



# Olympia Planning Commission (OPC) Comprehensive Plan Update Final Recommendations

---

Recommended by OPC on March 18, 2013



	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
<p><b>NOTE:</b> The City Council and Planning Commission Charter for the Comprehensive Plan Update guided the Commission to make recommendations on the Value &amp; Vision statements, substantive changes proposed by staff, and other topics that arose from the Commission’s public hearings and deliberations. These recommendations are included herein.</p> <p>On May 20, 2013, the City will release the “Planning Commission Draft” online, wherein these changes will be incorporated into the draft online. At the same time, additional documents will be available online to help the public track the changes and see how the major topics that arose from public comment are addressed within the document.</p>			
<b>CONCEPTS TO INCLUDE WITH RECOMMENDATION</b>			
	<b>Minor Edits</b>	<p>Give staff authority to make minor, non-substantive edits that do not change the substance of language being recommended (for example, caps, punctuation, spelling.) Also, ask staff to integrate value and vision statements with intro text in each chapter of draft.</p> <p>Also, during deliberations, the Commission asked staff to find a consistent and efficient way to link to related documents when these are mentioned within policy language. For example, at the end of the policy state, “[For more information see: Appendix B: Transportation 2030 Street Capacity and Connectivity Project List and Maps.]”</p>	March 18, 2013
	<b>Graphics</b>	The Commission voted to add a recommendation to their cover letter that the sketches within the Plan either be replaced or removed. (Language forwarded to Chair Parker for inclusion in the letter.)	March 18, 2013
	<b>Search-ability</b>	The Commission and staff agree a better search tool is needed. The Commission did not make a motion to recommend anything specific; however, staff is looking into options to bring forward to City Council.	March 18, 2013
	<b>Chair’s Cover Letter</b>	The Commission voted to add specific text regarding transportation and climate change to their cover letter (Language forwarded to Chair Parker for inclusion in the letter.)	March 18, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
	<b>Future Work</b>	<i>The Commission voted to request a future work item to work on a concept and consider a Code amendment to change the hearing body on rezones from Hearing Examiner to Planning Commission.</i>	March 18, 2013
<b>INTRODUCTION CHAPTER (F.K.A. Olympia's Vision)</b>			
1	<b>Introduction Chapter</b>	Change the name of the first chapter from "Olympia's Vision" to "Introduction."  The Commission edited the Introduction chapter (FKA: Olympia's Vision) to remove unnecessary language and include more key challenges. They reformatted and edited the value and vision statements from the July Draft and moved this section to a new chapter called "Community Values and Vision." They also dispersed the value and vision statements within corresponding chapters. (See chapter at end of document.)	March 13, 2013
2	<b><u>Sustainability Goals and Policies</u></b>	<u>Remove GO1, PO1.1 and PO1.5 as proposed in the July Draft from the draft. These concepts are incorporated into the edits made to the Introduction - Key Challenges section, under "Become a more sustainable city."</u>  <u>Move PO1.2, PO1.3 and PO1.4 to the Public Services Chapter.</u>	March 13, 2013
<b>(New!) COMMUNITY VALUES &amp; VISION CHAPTER</b>			
3	<b>New Chapter – Community Values &amp; Vision Chapter</b>	The Commission separated the Value and Vision statements from the Introduction chapter (FKA: Olympia's Vision) and placed them in their own chapter. The statements were also reformatted and edited from the July Draft. (See chapter at end of document.)	March 13, 2013
<b>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION &amp; PARTNERS CHAPTER</b>			
4	<b>Value &amp; Vision Statement for Chapter</b>	<i>Integrate this Value &amp; Vision statement into the text at the beginning of the Chapter:</i>  <i>Value:</i> <b>Public Participation:</b> Olympia residents value meaningful, open, respectful, and	March 13, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>inclusive dialogue as a shared responsibility to make our community a better place.</p> <p><i>Vision:</i>  <b>Public Participation and Partners:</b> Public engagement is a high priority for Olympia government. By engaging citizens early and often and by ample demonstration that citizens have been heard, the City has avoided the high cost of community distrust and redundant public processes to resolve problems. As a result of a healthy public participation process, each segment of the community understands the larger picture and helps determine the best interests of the City as a whole. Olympia engages the public in major decisions through community conversations, public forums, interest-based negotiation and a variety of media, and responds to the public about how its input was used.</p>	
5	<b>Action Plan Partners</b>	<p><i>Revise policy proposed in July Draft to state:</i>  <b>PP1.1:</b> The City Council and the Planning Commission, with the support of City staff is to identify the elements to include in the action (implementation) plan. The action plan should reflect City advisory groups' priorities. The public shall be engaged by doing outreach to neighborhoods, the business community, environmental and other public interest groups and citizens. This strategy will include an updating, monitoring and reporting process.</p>	January 14, 2013
6	<b>Action Plan Partners</b>	<p><i>Add New Policy:</i>  <b>PP1.2:</b> A committee, established by the City Council, will on a yearly basis review the progress of the action plan and make a report to the City Council, Planning Commission, staff and citizens. The committee should include members from the Planning Commission, neighborhoods, business community, environmental and other public interest groups and citizens.</p>	January 14, 2013
7	<b>Public Participation</b>	<p><i>Recommend policy as proposed in July Draft:</i>  <b>PP3.1:</b> Encourage City staff and other community leaders to strengthen their ability to design and implement effective public involvement strategies.</p> <p>[FSEIS p.46]</p>	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
8	<b>Public Participation</b>	<p><i>Revise policy proposed in the July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PP3.3:</b> Provide opportunities for citizens, neighborhoods, and other interested parties to get involved early in the land use decision-making processes. Encourage or require applicants to meet with affected community members and organizations.</p> <p>[FSEIS p.46]</p>	<p>December 17, 2012</p> <p>(Consent Agenda)</p>
9	<b>Subarea Planning</b>	<p><i>Recommend goal and policies as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>GP4 and policies:</b> Sub-area planning is conducted through a collaborative effort by community members and the City and is used to shape how neighborhoods grow and develop.</p> <p><b>PP4.1:</b> Work with neighborhoods to identify the priorities, assets and challenges of the designated sub-area(s), as well as provide information to increase understanding of land-use decision-making processes and the existing plans and regulations affecting sub-areas.</p> <p><b>PP4.2:</b> Encourage wide participation in the development and implementation of sub-area plans.</p> <p><b>PP4.3:</b> Define the role that sub-area plans play in City decision-making and resource allocation.</p> <p><b>PP4.4:</b> Allow initiation of sub-area planning by either neighborhoods or the City.</p> <p><b>PP4.5:</b> Encourage collaboration between neighborhoods and City representatives.</p> <p>[FSEIS p. 49]</p>	<p>December 17, 2012</p> <p>(Consent Agenda)</p>
10	<b>Public Participation</b>	<p><u>Add New Goal and Policies:</u></p> <p><u>Goal:</u> Citizens and other key stakeholders feel their opinions and ideas are heard, valued, and used by policy makers, advisory committees, and staff.</p> <p><u>Policy:</u> Build trust between all segments of the community through collaborative and inclusive decision making.</p>	<p>March 13, 2013</p>

