of growth. She suggested broadening the language to avoid closing off future opportunities. Some cities are using impact fees to acquire funding for signal timing projects rather than building capacity, which may be something the City wants to enable. The City may also want to consider location efficiency in the future. A developer developing a single family residential subdivision in southeast Olympia where the area will always be auto-oriented might have different fees than development located closer to the urban corridor where people have viable alternatives to driving. One of the recommendations of the Urban Corridor Task Force is to look at location efficiency.

In addition to the need to look at intersection geometry, for a community that is so committed to mixed-use neighborhoods and communities, Ms. Black suggested the City should seriously consider the last mile of delivery of goods and services and how UPS trucks fit on streets. There is no mention at all in the plan concerning freight.

Commissioner Horn referred to the urban corridors and transit oriented districts and asked whether they are mutually exclusive or whether it's possible to have both. Ms. Black replied that the City has both. The notion of corridor districts can be compared to beads on a necklace where instead of trying to spread urban infill and redevelopment up and down a corridor where it could take many decades to complete, development is focused in certain districts where linear connectivity can occur. Corridor districts need to be on primary transit corridors because they would become a wasted opportunity if the City tried to create them off the corridor. Currently there is 15-minute transit service along the corridor and if the region is ever able to consider high-capacity transit in the future, whether it's light rail or bus rapid transit, it will be along the main corridors. Creating those neighborhood districts along the corridor is essential.

Commissioner Leveen asked how location efficient impact fees could be considered at the regional level. Ms. Black replied that the region is just beginning to explore the option as another tool. It was one of the recommendations by the task force.

Commissioner Horn commented that those residents who live in the outlying areas would have an opportunity to leave their car at home if retail developed within surrounding neighborhoods. Ms. Black agreed it's possible to attract and maintain neighborhood scale commercial economically if the political ramifications could be overcome. The emphasis on commute management is very specific to commute trips; however, commute trips only account for 15% to 20% of all trips. Adding small-scale and viable commercial development either inside of or adjacent to existing neighborhoods would enable people to make trips on foot or bicycle instead of driving.

Frank Gorecki, 12532 Waddel Creek Court SW, reported the Port of Olympia Citizens Advisory Committee sent a letter to the City Council in May commenting on the April comprehensive plan draft. He is the past chair

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of Meeting
July 25, 2012 Page 5 of 22**

of the committee and Ms. Cuykendall is the current chair. Since he has been unable to find the letter on the City's website, Mr. Gorecki read the letter into the record. "The undersigned members of the Port of Olympia Citizens Advisory Committee have been following Thurston County's Regional Plan for Sustainable Development because the Port is a countywide special purpose district. We have also been following the City of Olympia's Comprehensive Plan and Shoreline Master Program updates because three of the Port's business units have substantial operations on the Port Peninsula and are subject to Olympia's jurisdiction (the Seaport, Marina, and Real Estate). We have three significant comments regarding the latter; (1) view corridors; (2) alignment between Olympia's draft Comprehensive Plan and the draft Shoreline Master Program; and (3) economic development.

Many of the proposed view corridors (Chapter 1: Land Use and Urban Design, PL 3.10) restrict the Port's ability to perform all of the functions assigned to it by state law, including marine terminals, marinas, and facilities for economic development (RCW 53.04). Further, the establishment of view corridors is an unjustified regulatory taking benefiting some Olympia private property owners with a taxpayer subsidy from the entire County and burdening the Port without compensation. Most of the Port taxpayers live outside Olympia and are not benefited or burdened by the proposed view corridors. However, we will have to make up for the adverse consequences to the Port, including litigation and stymied economic development, which in turn will reduce the Port's ability to repay its bonds and perform its state authorized functions without tax increases. Vibrant cities have changing skylines, not static ones.

The draft Comprehensive Plan section on the Economy recognizes the role of the Port of Olympia in Olympia's economy, but it is inconsistent with the draft Shoreline Master Program (SMP), which designates East Bay on the Port Peninsula as Urban Conservancy. The Port has already invested in the infrastructure for East Bay to be a mixed use commercial district after a robust public participation process, consistent with the draft Olympia Comprehensive Plan. If this is changed (down-zoned) by the SMP, the non-Olympia taxpayers who support the Port will be subsidizing the City of Olympia without any corresponding benefit. Further, the Port has already demonstrated its ability to protect Puget Sound by completing the Cascade Pole Clean-up and preparing for sea-level rise. The SMP should be aligned with the Comprehensive Plan and East Bay should remain a mixed-use commercial district under an Urban Intensity designation.

The City should work more closely with the Port to attract development to the Port Peninsula which could provide services for a growing downtown population, something that has the potential to benefit the entire County without disproportionately burdening Olympia taxpayers. Collaboration with other jurisdictions maximizes economic opportunity and funding for regional sustainable development to which the Port has made, and can make, a significant contribution. We support the comments in the Port's June 24, 2010 and January 7, 2011 letters to the Olympia Planning Commission, as well as the Department of Ecology's comments on the Urban Conservancy designation for East Bay in its June 6, 2011 letter to the City and further reiterate our recommendation in support of the Urban Intensity designation."

Clydia Cuykendall, 4203 Amber Court SE, said she is one of the 13 signatories of the letter that Mr. Gorecki just read into the record. She has over 35 years of legal experience preventing litigation between private enterprises, their surrounding communities, and the regulators, including service on the National Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. In her opinion, the view corridor's will generate litigation from which local lawyers like herself will benefit; however, as a taxpayer she doesn't want to fund this litigation. Her nightmare is that the City of Olympia and the Port of Olympia will engage in litigating corridors or conflicts between the comprehensive plan and the Shoreline Management Program. As a taxpayer to both jurisdictions, she will be paying the legal costs of both sides. There is an existing legal process for private property owners to preserve the use that they want. They can negotiate view easements. The City should not interfere with this process by imposing view corridors without the consent of those affected. She is also very concerned corridors will restrict the development of solar energy systems within their scope.

Commissioner Horn asked for a further explanation regarding solar impacts. Ms. Cuykendall said she attended a meeting of the Planning Commission where one of the Commissioners expressed concern that the views from the Capitol Campus down to the Port would be ruined by the installation of solar panels on the roofs of buildings. That is what led her to consider this comment, as she is an investor of Community Solar and believes it has

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of Meeting
July 25, 2012 Page 6 of 22**

great prospects in the City of Olympia and also within the entire county in terms of sustainable development. Because of the comment that she heard at the Planning Commission meeting, she has that concern.

Chair Tousley reported the letter that was submitted was provided to staff. Ms. Cuykendall said the committee addressed the letter to the City Council at the request of one of the Port Commissioners assuming that they would provide the letter to the Planning Commission.

Timothy Harris, Goodstein Law Group, 501 S. G. Street, Tacoma, spoke on behalf of the Port of Olympia. He expressed appreciation for the availability of staff throughout this process and looks forward to continuing to work with staff as this plan evolves. He spoke on Monday and reiterated his concern about the confusion between the Shoreline Master Program and the comprehensive plan update. The comprehensive plan update doesn't have to be submitted until 2016, so there is some time, and his hope is that it could be moved along in a more linear fashion to eliminate confusion. He will submit written comments by the end of the week. The previous speakers addressed the three issues that he plans to address regarding view corridors, economic development, and consistency with the Shoreline Master Program because they have to be legally consistent. Generally, the current concern about aspects of this comprehensive plan is that it may stifle economic development in and around Olympia. Specifically, the Port is concerned about any aspects of the comprehensive plan that limit Port activities or the uses to which Port activities may be put. There is also concern about harmony between the Port's plan and the City's vision for Port property. To this end, important parts of the comprehensive plan related to the Port's economic development mission were eliminated from the July 2012 draft. It was however, included in the original draft.

As an aside, the Growth Management Act (GMA) has a roadmap of what comprehensive plans should look like and there are many elements. In an earlier conversation with Manager Stamm, he indicated that the City does not consider those elements as chapters. Mr. Harris agreed with that legally, but most jurisdictions treat them as chapters, and in fact, this jurisdiction used to treat them as chapters and it would be easier to review the plan to see exactly how it meets the requirements and the goals of the GMA. In the current format, it requires a bit of thumbing around and reviewing different sections. There is some extraneous information that is not required under the GMA and there is information difficult to locate. The most obvious example is the lack of a housing chapter or housing element. He understands that the draft is broken up into different areas; however, it's difficult to determine if it's adequate in meets the goals of the GMA. In fact, housing is a concern of the Port, as there has to be plenty of affordable housing for residents to ensure an adequate workforce and to ensure economic development in the area.