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b>Policy:</b> <u>Replace or complement three-minute, one-way testimony with participation strategies that facilitate rich dialogue between and among interested citizens, other key stakeholders, City Council members, advisory boards, and staff.</u></p> <p><b>Policy:</b> <u>Clearly define public participation goals and choose strategies specifically designed to meet those goals.</u></p> <p><b>Policy:</b> <u>Evaluate public participation strategies to measure their effectiveness in meeting desired goals.</u></p> <p><b>Policy:</b> <u>Select strategies from the full spectrum of public participation tools and techniques.</u></p>	
<b>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CHAPTER</b>			
11	<b><u>Value &amp; Vision Statements for the Chapter.</u></b>	<p><u>Integrate this Value &amp; Vision statement into the text at the beginning of the Chapter:</u></p> <p><u>Value:</u> <b>Natural Environment:</b> <u>Olympia residents value our role as stewards of the water, air, land, vegetation, and animals around us and our responsibility to our children, our children’s children, and all life, to restore, protect, and enhance our environmental birthright.</u></p> <p><u>Vision:</u> <b>Natural Environment:</b> <u>Recognizing that gifts of nature define in large measure its greatness, Olympia works closely with the surrounding governments to preserve, protect and-restore our natural heritage.</u></p> <p><u>A dense tree canopy throughout the City provides aesthetic, health, environmental, and economic benefits. Despite the increased population, Olympia's air and water are</u></p>	March 13, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<u>cleaner. Seals, sea lions, orcas, and otters roam the waters of southern Puget Sound. Wildlife habitat has been preserved to maintain a biologically healthy diversity of species. As a result, salmon return to the streams where they were born to spawn and to die.</u>	
12	<b>Open Space Map</b>	<i>Recommend map as proposed in the July Draft:</i> Open Space and Environmentally Sensitive Areas Map revised to incorporate “Possible Open Space Corridors” and “Possible Future Trails.” [FSEIS p.]	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
13	<b>Regional Coordination</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i> <b>PN1.2:</b> Coordinate critical areas ordinances and stormwater management requirements regionally based on best available science. [FSEIS p.]	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
14	<b>Topography</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i> <b>PN1.5:</b> Preserve the existing topography on a portion of new development sites; integrate the existing site contours into the project design and minimize the use of grading and other large scale land disturbance. [FSEIS p.]	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
15	<b>Hillside Development</b>	<i>Revise policy proposed in July Draft to state:</i> <b>PN1.7:</b> Limit hillside development to site designs that incorporate and conform to the existing topography, and minimize impacts to existing hydrology. [FSEIS p.55]	January 14, 2013
16	<b>Low Impact Development</b>	<i>Recommend same policies as proposed in July Draft:</i> <b>PN 1.8:</b> Limit the negative impacts of development on public lands and environmental resources, and require restoration when impacts are unavoidable.  <b>PN1.9:</b> Foster partnerships among public, private, and non-profit agencies and community groups to identify and evaluate new and innovative approaches to low impact development and green building. [FSEIS p.]	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
17	<b>Sustainable Design</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i>	December 17, 2012