The Port encourages the Planning Commission to develop a comprehensive plan that benefits jobs. Adequate transportation is relevant and is a concern of the Port. The community would also be well served by a comprehensive plan that is clear, predictable, flexible, and directly addresses the goals and framework set forth in the GMA. The Port also urges the Commission to reconsider putting Port-related activities back in the draft that were removed from the previous draft. The Port is also concerned that many aspects of the new draft limit industrial uses. Based on the new future land use map and the changes that decrease the footprint of industrial uses on the Port Peninsula, the actual footprint is smaller than it was in the previous draft, which he can understand. One of the reasons is that it's meant to be a flexible barrier and not meant to be set in stone. However, the problem is that it can be reduced or enlarged and the Port would like to have more definition and more flexibility to ensure where Port industry can grow. Rather than limiting, the Port would like to increase flexibility so that the Port can achieve its mission of fostering economic development for the citizens of Thurston County.

There are other things in the plan about designations that have changed, designations that limit industrial use, deleting the high density designation of places, and changing light industrial to auto services that limit the flexibility of what can be done with those areas to encourage economic development.

Finally, protecting, preserving, and enhancing views of Capitol Campus, Budd Inlet, the downtown skyline, Mount Rainier, Black Hills, Capitol Lake, and the Olympic Mountains are all aspects that view corridors are meant to protect. However, that's a lot of stuff to ensure that you can see throughout the City. He asked the Commission to take another look, temper those view corridors with reasonable land use allowances, and

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of Meeting
July 25, 2012 Page 7 of 22**

incorporate the goals of the GMA pertaining to economic development. At a minimum, the draft plan should better define what it means to preserve, protect, and enhance views. It appears based on the draft that it's not possible to build downtown and in particular on the Port peninsula or anywhere throughout the City of Olympia if it will interfere with the views. The Port would appreciate a better definition of views. The Port will be submitting comments that are more detailed by Friday, July 27.

Commissioner Leveen referred to the comments about the removal of Port related activities from the draft comprehensive plan. There were also comments about the limitations on Port activities. He asked if those comments were in relationship to the example provided of the change in zoning. Mr. Harris replied that it pertains to change in zoning, view corridors, and transportation, which are all concerns. For example, freight is of concern as well as housing because it impacts the Port. Mr. Harris explained that it appears if Port-related activities are removed; the City is in fact, providing more flexibility to the Port to make its own determinations. He referred to Appendix 3A, which was removed that speaks to the Port's mission. There was good language in the appendix about what the Port does, why it does it, and how important it is to the community as well as the Port Commission and its charge to foster economic development. It was an important part of the comprehensive plan before and it seemed to be incorporated as part of the economic goals as well as the land use goals. The Port believes it should be retained in the current draft.

Chair Tousley asked about the timing of the last update of the Port's Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements. Mr. Gorecki reported the Port Commission updated the Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements in November 2011. The plan is published on the Port's website as the 2012 plan. The plan includes various capital investments opportunities that are being explored for the entire Port operation. Chair Tousley expressed an interest in obtaining a link to the document.

Rob Ahlschwede, 3726 Wesley Loop NW, said his main concern involves the Parks, Arts, and Recreation Chapter of the comprehensive plan. He questioned the inclusion of the historic preservation section within the Parks, Arts, and Recreation Chapter. Historic Preservation should have its own chapter, as it has had in the past. The history of Olympia is important to what Olympia is, who we are, and what we want to become. To hide this important part of the City in the Parks chapter is not acceptable. In reading the chapters, it is clear that the role of historic preservation has been basically cut and pasted into the staff draft and that needs to be changed. The work of the Heritage Commission should not be diminished by adding it as a mere footnote to the Parks, Arts, and Recreation Chapter. There are currently 10 chapters within the draft and it's difficult to understand why 11 chapters would be too many. It is something important to the City, has always been important to the City, and it should be seriously considered. Historic preservation deserves to have its own chapter. It's more than important to this community. Beyond that, section PC 5.6 speaks to preserving street rights-of-ways which extends to the shorelines, which is important. The City needs to ensure that those parcels are secured, protected, and made available for use by the community. The land, small that it may be, may provide access to the water for everyone. This has been done in other cities. Those lands become an important access point for citizens. For a little signage and some maintenance, it provides a great benefit. Another issue is the discussion pertaining to the SMP and the comprehensive plan and schedules. He agreed with the speaker from the Monday meeting who indicated that the Commission should defer the comprehensive plan until the SMP is completed. There are many things in the SMP that are not secure and not solid that the comprehensive plan depends on. The Commission has been working on the SMP for three years. To think that the comprehensive plan can be completed in the next three months doesn't make sense to him. He suggested the Commission should seriously considering postponing, finalizing, and changing the calendar.

Steve Hodes, 3136 Maringo SE, said he opposes the current urban corridors designation for parts of Governor Stevens/Carlyon neighborhood. Another speaker indicated that the neighborhood is not "low hanging fruit," which was a relief. As indicated in earlier email comments on the draft plan, the neighborhood is a neighborhood of single family homes with many dating to the 1930s and before. There are virtually no multifamily dwellings in the neighborhood. The neighborhood, other than for open space, is currently 3-5 units an acre. The area is zoned 4-5 units an acre or maybe a little higher. He appreciates the changes and clarification that was included in the latest draft that indicates the neighborhood designation density target should be 7+ units rather than 15+ units. That is very helpful. He urged maintaining the current density in the area of 4-7 units per acre.

Commissioner Parker requested clarification from staff on whether citizens who previously submitted comments on the April plan need to resubmit the comments for the July draft. Senior Planner Buckler replied that all previous comments are published online and are included in the update record. It's not necessary to resubmit comments except if the comments pertain to changes included in the current draft.

Kathleen Byrd, 132 Plymouth NW, said her comments pertain to the 16th Street and Decatur connections in the Southwest Olympia Neighborhood. She is a member of the Southwest Olympia Neighborhood Association because she lives south of Harrison and has been involved with the association for 12 years. She is also a bicycle commuter and rides her bike year-round from the neighborhood to South Puget Sound Community College (SPSCC). The Decatur bike path is arguably the only safe route from the neighborhood to Black Lake Boulevard and SPSCC. She's very interested in protecting that bike path. The Commission was provided with copies of the Decatur dialogues, a compilation of emails and letters that have been sent by Southwest Olympia residents in opposition to opening Decatur Street or 16th Street. The map outlines the location of the bike path on Decatur that was featured during a bike event day two years ago. Many commuters from SPSCC use the bike path regularly.

Ms. Byrd focused her comments on the transportation section of the draft plan, specifically on the connectivity policy where there is some specific language proposed as a change that has a drastic impact on the potential for neighborhood involvement in any decision-making around opening streets. The current language of the comprehensive plan states, "To determine when a new connection to be made to existing streets, the City will determine whether the merits outweigh the demerits of the whole package," In the draft plan, the language is, "Pursue all street connections." This is a new policy. This analysis will occur at the development review level if a connection is opposed instead of the current practice of proving the need of a proposed connection; the assumption is that all streets are needed. This evaluation will be used to describe why a proposed connection is not considered valuable to the street network and requires the opponent to make the case against the connection. Ms. Byrd said her read on this is that the neighborhood is viewed as an opponent – so the people living, residing, and using the neighborhood for biking and walking are the ones who have to bear the burden of proving that the connection is not a valuable one. This is drastic change in language that is being proposed in the July draft and it raises concerns and is counter to the goals of public participation and to the larger vision of the Transportation Chapter of the plan, which is to promote walkability and biking. The criteria for what will be analyzed are also drastically different in the current plan than in the July draft plan. For example, the first two criteria in the current plan are that the City will take into account, (1) neighborhood development plans, and (2) pedestrian safety. In the July draft plan, the first two criteria are, (1) it will analyze the impacts on directness of travel for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists, and (2) impacts on directness of travel for emergency, public, and commercial service vehicles. Both of the criteria relate to directness of travel. It's really about convenience for cars and not about bicyclists and walkers. Street connections are about connecting streets for cars. There is already a bike pathway that many people use to move from the neighborhood to places of work, commercial businesses, and recreation uses. Her concern with that aspect of the policy change, in addition to the very specifics of street connections, is because it applies to any neighborhood that wants to be part of a decision-making process around street connection.

Bethany Weidner, 1415 6th Avenue SW, reported she is past president of the Southwest Olympia Neighborhood Association. Brad O'Brien is the current president and could not attend the public hearing. She encouraged the Commission to read through the Decatur dialogues as they are fun and interesting. Generally, they reflect the views of the bulk of the neighborhood in that opening 16th and Decatur to Highway 101 would basically create an off-ramp that would flow traffic through the neighborhood to the mall and other places to avoid congestion on Black Lake Boulevard and Cooper Point Road amongst other places. It's a feeling that is generally shared that the two connection possibilities should actually remain closed. She reiterated Ms. Byrd's comments about the policy in the draft plan. The neighborhood has developed suggested language that the neighborhood would like the Commission to instruct staff to replace to substitute for the language in the draft plan. The language is a sea change on the current policy and effectively shifts the burden of proof to someone who disagrees with the connection even in an established neighborhood. She said she spoke with David Riker and he indicated that there is no intent to prevent an established neighborhood from being able to participate in

the decision. If that is the case, changes need to be made to the language. Currently, it shifts the proof of burden from innocent until proven guilty to guilty and provides a little window to prove innocence.

Ms. Weidner referred to page 2 (handout materials) of the side-by-side comparison that lays out the description of the Decatur Street connection, what's included in the current comprehensive plan, what's included in the July draft, and the requested new language from the neighborhood. In the draft, the language contains a lot of unsupported assertions that support a favorable view of opening Decatur. The draft plan indicates that any decision on whether to connect to Decatur Street to Caton Way and open 16th Avenue as a vehicular connection will not be made until the West Olympia Access Study Phase 2 Study is complete. That's the dispositive statement about Decatur and 16th Street. This description includes a lot of things that are in dispute and are assertions that are unsupported. For example, another provision states, "A system of traffic calming devices has been installed and these devices should be effective in reducing the volume of through traffic from outside the immediate neighborhood." Well, that's not necessary for a connection where the decision is not to be made until new information comes in. Another problem with the draft language as designated on the left-hand side of the current comprehensive plan is the deletion of information that suggested that the area of the neighborhood experiencing traffic increases associated with opening those connections would be incompatible with a residential environment. Staff retained language from the current plan that favors opening or suggests that there wouldn't be any impacts. Staff deleted the language that indicated that there would be impacts. The neighborhood believes that the change is not necessary and it raises some questions about the intent of the provision. Another statement that is disputed is the one pertaining to a majority of users for this connection would be local. She understands that it's based on a staff presentation from 2001 before development occurred on the west side expansion of Capital Mall, expansion of Capital Medical Center, and the development of subdivisions on Mud Bay. She asked why that language is included. None of those assertions are necessary to document the Decatur and 16th Street issue and the neighborhood does not believe they are appropriate. Other language has been suggested, which is accurate, stating, "A proposal to move forward on a new West Olympia Access to State Route 101 by connecting the Southwest neighborhood via connections at Decatur Street and 16th Avenue was rejected by the City Council in 2004. At that time, the Council instructed staff to create a bike way connector." The next paragraph states, "New vehicle access would allow residents of the neighborhood direct route to 101, but it would also make it an attractive opportunity for outside cars to use the route to go to the mall, Capital Medical Center, or downtown." According to the map it is possible to envision why opening 16th and Decatur represents a desirable alternative for bypassing congestion on Cooper Point Road. The last of the suggested changes points out the agreement that the connections would not be considered until after completion of the study. Other language the Commission is requested to remove that is consistent with the same observations is the listing of the Decatur Street connection in Appendix B as a connection to be opened. It also exists in the engineering and design and development standards, which are being revised as a connection to be opened. To be consistent with the Council decision that it will not be considered until after the close of the study, the neighborhood would like that language removed as well.

Commissioner Parker asked whether the last request is reflected in the materials provided to the Commission. Ms. Weidner offered to provide the information to the Commission.

Martin Collamore, 2915 Moore, said he's not a planner or an official government bureaucrat. His background is in science. He has been a homeowner in the Carlyon/Governor Stevens area for 35 years and raised two children and has a wonderful house. He applauded the Commission's willingness to entertain comments on the urban corridor issue. He doesn't understand why the small section of the neighborhood from I-5 along Capitol Boulevard, which would affect his home directly, is included in the urban corridor. There is no parking along Capitol Boulevard and the area consists of single residences. He understands the east/west aspect of the urban corridor planning. However, the small section along his neighborhood doesn't make sense. He has previously sent an email about his concerns about the area as it's an historical area comprised of single residential homes in an established neighborhood. He shared that he walked around the area earlier and discovered that approximately four houses are for sale. For comparison, he visited the Cleveland/Custer Way area and counted businesses and found that of the 43 businesses in the area from the Sunset building to beyond Safeway, there are 11 vacancies or 26%. He questioned why Olympia would want to imitate the City of Tumwater's problem. He questioned what his neighborhood would gain by the designation. The bigger issue is what the neighborhood would lose.

Steve Segall, 3110 Red Fern Drive NW, believes the comprehensive plan is implicitly intertwined with the waterfront and the SMP. The vitality of Olympia will be dependent on its central core – its downtown and working its way out. In looking at the comprehensive plan, the health of the outer areas of the City is not going to be sustained if the central part of the City is allowed to decay and die. Eight days ago, the Council gave direction to City staff to proceed with acquisition of the Larida Passage properties in an expeditious manner with the idea of ultimately obtaining the Capital Center Building by the lake. One of the things that Council brought up was that this could be a central part of the City's redevelopment and vision for downtown. Any comprehensive plan needs to take that direction very seriously. This development is going to be essential to downtown and it's not going to happen unless the Commission provides the City with the tools in the form of the comprehensive plan.

Because the SMP is due sooner than the comprehensive plan, which is not due until 2016, it is putting the cart before the horse to rush the draft comprehensive plan by December prior to finalization of the SMP and submission of the SMP to the Department of Ecology. Ultimately, the Department of Ecology will approve the SMP or modify it. He said he is taken aback by the Port's position. The Port seems to be threatening litigation and it talks about its charter or what it is required to do under state law in terms of economic development. The Port refers to its accountability for all Thurston County taxpayer dollars and impacts, and how essential the Port is to the economic development of the area. The Port has asked about industrial use of the property on the Port peninsula and is concerned that view corridors will adversely impact its ability to function. The Port is the farthest port from the ocean and is dependent upon the exportation of logs. It is a 19th century industry where raw materials are exported to industrialized countries to turn them into finished products. That is not the economic model that the City should incorporate into the comprehensive plan for Olympia's 21st century. The Port's use of taxpayer dollars has been primarily to clean up the environment that's left over from the early part of the 20th century. Those industries have gone away. For the Port to say that it needs an appropriate comprehensive plan for additional industry in the Port peninsula is somewhat laughable. The Port has other properties throughout the county and if it wants industrial development he would encourage the Port to do it where there is land that can be utilized more efficiently. Right now, there are detriments of having log trucks tearing up the city's roads, creating noise, and polluting the downtown area. That's not the future of Olympia. The SMP should be accomplished before proceeding with the comprehensive plan update. It is not the City's job to define the Port's mission within its comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan should consider environmental stewardship and not just mitigation. Restoration, quality of life for citizens, and enabling the City to carry through on a vision that will revitalize downtown including the use of the Community Renewal Act as appropriate so that the City can build on its strengths is important rather than reaching back to the last century and repeating the same mistakes. Growth impact fees should be a reasonable and commensurate with the impact. Land dedication should be an option when the developer has the ability to dedicate a certain amount of land because of the costs associated with development are not always borne by the developer and the City is ultimately responsible for roads, public safety, water, sewer, utilities, schools, and parks. The City needs to be realistic in assessing those societal costs.

Chair Tousley asked whether Mr. Segall's suggestion of land dedication refers to the transfer of development rights. Mr. Segall said the transfer of land would enable the City to utilize the land for a neighborhood park or other purpose. The dedication should accurately reflect the impact of the development. He added that he doesn't believe the Port pays B&O tax to the City.

Commissioner Horn asked whether the concept of land dedication replaces impact fees. Mr. Segall said it could, but the intent is a dedication that measures the true impact of the development. For example, the demand on City services, on school districts, and parks, etc.