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<b>PN1.11:</b> Design, build, and retrofit public projects to incorporate sustainable design and green building methods, require minimal maintenance, and fit naturally into the surrounding environment. [FSEIS p.	(Consent Agenda)
18	<b>Land Preservation</b>	<i>The Commission did not vote on PN2.1, which was proposed by staff in the July Draft. So the staff recommendation moved forward:</i>  <b>PN2.1:</b> Prioritize acquiring and preserving land by a shared set of priorities that consider the environmental benefits of the land, such as stormwater management, wildlife habitat, and access to recreation opportunities. [FSEIS p. 60]	TABLED on January 14, 2013
19	<b>Invasive Species</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i> <b>PN2.3:</b> Identify, remove, and prevent the use and spread of invasive plants and wildlife. [FSEIS p.	December 17, 2012 (Consent Agenda)
20	<b>Habitat Corridors</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i> <b>PN2.6:</b> Conserve and restore habitat for wildlife in a series of separate pieces of land, in addition to existing corridors. [FSEIS p.	December 17, 2012 (Consent Agenda)
21	<b>Maintenance - Reduce Environmental Impact</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i> <b>PN2.7:</b> Practice maintenance and operations that reduce the City's environmental impact. [FSEIS p.	December 17, 2012 (Consent Agenda)
22	<b>Urban Forestry</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i> <b>PN3.2:</b> Measure the tree canopy and set a citywide target for increasing it. [FSEIS p.	December 17, 2012 (Consent Agenda)
23	<b>Urban Forestry</b>	<i>Revise policy proposed in July Draft to state:</i> <b>PN3.4:</b> Evaluate the environmental, ecologic, health, social and economic benefits of the urban forest. [FSEIS p.67]	January 14, 2013
24	<b>Urban Forestry</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i> <b>PN3.5:</b> Provide new trees with the necessary soil, water, space, and nutrients to grow to maturity, and plant the right size tree where there are conflicts, such as overhead utility wires or sidewalks.	December 17, 2012 (Consent Agenda)