Commissioner Bardin referred to the comment that it wasn't the City's job to define the Port's role. She asked if the comment pertained to the inclusion of the appendix. Mr. Segall affirmed as that is the section where the City had acknowledged the importance of the Port. He believes the Port can define its own mission and that it's not up to the City to define it for the Port.

TJ Johnson, 319 Sawyer Street NE, appreciates that the comprehensive plan has a clear focus on realizing the vision of a sustainable City. However, it's been difficult for him to conceive of a sustainable City if that city does not have a sustainable food system. The language to the extent that it exists in the draft plan is woefully inadequate to position the City to develop a robust urban agricultural program and policies. Humans have pretty basic needs – food, water, and shelter. There is much in the plan about water and shelter, but very little about food. The average US city has three days worth of food in reserve. The saying goes - we are always nine meals from anarchy, and he would like to think that as a community, the City proactively plans to ensure that the City is not nine meals from anarchy. In doing that, the City would be in step with cities all over the country that are changing comprehensive plans and developing policies and programs and developing partnerships to encourage the production of food and development of local food economies and growing and selling of fresh healthy food within the communities. Residents in the community are clearly tuned into this over the last two years. Hundreds of people have turned out to attend the Food Summit and various food-related events. Two months ago, when it was believed that the City would enact an urban agriculture ordinance through the Planning Commission, 85 people attended the meeting ready to talk about the importance of City leadership on developing policies and programs to create a local healthy food system. Some of what came out of that meeting were code changes and some big picture ideas and policies that are really much more suited for inclusion in the comprehensive plan as a means of setting the stage for subsequent work and development of programs and acquisition of future resources in future years to realize the vision. Some areas that should be included in the comprehensive plan to address specific urban agriculture and the food system are the areas of education to ensure education and information is provided to the community about the importance of a food system, as well as, elements around production and policies and statements that encourage the development of home gardens that would discourage more green grass and encourage for-profit agriculture enterprises in the City. The City also should be addressing the issue of consumption and encouraging people to have healthy lifestyles. More information could be included about the connection between diet and community well-being. The plan addresses many transportation choices and how it affects health and well-being but the plan lacks any information about diet. The main impetus for driving cities' interest in urban agriculture across the country is economic development. It is a means of bringing income into the community and not outsourcing jobs or food dollars to multi-national corporations. Other information that should be included in the plan is a commitment to regional leadership and collaboration. Much activity is occurring within the community from the spinoff from the Food Summit, creation of a Local System Food Council, and the Food Panel that is involved in the Sustainable Thurston process. Olympia should be positioning itself as a regional leader and partner in those efforts. The plan needs some clear visions and some of the visions that have been suggested in the public meetings included that everyone who lives in the City of Olympia is within walking or biking distance of a place to grow food. That may entail a backyard, a community garden in a city park or on private property where everyone should have that opportunity. The second is a commitment to restore the health of Puget Sound as a food production source. There has been much talk about restoring Puget Sound. Historically, Puget Sound was a primary food source for the people who lived in this region. That should be an option again for the future. Another vision statement could include that by 2020, 20% of all food consumed in the City of Olympia is produced within 20 miles from the City of Olympia. That focuses on localizing and having some measurable benchmarks to help the City determine its success of re-localizing the food system. Everybody understands the fragility of the current industrial food system and as corn crops in Indiana and Iowa wither in the heat and the price begins spiking on all commodities, it should be very obvious why the community should be in control of its own destiny when it comes to food. The importance of including that in the comprehensive plan cannot be overlooked. There is an opportunity now that the sister cities in Lacey and Tumwater took last year during their annual comprehensive plan update process. Both cities expanded their support for urban agriculture, and frankly this community is way behind the curve. Mr. Johnson asked the Commission to adopt some strong clear language in the plan that would allow the community to set a course in re-localizing the community's food system, revitalizing the economy, and improving the health of the community.

Commissioner Parker requested clarification about the City regional partnership role. Mr. Johnson said creating a local food system requires connecting urban eaters to rural production areas while also recognizing the significant levels of production in urban areas through backyard gardens, community gardens, and rooftop gardens where more food can be grown. It's important to have strong partnerships with larger farms and work at a regional level because it's not possible to raise all the food sufficient to feed the community.

Commissioner Horn asked whether Mr. Johnson has viewed other comprehensive plans that included a separate chapter on urban agriculture or whether it entails principles and goals included within the plan. Mr. Johnson shared that he has reviewed how other cities are incorporating the goals. Some cities include some elements within the plan while other cities, such as Cleveland, have a separate plan for urban agriculture and economic revitalization through its agricultural system. For the City of Olympia, it would be best to include some general principles and vision statements that provide context and include specific ideas into the various elements of the plan. For example, the issue of creating vibrant sales from community and backyard gardens could be an element of the economic development chapter with the land use chapter addressing appropriate space in the urban areas for food production. He suggested looking for opportunities within the existing chapters at this point.

Commissioner Richards commented that the comprehensive plan isn't prescriptive but rather sets goals and policies. He asked about the process of implementing goals and policies for urban agriculture. Mr. Johnson replied that it's the second step. In some ways, having a delay in the code work might be beneficial if elements are included in the comprehensive plan to provide clear guidance on what those goals and policies should be. The comprehensive plan is a vision and it's possible to find something to support or negate dependent upon a particular point of view. If the community wants to be serious about creating a healthy local food system and a robust urban agriculture program, the next step is after the plan is adopted is putting the pieces in the place and building the partnerships with community groups and citizens to achieve the vision.

Commissioner Leveen asked about other examples of adjustments from other communities that are necessary to development codes to enable rooftop gardens or community gardens. Mr. Johnson said there are many examples. The City of Seattle added a height density bonus for rooftop greenhouses. Some cities are requiring land allocated for community gardens during the permitting process for subdivision development.

Commissioner Bardin asked whether food can be linked to other examples of sustainability in the City that should be included in the comprehensive plan. Mr. Johnson said the benefit of food is its connection to everything making it easy to consider holistically in terms of a food system and how it impacts other things. One question is why the amount charged for water flushed down the toilet is the same for the amount used for growing food for a family or a neighborhood. Perhaps, there should be some consideration of having separate rates for the utilization of water for different purposes.

Bill Chernoff, 1975 Cambridge Lane SW, expressed concerns about the provision in the low density housing section in Appendix A. The provisions for low density housing states that the designation provides for low density residential development, primarily single family residential detached housing. The section continues to state that densities range from 8 units per acre to 1 unit per five acres and his concern is how 8 units per acre could be considered low density housing. For example, a 10-acre parcel could contain 80 housing units, which equates to approximately a 5,000 square-foot lot minus the provisions for streets and utilities access. That figure doesn't make any sense because that density is denser than many urban neighborhoods. The section also includes a provision for allowance of extra ordinary clustering to achieve minimum densities. Minimum density is 4 units per acre. That minimum is preferable than 8 units per acre, but it still equates to a 10,000 square-foot lot. The section may allow townhouses and small apartments. Zoning densities are to be determined by unique characteristics. He assumes that it means that not all 10-acre parcels can be typically developed as some might include a streambed, wetlands, or steep slopes. It appears that the City is attempting to put 10 acres of housing on less than 10 acres. Additionally, the section states that clustered developments are to provide future urbanization where urban utilities are not readily available. He's unsure what that means. It does appear the City is going to open the door to cluster development so that urban development can be built. His concern is how 8 units per acre can be considered low density. In many areas where he has previously lived, such as Kitsap County, typical low density zoning was 1 unit per 2-1/2 acres as the maximum allowed. A 10-acre parcel would allow 4 units of housing. If this is a low density area, chances are there is not much development surrounding it and if 8 units per acre is the minimum there would be problems concerning access, drainage, sewerage, water, power, and safety requirements of police and fire. All those requirements must be considered. The provision of 80 units on a 10-acre parcel certainly doesn't appear to be low density. In terms of extra ordinary clustering where environmental constraints are significant, he questioned why the City would seek ways to increase density. If 8 acres of a 10-acre parcel is unbuildable, the issue is why the City is seeking

to add more units on the 2 acres that are buildable if it is to be low density housing. The provision states that the minimum is 4 units per acre. The issue is whether that is considered low density housing. If it is possible to achieve those densities, as recommended in the low density proposal, the question is whether it can be achieved without building common wall townhouses or small apartment buildings considering that there are some environmental restrictions. Building small apartments on low density land is not what he believes is low density development, and he's unsure if anyone else would. He questioned the provision stating, "Cluster development to provide future urbanization opportunities will be required where urban utilities are not readily available." He recommended the City should eliminate the 8 units per acre potential designation that is referred to as low density. He recommended 1 unit for 2-1/2 acres maximum. The clustering idea appears to be a way to get around density requirements and he recommends allowing clustering under the planned unit development recommendations, which are also included in the same section. The goal is preserving wetlands, stream flow, and run-off and absorption capacities without totally eliminating the development of an area; however, each planned unit development would be developed without increasing density. He suggested letting the planned unit development section of the plan handle density issues.

Jacob Morningside, 1624 11th Avenue SW, reinforced previous comments from the Southwest Olympia Neighborhood pertaining to the Decatur connection. He shared that by being in the right place at the right time, he was able to save a child who was almost hit by a vehicle on Decatur as she exited Decatur Woods Park. It's an accident waiting to happen if the City increases the traffic just on that thoroughfare to the level that would sustain traffic from Highway 101. The neighborhood will experience accidents involving children and pets and there will be incredible risk. Sometimes, it becomes a thoroughfare today as the traffic calming devices are a joke. He has witnessed a car that traveled at such a high rate of speed that it literally took the roundabout on two wheels. If the connection is opened it will decimate the southwest neighborhood. He lives on 11th Avenue and people who use the route will also use 10th, 11th, and 12th Avenues to maneuver around congestion to reach downtown or the north side. There are many children and pets that walk. It's amazing the amount of activity occurring on the streets and the connection will turn the area into a hazard. He asked the Commission to consider during its deliberation on what should or should not be in the comprehensive plan. Steve Hall and staff are not listening and really don't get it. It took him and his wife six years to get a segment of sidewalk installed to keep people from getting stuck who were in wheelchairs. It's amazing what goes on in that neighborhood. He asked the Commission to consider these issues before developing the final draft regarding Decatur and 16th.

Mr. Morningside referred to several visionary speakers, such as the gentleman who spoke about the Port and the export of logs. Much would be available to the people of the City if the Port was to get out of the logging and exporting business and the cost that it really is to the City and the people. The second speaker is TJ Johnson, who is a man of great vision, knowledge, and compassion. His comment on the sustainability of food is a vital way to go. He lives on a 30-foot lot and he and his wife produce approximately 70% of what they consume. They are both vegans and are to provide for themselves on a 30-foot lot. Every park is available for the people including Decatur Woods Park where it's possible to plant potatoes and onions and many other edible things in a park area that will go a long way. There are a number of parks throughout the City and there is land that is not being used for those resources that would support the Food Bank and many other avenues of feeding of this City and the county.

Roger Polzin, 804 Foote Street NW, admitted he is not a great fan of the planning process that has been used in gathering input from the public. He attended one of the first *Imagine Olympia* meetings and the process used included participants sitting at tables with a staff facilitator. Everyone shared opinions and information and at the conclusion of the time period, the staffer asked for someone at the table to summarize what had been discussed. The person talking at his table was the one with the most vehement views. There was no balancing of opinions. He wondered how staff assured that the staff summaries really represented the public opinion through that process. He is suspicious about that prior process. The same process was used by City Manager Steve Hall during a meeting on the west side on the Garfield playfield. At that time, they did the same thing and put maps on both sides of the wall and had people go around them. He never saw a work product from that meeting. The same thing occurred with the Sustainability conference at Thurston Regional Planning Council. He referred to copies of an article by Jim Lazar who attended the meeting. Once again, it was not an even playing field.

His first substantive comment concerns the high density urban corridors. Previously, he worked in the transportation field and heard of HDCs as a “fifty dollar concept.” His real objection is not the concept, but within the plan it is such a meat ax approach and it makes it seem as if everything is going to be a half mile wide. He doubts if that is the intention. He is concerned that it may startle people and cause them to start selling their houses and moving out. He doesn’t want to see that because there are wonderful homes in the Governor Stevens area. They add value. He doesn’t want to see them suddenly panicking and leaving long before there is anything to replace them. He doesn’t want to see the entire corridor of Capitol Boulevard minus the South Capitol Neighborhood suddenly become an apartment complex half a mile wide. For comparison, he drove from Capitol Boulevard to Jefferson, which is over a quarter mile. Taking a half mile swath would destroy the City. The Commission must refine the concept before the plan is finalized. The plan should recognize low density development downtown. However, the problem is that there is pollution downtown. Allowing developers to go out a quarter mile on each side of major arterials, that is where they will build to avoid the costs of cleanup. That will lead to the City self-destructing by taking away any incentive for developers to build downtown. Another concern is Olympia’s approach to zoning where the City tends to draw lines on a map with no regard to carrying capacity of the area. To illustrate his point, a land use attorney representing the group wanting to put a third stadium in the SoHo area in south Seattle argued that the area was zoned to permit stadiums and therefore it must be allowed even though the infrastructure could not handle the development with the highway system becoming clogged. The City needs to consider the carrying capacity of an area when considering zoning.

His second substantive comment relates to earthquake induced liquefaction. It’s a subject that people are avoiding. The first meeting he attended of the Shoreline Management subcommittee of the Planning Commission was in February 2010. That was at the same time of an earthquake in Chile. Old buildings came down but they didn’t collapse but fell over. The same thing occurred in Japan. With current foundation technology, it is possible to assure the community that buildings will not fall over. He reviewed the proposals for development on the Port peninsula and it concerns him greatly. His concern is with residential development of high rise buildings and hotels and motels. That is a high risk area. That’s an area that was once the location for garbage and now some major buildings have been built. He suggested beginning a process by categorizing the various risk levels of where fill and filling is located in the City. He suggested beginning at what the county has recently done with a high risk definition of “fill.” The county hasn’t completed the work but it’s beginning to consider the issue.

Finally, the comprehensive plan document has inherent contradictions. The Planning Commission should urge the City Council to establish a process for identifying and resolving the contradictions and maybe more frequent reviews by the citizens since the document is not due until 2016. That would entail time to clean up the document, as there is much to clean up. There is also a need to develop a meaningful index for the comprehensive plan. Perhaps it’s not intended to be a document for the public. However, it needs one if the public is to have any chance to understand and support the document.

Commissioner Horn asked for examples of inherent contradictions that the Planning Commission could review. Mr. Polzin replied that it entails land use and transportation.

Egan Babler, 1914 Berry Street, referred to his friendship with Commissioner Ingman and their previous discussions. He had complained about a bicycling experience he encountered downtown. He has worked in Germany in the small town of Landshut. He has been a long-term resident in the U.S. but quite frequently visits Germany. He’s listened to some of the same concerns and problems and some of the recommendations. He considered what the town of Landshut had done about some of the same problems the City is currently discussing. Years ago, he thought it would be nice to have an exchange of a committee of members of the City Council with an agenda to meet with the town of Landshut to have them prepare a response to the presentation to determine if some of the measures the town took could assist the City. The town had to confront some of the same problems that are facing Olympia today. The town was forced to react and it would be something that the City could take advantage of. The situation is quite different in Germany and in Europe, as the population density is seven times higher than this area. They have no means of accommodating sprawl as what has occurred here over vast areas. They live on top of each other more and if they had two cars per family, they would have absolutely no space to grow their potatoes. That forced them into a totally different situation and he

believes the City is approaching a similar situation. In the center of cities in Germany, children play on main streets or bicycle or tricycle on main streets. The inner city belongs to the pedestrians. He's unsure whether that is a good idea and whether it could be applied in Olympia. It would however, be interesting to follow up. Approximately eight years ago he approached the City Council and proposed an exchange. He has also talked to the "Stadtrat," which is the City Council in Landshut about the feasibility of participating in an exchange to present an agenda to the City to share information on how the City of Landshut handled similar issues. Landshut is located approximately 40 kilometers northeast of Munich. It would be interesting and it might be possible to develop some answers to many of the same issues, such as food, congestion, busing students to schools, and other urban problems to determine if some of the solutions should be considered by Olympia. He offered to serve as the tour guide and suggested a week visit would be quite nice. Mr. Babler said he also asked Commissioner Ingman to visit Google Map and view the intercity of Landshut. There is no traffic in the city center. The city center is filled with pedestrians. Landshut streets were designed in the 1500s. The city has big, wide open streets. Today, a nice summer day can draw hundreds of people sitting in the middle of town with surrounding restaurants serving food and children playing or bicycling. He suggested also viewing Munich on Google Map and the *Marienplatz*, the immense center of the City of Munich. It is a huge area. He worked in the area in the 1960s, and at that time, traffic traveled throughout the middle of the city. The city center was totally destroyed during World War II and was not rebuilt to modern standards. Since then, traffic has been removed from center streets. When he crossed Marienplatz, there was much traffic. Today, there are only people and dogs. Today, Munich has underground stairways leading to an underground transportation system that did not exist in 1964, but has since been developed. It is a vast system. The city was forced to build the system as population density is seven times greater than Olympia's population. The transportation system is known as the *SBahn* and can transport passengers to the airport located 25 miles from Munich. He urged the Council to take advantage of visiting the area with him offering to be the tour guide.