	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		[FSEIS p.]	
25	<b>Urban Forestry</b>	<p><i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>PN3.6:</b> Protect the natural structure and growing condition of trees to minimize necessary maintenance and preserve the long-term health and safety of the urban forest.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[FSEIS p.]</p>	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
26	<b><u>Sea Level Rise</u></b>	<p><i>Replace policy PN4.4 proposed in July Draft with a new Goal and Policies:</i></p> <p><b><u>Goal:</u></b> The City has used best available information to devise and implement a sea level rise strategy.</p> <p><b><u>Policy 1:</u></b> Evaluate all options, including retreat, to deal with the impacts of sea level rise in Olympia.</p> <p><b><u>Policy 2:</u></b> Consider different scenarios for varying amounts of sea level rise, and the accompanying adaptation and response options for each scenario.</p> <p><b><u>Policy 3:</u></b> Perform a cost-benefit analysis for each adaptation strategy. Consider the physical, environmental and social factors as well as costs in the analysis.</p> <p><b><u>Policy 4:</u></b> Evaluate different financing options for adaptation strategies.</p> <p><b><u>Policy 5:</u></b> Use the best available science and the experiences of other municipalities in formulating future plans for sea level rise.</p> <p><b><u>Policy 6:</u></b> Engage the community in a discussion of the different mitigation scenarios and adaptation strategies and response and the cost.</p>	March 4, 2013
27	<b>Urban Agriculture/ Local Food Production</b>	<p><i>Add the following policy under GN4 (Natural Environment Chapter):</i></p> <p><b>PN4.5:</b> Restore and protect the health of Puget Sound as a local food source.</p>	February 25, 2013

	<b>Staff Proposed Change/ Topic</b>	<b>OPC Recommendation</b>	<b>Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote</b> (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
28	<b>Stormwater Treatment</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i> <b>PN5.3:</b> Retrofit existing infrastructure for stormwater treatment in areas of the City with little or no treatment.  [FSEIS p.]	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
29	<b>Floodways</b>	<i>Revise policy in July Draft to state:</i> <b>PN6.5:</b> Retain and restore floodways in a natural condition.  [FSEIS p.76]	February 11, 2013
30	<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>	<i>Recommend same goal and policies as proposed in July Draft:</i>  <b>GN8:</b> Community sources of emissions of carbon dioxide and other climate-changing greenhouse gases are identified, monitored, and reduced.  <b>PN8.1:</b> Coordinate with local and state partners to identify and monitor sources of greenhouse gas emissions using best available science; identify reduction targets and actions.  <b>PN8.2:</b> Monitor the greenhouse gas emissions from city operations, and implement new conservation measures, technologies and alternative energy sources to reach established reduction goals.  <b>PN8.3:</b> Reduce the use of fossil fuels and creation of greenhouse gases through planning, education, conservation, and development and implementation of renewable sources of energy. (See also GL2.)  <b>PN8.4:</b> Encourage the conservation and reuse of existing natural resources and building materials.  <b>PN8.5:</b> Reduce the pollution and energy consumption of transportation by providing accessible and inviting alternatives. (See also GT25.)  [FSEIS p.]	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
31	<b>Climate Change</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i>	December 17, 2012

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b>PN8.6:</b> Plan to adapt, mitigate, and maintain resiliency for changing environmental conditions due to climate change, such as longer periods of drought and increased flooding.</p> <p>[FSEIS p.</p>	(Consent Agenda)
32	<b>Urban Agriculture/ Local Food Production</b>	<p><i>Add the following policy under GN8 (Natural Environment Chapter):</i></p> <p><b>PN8.7:</b> Reduce energy use and environmental impact of our food system by encouraging local food production.</p>	February 25, 2013
33	<b>Dark Skies</b>	<p><i>Recommend same goal and policies as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>GN9:</b> Artificial sources of nighttime light are minimized to protect wildlife and vegetation, and preserve views of the night sky.</p> <p><b>PN9.1:</b> Design nighttime lighting that is safe and efficient by directing it only to the areas where it is needed. Allow and encourage reduction or elimination of nighttime light sources where safety is not impacted.</p> <p><b>PN9.2:</b> Eliminate or reduce lighting in proximity to streams, lakes, wetlands, and shorelines so as not to disrupt the natural development and life processes of wildlife.</p> <p>[FSEIS p.</p>	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
34	<b>Toxins</b>	<p><i>Recommend same goal and policy as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>GN10:</b> Risk to human health and damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat due to harmful toxins, pollution, or other emerging threats is tracked by appropriate agencies and significantly reduced or eliminated.</p> <p><b>PN10.1:</b> Minimize the City's purchase and use of products that contribute to toxic chemical pollution through their creation, use, or disposal.</p> <p>[FSEIS p.</p>	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)