Lauren Donner, 617 Carlyon Avenue SE, has lived in the neighborhood for the last eight years and served two terms on the Olympia Heritage Commission from 2000 to 2005 and has significant professional experience in local history and historic preservation, including as former director of the State Capitol Museum. She is a small business owner and an historian and serves as the Vice President of the Carlyon North Neighborhood Association. She addressed the urban corridor proposal in the Land Use section of the draft comprehensive plan and urged the Planning Commission to maintain the current zone density of 4 to 7 housing units per acre in the area proposed for urban corridor designation along Capitol Boulevard/I-5 bridge to the Tumwater boundary. She is opposed to changing the density in this area for several reasons, all of which have been covered by written comments that she will submit by the end of the week. Her focus is on one concern in particular - the historic significance. She offered some historical context. The neighborhoods in question, which include Carlyon North, Governor Stevens, and Wildwood as well as the areas not covered by formal neighborhood associations, are some of the most historic in the City. In the late 1890s, residents rode streetcars to the Thurston County Fairgrounds located at the current Sunset Life Office building site on Capitol Boulevard to watch horse racing and baseball games. By the end of the 19th century, a velodrome drew crowds for bicycle racing and in the first years of the 20th century, local booster and real estate developer, Fred Carlyon, replaced the bike racing track with a horse racing track. In 1913, he began plotting the area for single-family homes building his own on what is now the Sunset Life campus. Those of us who live in the neighborhood often dig up pieces of the horse racing track or the bike racing track, such as horseshoes and those kinds of things. In 1915, Hazard Stevens, son of the first territorial governor and the first person to summit Mount Rainier, built a dairy farm on land that now houses Olympia High School. The entrance to the farm is now the intersection of Carlyon Avenue and Capitol. Ms. Donner displayed a picture that shows the entrance of Cloverfield Farm, which was the driveway. The Cloverfield farmhouse still stands and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. By the 1940s, Fred Carlyon, JT Otis, and a few other developers had plotted much of the area stretching east from Capitol Boulevard for single-family residential housing. Her house dates from 1924 and is part of the original Carlyon fairgrounds plat. The majority of the houses in the area were built between 1920 and 1950 and they tend to be architecturally modest, not formal design or high design and include a good sampling of Tumwater Valley Lumber kit homes. Most pertinent to the current discussion is that these homes were specifically and purposely designed to be affordable for mid-level state workers. Not to put a fine point on it, but this area was built to house government workers and 70 years later, it still does. In the Carlyon North neighborhood alone, there are over 400 houses and 300 in Olympia and about 125 in Tumwater. A lot of Governor Stevens and Wildwood as well as the surrounding areas represent a significant number of homes in

an affordable neighborhood that continues to attract middle-class residents. By her count, there are 49 properties in this region on the historic property inventory, which was last done in the 80s and/on the local state or national historic register. Most of these fall within the proposed quarter-mile urban corridor boundary. Further, 1/10th of Olympia's national historic register places are in this area. Last year's historic home tour was also in this neighborhood that attracted over 1000 people. The urban corridor proposal conflicts with the City's existing historic preservation goals. The Historic Preservation chapter in the comprehensive plan requires the City to safeguard and promote sites, buildings, districts, structures, and objects which reflect significant elements of the City's history, and establish zoning that is compatible and conducive to continued preservation of historic neighborhoods and properties. The entire area is called out as one of five selected historic neighborhoods in the Historic Preservation Assessment and Action Plan. In fact, the rich history of the area is a key element that attracts residents. Lots are small, houses are generally modest, and virtually every home is at least 60 years old. Many are more than 80 years old. Adding new development and or tearing out existing homes runs counter to the historic preservation tenant and would have a negative impact on one of the most desirable neighborhoods in the City. Residents of this area have testified that the friendly, accessible, and historic character of the neighborhood is what drew them here; it is certainly true for her family. They looked for more than eight months for a house with walkable and bicycle streets, sidewalks, families with kids, and good schools. They found their cottage and can't imagine living anywhere else. This is a family-friendly neighborhood that is architecturally cohesive and historically significant. The urban corridor proposal in the draft comprehensive plan disregards that. To plan for high density development among these homes undermines the character of the neighborhood. Thank you.

Commissioner Parker asked whether the homes on Capitol Way near Safeway are within Tumwater. Ms. Donner affirmed they are in Tumwater and are Tumwater Valley Lumber kit homes, which were a series of model houses. Commissioner Parker asked whether kit houses have historic status. Ms. Donner replied that within her neighborhood, there are four Tumwater Valley Lumber kit homes and one of the houses is on the register. There are streets of Tumwater Valley Lumber kit homes throughout the entire City. There is also a home on Lorne Street that is a kit home.

Commissioner Bardin asked Ms. Donner to identify the five historic neighborhoods in her written comments. Ms. Donner said the neighborhoods are selected historic neighborhoods called out by the City in its own Historic Preservation Action Plan. The southeast neighborhood, which encompasses Carlyon North, Wildwood, and Governor Stevens, is one of those five neighborhoods. The others are likely South Capitol, the west side, the Bigelow area, and perhaps downtown.

Tom Zvirzdys, 612 5th Avenue SW, thanked the commission for the opportunity to share his family's concern about the Olympia Comprehensive Plan. His concern is with property that his family owns at 612 5th Avenue. He understands the Planning Commission changed the comprehensive plan and he is not clear on what the changes mean to his family or to their property. Language in the comprehensive plan speaks to creating unobstructed views of the water, mountains, lake, etc., from different viewpoints all over the City. However, this does not appear to be defined. This is a big and ambiguous change and there is no indication of the impacts that this will have to property owners and business owners who are the source of the City's tax base. Proper disclosure is the City's responsibility. The process of the comprehensive plan and the Shoreline Master Program is confusing to say the least. It is a complex and controversial plan and communications with the community needs to be improved. His family only heard of the changes 10 days ago and is now scrambling to be proactive in the process. However, this is difficult because of the lack of notification and the sheer complexity of the plan. It appears there is a conflict in what the comprehensive plan says and what the Shoreline Master Program states and will render any properties to be nonconforming with the codes. This could result in an inability to refinance, obtain financing, sell, make significant changes, or improvements, etc. It devalues his investment and investments of many other stakeholders. Unless the City is prepared to purchase our properties at market value, then this plan is robbing every one of their hard-earned investments. Properties in the downtown area, including his, have been zoned commercial for years and many retirement plans and financial commitments have been made based on the zoning the City put on these properties years ago. Now, from what is understood, this is all to change making the properties useless for current and legal purpose and creating financial hardships for property owners - owners that have been members of the Olympia community for generations. He and his family also think it's important that the City disclose its position on the estuary, as

it's necessary for the public to have discussion on the impacts that may result from the City's decision. On Monday night, Mike McCormick mentioned that the Legislature extended the due date for these plans to 2016. He asked for the City to slow down and communicate to stakeholders that have a potential for huge economic loss. If the City is unwilling to slow the process down and property owners are unable to properly learn about the complexity of the issue and how it affects them and what their options are, he asked whether the City has considered how it is going to financially compensate the owners that are going to lose their rights of ownership. He asked where the City would obtain the money for this compensation when in doing so it is reducing the tax base from which the City operates. He asked the Planning Commission and the City Council to contact all the property owners that will be affected by the comprehensive plan as well as the SMP. He implored them to boldly and honestly spell out the changes and their subsequent short - and long-term impacts to those impacted by the decisions rather than expect those that are affected to wade through 300+ pages to find the answers. He asked for time to review the changes and to hear from the City how the changes will affect citizens.