**LAND USE & URBAN DESIGN CHAPTER**

	Staff Proposed Change/  Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
35	<b>Value &amp; Vision Statement for the Chapter</b>	<p><i>Integrate this Value &amp; Vision statement into the text at the beginning of the Chapter:</i></p> <p><i>Value:</i>  <b>Land Use:</b> Olympia residents value accommodating growth without sprawl or excessive reliance on automobiles; neighborhoods with distinct identities; historic buildings and places; a walkable and comfortable downtown; <u>increased urban green space</u>; local production of food; and public spaces for citizens in neighborhoods, downtown, and along shorelines.</p> <p><i>Vision:</i>  <b>Land Use and Urban Design:</b> Pedestrian-oriented streetscapes, livable and affordable neighborhoods, safe and meaningful street life, and high-quality civic architecture have made Olympia a showcase, fulfilling its potential as the capital city of the Evergreen State.</p> <p>Olympia has collaborated with Tumwater and the Port of Olympia to make our urban waterfront a shared and priceless asset. This shoreline follows the Deschutes River from Tumwater’s historic buildings, past Marathon and Heritage parks to Percival Landing and the Port Peninsula.</p> <p>People walk throughout downtown, shop at its small businesses, enjoy its artistic offerings and gather at its many fine restaurants and meeting places. The historic Capitol Way boulevard linking the waterfront and downtown to the Capitol Campus invites and attracts residents to enjoy the City’s civic space. Plazas, expanded sidewalks, and art in public places have stimulated private investment in residential development, which, in turn, has greatly increased downtown’s retail and commercial vitality.</p> <p>Olympia has established “urban nodes” characterized by higher density and mixed use development, walkability, transit feasibility and lower costs for urban services.</p> <p>Infill projects and remodels help to meet the demands of population growth while</p>	March 13, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>creating more walkable communities. Older neighborhoods have been rejuvenated. Historic buildings are valued, preserved and adapted to new uses.</p> <p>Olympia achieves its development and redevelopment goals through “sub-area planning.” These plans determine where and how to increase density, how to retain green space, and how to enhance mobility. They assure safe and convenient access to the goods and services needed in daily life - grocery stores selling local products, schools, neighborhood parks, community gardens and neighborhood gathering places.</p>	
36	<b>Future Land Use Map</b>	<p>Revise the Future Land Use Map to consolidate the 34 categories into 15 categories with less definite boundaries. Agree with the 14 categories proposed in the July Draft, except add one: split Light Industrial out into its own category.</p> <p>[FSEIS p. 86]</p>	March 13, 2013
37	<b>Future Land Use Map</b>	<p><i>In response to the map changes proposed in the July Draft, the Planning Commission makes the following recommendations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Kaiser Road:</b> <u>Light Industrial area should be retained (and the Future Land Use map should reflect this as a separate land use designation from Industrial.)</u></li> <li>• <b>South Bay Road:</b> Light Industrial area should be retained (and the Future Land Use map should reflect this as a separate land use designation from Industrial.)</li> <li>• <b>LOTT treatment plant:</b> Same as staff recommendation – change from Industry to Urban Waterfront designation.</li> <li>• <b>Henderson Park:</b> Same as staff recommendation – change from CC/CSHD to General Commerce designation. (OPC could not reach a majority so reverts to staff recommendation.)</li> <li>• <b>Capitol Campus:</b> Same as staff recommendation - change from Cap Campus/Comm. Srvs. High Density (CC/CSHD) to Planned Development.</li> <li>• <b>Heritage Park:</b> Same as staff recommendation – change from High-Rise Multi-family category to Planned Development.</li> <li>• <b>Two Professional Office blocks near City Justice Center:</b> Same as staff recommendation - change to City Center designation.</li> <li>• <b>Text description of “Auto Services” added.</b> Same as staff recommendation</li> </ul>	March 13, 2013