Mr. Zvirzdys clarified that his comments pertaining to the estuary involve the decision pertaining to Capitol Lake.

Gus Guethleim, 3222 Wiggins Road SE, apologized for not having adequate time to formulate his thoughts. He suggested that those that are concerned about schedule should speak to the City Council as the City Council is driving the schedule for the Planning Commission's review of the comprehensive plan. Comments in that particular area are a little misdirected. The comprehensive plan is basically a philosophical document and is the impression of a collective will of the City as to the shape and direction that is desired for the City for the future, to preserve and protect, and the changes to promote. From his personal perspective, he appreciates the holistic comprehensive approach and respects and appreciates the manner in which so many issues are interconnected and the work that has been done to reduce the number of times certain sections are repeated in different manners with different implications and meanings, making the plan more coherent and comprehensive with cohesive statements for the collective vision. He is encouraged, for instance, by the recognition of the importance for a healthy tree canopy for its contribution to stormwater mitigation, clean air, clean water, and mitigation of heat island affects. He is somewhat concerned about the unsupported assumption that jobs are keeping pace with housing. The fact is, they are not and have not for many years. He attended a TRPC open house a number of years ago and was struck by what was called "out of county commuter" or the percentage of wage earners that have to drive out of the area in order to work and support their families and mortgages. His numbers are somewhat rough because he is relying on memory, but in the 1960s and 70s; the percentage of wage earners who had to leave the county was approximately 2%-3%. In the early 2000s, it was approximately 8% and was projected at that time to increase to 12% and 14% by 2025. Twelve percent is roughly one out of every eight wage earners having to commute out of the county in order to support themselves. The average out of county work centers are in Tacoma and Centralia, which is roughly 300 miles a week or 15,000 miles a year per wage earner. Other out of county destinations would be King County resulting in 500 to 600 miles a week or 25,000 to 30,000 annual commuter miles. There are destinations that are even further, such as Everett or Portland.

One of the many consequences of all this added commuter trip miles is that greenhouse gases become acidic rain, which in turn changes the pH of the oceans. Locally, ocean acidulation has reached the point where local shellfish fry are no longer viable. The acidic ocean eats away their shells faster than they can grow. This is threatening the \$250 million a year industry, not to mention something more fundamental – a source of food.

There has also been much information about urban corridors, with one in particular. As he understands it, that designation has actually been on the books for a number of years. That is not really a change. The Capitol Way urban corridor was included in the previous comprehensive plan and perhaps before then. There is also the adjacent uplands to Ken Lake, which may be designated to something similar to a critical area for a number of reasons, and then there is a proposed apartment project on the west side that poses some very unique problems giving its particular designation and the realities of the surrounding area that do not support that designation. Urban growth management does not mandate development of all vacant land but it does require planning and implementing growth in an effective, orderly, and most importantly, a sustainable manner. To borrow a sentiment from Monday night, a plan is only as good as its enforcement or from his perspective - the plan is only as good as its implementation and enforcement. His impression of the previous comprehensive plan is that it was a collection of very nice goals and policies, but in many instances land use regulations and

municipal codes did not support those goals and policies, and on some occasions, the day-to-day and week-to-week business conducted by the City did not support either the comprehensive plan goals or the municipal code requirements. Going forward, that is the real challenge of this particular cycle of the comprehensive plan update – getting the supporting regulations and the business actions of the City to support the goals and visions embodied by the comprehensive plan.

Walt Jorgensen, 823 North Street SE, lives on the Tumwater side of North Street. The comprehensive plan has elements that affect all parts of the City with many of them directed to the downtown area, which includes the isthmus. Many people, such as him, are visual animals and are always asking about what it would like it. In trying to envision different configurations of the downtown and trying to visualize the changes to the downtown cityscape from setbacks and heights, it has been very difficult for him. He explored on-line, discovered several ways to develop architectural alternatives, and contacted a firm with offices located in San Francisco and in Seattle. The firm provided a generic example of the kind of modeling that could be used to analyze and present proposed changes and the effect of differential level of build-out. Mr. Jorgensen played a video of the model example and thanked Senior Planner Buckler for her assistance. Mr. Jorgensen described the capabilities of the modeling technology. It goes well beyond silhouetting buildings. The digital model provides a precise city image that is flexible and can be edited and built upon using existing City GIS assets expanding over time from a variety of sources that is easy to visualize. The model allows analysis of any aspect of design planning. For instance, the City's skyline, views, tall buildings cascading shade on other buildings, and tall buildings blocking vistas. It also allows separation of systems or elements of the City infrastructure, such as biking systems connecting schools, housing, underground creeks, and green corridors for pedestrians. Mr. Jorgensen advised that he will submit written comments by Friday. He commented on several topics with the first being trees. He established the Tumwater Tree Board almost 20 years ago and was very concerned about trees then and now. He suggested accepting the gifts of what trees provide. Trees move water into the air through evapotranspiration and they keep carbon out of the air by sequestration. They are referred to as natural infrastructure and are certainly more natural than retention ponds. Another issue is the Port of Olympia or more accurately, the Port of Thurston. Please keep in mind through deliberations that the Port is a junior taxing authority and although the Legislature has given them some latitude to pursue economic development, the Port of Olympia does not have land use authority. The City of Olympia does, and it's the City's purview to determine zoning and other development regulations. Other than direct marine related activities, the Port should be treated like any other developer.

Chair Tousley referred to the modeling program and asked whether cost estimates are available as the issue of visualization was addressed within the SMP process to visualize potential changes. Mr. Jorgensen said he doesn't have information on the cost. The model is a gratis depiction of some generic capabilities from a private company that would be interested in learning about the City's next steps.

Troy Bussey, 2805 Orange Street, said he's a professional environmental engineer and has lived in Olympia for 12 years. He shared comments on two issues involving downtown Olympia and urban sprawl. Those two issues are the most important aspects of the comprehensive plan being a State Growth Management Act requirement. Based on his observation and for many other people he knows, downtown Olympia is essentially dead. There are obviously many institutions that the community supports and likes; however, for him and for many others, downtown Olympia is on a dying path. Secondly, in terms of urban sprawl, he believes Thurston County and the region is sprawling incredibly. Many may agree and if not, he suggested they should head out to the outskirts of Lacey and Yelm and other places in the county and see where things are sprawling in this region. He personally thinks that one of the main solutions is increasing density downtown and increasing market rate housing. Obviously, there are goals in the comprehensive plan to do those things and those goals were in the past plan. However, since the last plan, which was approved nearly 20 years ago, there has been almost no market rate housing built downtown and almost no density increase downtown. In fact, for every proposal to increase density, the City receives much public opposition with the City ending up with less and less density downtown. That is the wrong way to proceed and having a goal to increase density and to increase market rate housing is great, but the City needs to do even more and have the comprehensive plan include more incentives and more emphasis on those goals above all others. There are obviously many interesting ideas and plans in the comprehensive plan but those detract from what he believes should be the main goals of increasing density downtown and increasing market rate housing. Those are the only things that can decrease

urban sprawl and solve many of the problems that people are concerned about. Even worse, the comprehensive plan has many elements that will decrease density and decrease market rate housing opportunities downtown. Not only are there more incentives, but there are many roadblocks in the comprehensive plan and other things occurring through planning processes to discourage density and decrease density and market rate housing opportunities. Two examples include the shoreline issue by rezoning the shorelines downtown, which he believes will have significant impact on decreasing density and market rate housing opportunities. The second issue is view corridors and including general, vague, and pretty comprehensive language about protecting views, which could work against the City of Olympia to decrease density and market rate housing opportunities.

Commissioner Reddick asked Mr. Bussey if he has any opinions on the high density corridors along Martin Way and Harrison. Mr. Bussey said he believes density in the urban areas should be the focus with the first focus on downtown and then increase density along the corridors as that will increase transportation and improve quality of life and other things. It seems focusing on urban corridors first prior to the downtown appears to be placing the cart before the horse.

Commissioner Leveen asked about his concerns about vague view corridor language and the concern that it might result in decreased downtown density or market rate housing. Mr. Bussey said it appears there are 10 to 15 different views that are listed as desirable to protect. That can be interpreted to mean no development that would block views. Everyone knows about the issue with the isthmus and having that in the comprehensive plan will allow the community to use those view goals to oppose development because it may block a view.

Commissioner Parker asked whether the model simulation provided by the previous speaker addresses some of his concerns. Mr. Bussey said he personally believes that increasing density and market rate housing is much more important than views, because that will lead to a more sustainable City. To him, views are not that important, as it's about density and market rate housing.

Commissioner Parker asked him whether he has any specific suggestions for incentives. Mr. Bussey said he would need time to consider the question. As an engineer, he looks at empirical data. The empirical data reveals that over the last 20 years, the City has received little market rate housing. If that is a goal that the City wants to attain, the City must look at the data to determine what the City is doing wrong and what does it need to do better. There likely will be some good ideas generated to help make it better.

Commissioner Reddick asked him to describe the area of the downtown. Mr. Bussey said downtown is the cultural, social, and economic center of town. He doesn't believe the comprehensive plan defines the location of the downtown and suggested the downtown is Capitol Lake to Plum/Eastside Street to Capitol Campus and out to the Port peninsula. Most people would likely define that area as the downtown. That is the area that he believes the community should focus on first. As that area increases in density, focus should follow on the urban corridors.

Chair Tousley closed the oral portion of the public hearing at 9:26 p.m. Written testimony can be submitted by July 27 at 5 p.m. The Commission will receive a packet of all written testimony.

Chair Tousley recessed the meeting at 9:28 p.m. to 9:34 p.m. for a break.

Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Planner Buckler explained that the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is a document to analyze the environmental impacts of the overall comprehensive plan update proposal. It is a requirement under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). A secondary purpose of the document is another element of information that the Commission can review and refer to as it evaluates the proposal because it provides some background information and some basic evaluation. However, the report is a draft and public comments received until August 20, 2012 will be the basis of more staff analysis. Staff will issue a final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement in November or December.

Typically, Commissioners do not offer comments on a SEPA document. However, staff welcomes comments by Commissioners individually or as a full body. Additionally, the Commission will have other information requests that may occur after August 20, which will not be incorporated within the final EIS.

Chair Tousley added that any comments received during the EIS comment period require a response within the Final EIS.

Commissioner Parker asked if there is an associated public hearing for the Draft EIS. Planner Buckler advised there is no public hearing on the document.

Discussion: Format for August 1 & 8 OPC Meetings

Chair Tousley reported the August 1 and 8 meeting are full Commission meetings with the intent to review the topics raised during the testimony and submitted through written testimony. It likely will entail a brainstorming session on the topics to consider for determining the scope of work on those topics over the next several months, which will interface with the Comprehensive Plan Update Subcommittee. She asked for feedback on the option of utilizing the service of a facilitator to assist the Commission. The next meeting of the CPU Subcommittee is August 13.

Commissioner Bardin said the issue was discussed at the CPU Subcommittee meeting. At first, she supported the concept but later had some reservations. Based on previous experience of working with a facilitator, it usually involves a large and diverse group to develop a consensus on an issue. The Commission doesn't fit that definition. This is the first opportunity for the Commission to begin examining the document and determine how to address topics. She preferred the option of working through that process without assistance of a facilitator. There is also the issue of the cost of hiring a facilitator.

Commissioner Parker suggested beginning the process without the assistance of a facilitator and if the Commission reaches an impasse, consider the assistance of a facilitator.

Commissioner Richards said he's been supportive of the option of a facilitator only to assist the Commission through the process in developing its product.

Commissioner Kiszka commented on the tight timeline and that adding another person adds another layer. She expressed confidence that the Commission can work through the process without additional assistance.

Chair Tousley supported the suggestion to gauge the Commission's progress on August 1 with her facilitating the meeting to determine next steps moving forward.

Discussion ensued on the availability of Legistar. Staff advised that a copy of the Monday, July 25 public hearing recording should be available on the website by the next day and that the public hearing just concluded should be available on Friday, July 27. Timing of each person's comments has been tracked and annotated by staff and can be provided to the Commission to assist them in locating the time of each person's testimony.

Reports

Leadership Team – The next meeting is on Friday, July 27 at 8:30.

Comprehensive Plan Update (CPU) – No update.

Finance Sub-Committee - The next meeting is on August 10

Draft Letter to Land Use and Environment Subcommittee

Chair Tousley referred to the draft letter forwarded electronically to the Commission from Commissioners Parker and Ingman to Councilmember Langer, Chair of the Land Use and Environment Subcommittee. She encouraged Commissioners supporting the letter, to consider adding their signature.

**Olympia Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of Meeting
July 25, 2012 Page 21 of 22**

Commissioner Parker clarified some changes to the letter and suggested affording time for the Commission to review and finalize the letter during the August 1 meeting. Additionally, seven citizens testified about the need to slow the comprehensive plan update.

Commissioner Richards referred to the list of issues in the letter and asked whether dates have been projected for completing some of the tasks. Commissioner Parker said some dates will not be determined for some time. For example, the 7-11 decision will not be released for at least a year. It's important to be cognizant that the plan could have regulatory implications and therefore shouldn't be treated as a visionary statement that only has oversight after the code is adopted. Commissioner Parker said he envisions the process moving forward on the update by taking a 'wait and see' approach in the schedule and while moving forward. Another option is considering the issues addressed in the letter and moving forward on a revised schedule. He favors the 'wait and see' approach because it frees the Commission from absolute deadlines.

Commissioner Richards said many of the comments expressed the need to tie the development regulations to the comprehensive plan, which could be more important to have those pieces in place to implement policies and goals. Whether it's possible to complete that work prior to completing the comprehensive plan is unlikely and could require an additional year or two. He doesn't envision delaying the comprehensive plan update process as it would impact the delay in updating development regulations causing a delay in development actions. That's his concern with delaying the process.

Commissioner Bardin commented that the proposal could entail continuing to work on the update rather than stopping while affording some time for other elements to assist the Commission in its decision-making. Commissioner Parker said his suggestion is not delaying the process until all information is received, but rather receiving information on what's available now, consider the public testimony, and moving forward with the Commission's review of the July draft before establishing a preliminary schedule.

Commissioner Richards added that the process inherently entails a new report released every six months. At some point, the Commission needs to determine an ending point to complete its update realizing the plan is amendable each year.

Commissioner Parker clarified that the proposal is to invite Councilmember Langer to attend the August 13 meeting. The letter does not express a singular point of view by the CPU Subcommittee. However, it does represent a view of some Commissioners on the subcommittee.

Commissioner Horn offered that the Commission will have a much better idea after completing the issues identification process. He suggested affording some patience and pursuing that process through a deliberative manner. After the list of issues has been identified, it might be appropriate to review with Councilmember Langer the status. Commissioner Parker affirmed that entails the 'wait and see' approach.

Other Business

Commissioner Horn suggested rescheduling the Leadership Team meeting currently scheduled on August 10 because of meeting conflicts.

Commissioner Tousley referred members to the copy of a letter Commissioner Kisza submitted to staff regarding the Design Review Board.

Commissioner Leveen questioned the failure of the Commission's deliberation and discussion of the comprehensive plan update charter to address recent concerns about the timeline of the update process. The Commission discussed the charter over two meetings and approved the charter unanimously. He asked members for feedback to avoid repeating the pattern of making the mistake of believing the Commission is in unanimous agreement when it is not.

Commissioner Ingman said he suggested City's staff schedule should be part of the Commission's charter. It became apparent to him during a regular meeting that there was no plan for how the Commission would address the CFP, the subcommittee, and the scheduling. That detail was lacking and consequently, the

Commission is still struggling. He said he participated with the best intention, but feels the process is becoming much more complicated. The intent is not repeating the SMP process. If the Commission outlines its plan early at a higher level on how the Commission intends to organize the process, then it likely is possible to establish a date certain.

Commissioner Bardin said she also had concerns about the timeline and submitted those concerns, which were not forwarded to the Commission until after the meeting on the charter. She asked the Leadership Team to address the option of Commissioners participating in meeting by telephone conference. Chair Tousley said she plans to address the request to the General Government Committee. The next scheduled discussion on the Planning Commission is at its August 21 meeting. The suggestion will likely entail an amendment to the bylaws.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Tousley adjourned the meeting at 10:12 p.m.

Amy Tousley, Chair

Prepared by Valerie Gow, Recording Secretary/President
Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net