	<b>Staff Proposed Change/ Topic</b>	<b>OPC Recommendation</b>	<b>Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote</b> (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
38	<b>Future Land Use Map</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i>  <b>PL1.4:</b> Require functional and efficient development by adopting and periodically updating zoning consistent with the Future Land Use Map.	December 17, 2013  (Consent Calendar)
39	<b>Development standards, generally</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i>  <b>PL1.5</b> Require development to meet appropriate minimum standards, such as landscaping and design guidelines, stormwater and other engineering standards, and buildings codes, and address risks, such as geologically hazardous areas; and require existing development to be gradually improved to such standards.	December 17, 2013  (Consent Calendar)
40	<b>Parking, Bicycles</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i>  <b>PL1.13</b> Require new, and encourage existing, businesses to provide bicycle parking.	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
41	<b>Historic Preservation</b>	<i>Revise the following goals in the July Draft to state:</i>  <b>Goal GL3:</b> Historic resources are a key element in the overall design and sense of place of Olympia.  <b>GL5:</b> Historic preservation is achieved in cooperation with all members of the community and integrated into City decision processes.	March 13, 2013
42	<b>Capitol Lake</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i>  <b>PN4.3:</b> Support the process for determining a balanced and sustainable approach to the management of Capitol Lake; participate when the opportunity is available as a party of significant interest in the outcome. [FSEIS p.	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
43	<b>Historic Preservation</b>	<i>Add a new policy under G5:</i>  <b>PL5.9:</b> City departments and commissions collaborate with the Heritage Commission to	March 13, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		promote mutual goals in historic areas (districts, buildings, sites.)	
44	<b>Design Review</b>	<p><i>Revise policy PL6.1 in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PL6.1A:</b> Require residential and commercial development adjacent to freeways and public streets be subject to a design review process.</p> <p><b>PL6.1B:</b> The design review process should recognize differences in the City with the objective of maintaining or improving the character and livability of each area or neighborhood.</p>	January 14, 2013
45	<b>Views</b>	<p><i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>PL6.9:</b> Preserve and enhance water vistas by retaining public rights-of-way that abut or are within one block of water bodies and by not siting public buildings within associated view corridors.</p> <p>[FSEIS, p. 96]</p>	March 18, 2013
46	<b>Views &amp; Heights</b>	<p><i>Replace policy PL6.10 in July Draft with new Goal and Policies:</i></p> <p><b>Goal:</b> Community views are protected, preserved and enhanced.</p> <p><b>Policy 1:</b> Implement public processes, including the use of Olympia’s digital simulation software, to identify important landmark views and observation points.</p> <p><b>Policy 2:</b> Utilize Olympia’s digital simulation software to identify view planes and sightline heights between the landmark view and observation point.*</p> <p><b>Policy 3:</b> Prevent blockage of landmark views by limiting the heights of buildings or structures on the west and east Olympia ridge lines.</p> <p><b>Policy 4:</b> Height bonuses and incentives shall not interfere with landmark views.</p> <p><b>Policy 5:</b> Set absolute maximum building heights to preserve views of landmarks from</p>	March 4, 2013.

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>observation points, such as those identified in the following matrix, as determined through public process:</p> <p><u>Landmark Views:</u> (Landmark views involve State Capitol Campus, mountains, waterways, and hills.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Olympic Mountains</li> <li>• Puget Sound</li> <li>• Mt. Rainier</li> <li>• State Capitol Campus Promontory</li> <li>• Olympia valleys' treed hill slopes</li> <li>• Capitol Lake/ Estuary</li> <li>• Black Hills</li> </ul> <p><u>Observation Points:</u> (Observations points are either static or dynamic from: Puget Sound, State Capitol Campus, public parks, public right of ways, the Olympia Waterfront Route Map**, downtown Olympia, and the surrounding community.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Puget Sound's Navigational Channel</li> <li>• State Capitol Campus Promontory</li> <li>• Parks: West Bay Park, Priest Point Park, North Point, Sunrise Park, and Madison Scenic Park, and Percival Landing.</li> <li>• Streets: State, 4<sup>th</sup> Ave, Harrison, Deschutes, West Bay, East Bay Drive, 4th Ave Bridge, Olympic Ave, Boulevard Road, Pacific Ave, Martin Ave, Brawne, Foote, Capital Way, (portions)</li> <li>• Washington "W" walkway and bikeway system (portions)</li> <li>• Downtown: Hands-on Museum, and old/new City Hall,</li> </ul> <p>*Staff - Find a way to define words so public can understand. **Map 2.2 in Olympia Parks Arts and Recreation Plan, as of March 18, 2013.</p>	
47	<b>Light Industry in Commercial Zones</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i>	December 17, 2012



	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<b>PL8.8:</b> Provide opportunities for light industrial uses in commercial areas consistent with the commercial and multi-family uses of those areas, such as low-impact production within buildings with retain storefronts.  [FSEIS p.]	(Consent Agenda)
48	<b>Parking</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i>  <b>PL9.5:</b> Encourage efficient use and design of commercial parking areas; reduce parking requirements (but avoid significant overflow into residential areas); support parking structures, especially downtown and in urban corridors; and designate streets for on-street parking where safe.  [FSEIS p.]	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
49	<b>Design Review</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i>  <b>PL9.6:</b> Encourage new commercial uses adjacent to the arterial street edge and in mixed-use projects.  [FSEIS, p.]	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
50	<b>Urban Corridors</b>	<i>The Commission did not vote on this update proposed by staff in the July Draft, but tabled it for a potential future work item. So, for now, the staff recommendation as follows will move forward:</i>  <b>PL11.5:</b> Ensure appropriate transitional land uses from high intensity land uses along the arterial streets of the urban corridors to the less intensive land uses at the fringe of the corridors; generally the most intensive uses will be within 400 feet of the major streets; corridor redevelopment should enhance both the corridor and quality of life in adjacent residential neighborhoods.	TABLED on March 18, 2013  Relates to Urban Corridor work item
51	<b>Focus Areas</b>	<i>Recommend policy as proposed in July Draft to state:</i>  <b>PL12.1:</b> Maximize the potential of the Capital Mall area as a regional shopping center by encouraging development that caters to a regional market, by providing pedestrian walkways between businesses and areas; by increasing shopper-convenience and	March 18, 2013  Implied consent on February 11, 2013, as part of discussion about PU12.4, but actual

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		reducing traffic by supporting transit service linked to downtown; by encouraging redevelopment of parking areas with buildings and parking structures; and by encouraging the integration of multifamily housing.	motion regarding PL12.1 did not occur.
52	<b>Focus Areas</b>	<p><i>Revise policy proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PL12.4:</b> Plan for redevelopment of the Stoll Road area and that area bounded by Lilly Road, Pacific Avenue and I-5 as 'focus areas' adjacent to the Pacific Avenue and Martin Way urban corridors to include retail, office, personal and professional services and high density housing; planning for these areas should encompass consideration of redevelopment and improvement of nearby portions of the urban corridor.</p> <p>[FSEIS, p. 106]</p>	February 11, 2013
53	<b>Affordable Housing</b>	<p><i>Within body of introductory text, add another bullet under “Many factors contribute to the need for more housing of various types:”</i></p> <p>Add the following below the existing bullet that states, “The proportion of senior citizens is increasing ...”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City should provide annually information to the citizens on affordable housing, family incomes, and market rate housing.</li> </ul>	March 18, 2013
54	<b>Low Impact Development/ Cluster Subdivision</b>	<p><i>Revise policy as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>PL13.3:</b> Allow ‘clustering’ of housing compatible with the adjacent neighborhood to preserve and protect environmentally sensitive areas.</p>	February 11, 2013
55	<b>Neighborhood character</b>	<p><i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>PL13.9:</b> In all residential areas, allow small cottages and townhouses, and one accessory housing unit per home—all subject to siting, design and parking requirements that ensure neighborhood character is maintained.</p>	March 18, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
56	<b>Affordable Housing</b>	<p><i>Approve the following policy under Goal 13:</i></p> <p><b>PL13.12:</b> Require a mix of single-family and multi-family structures villages, mixed residential density districts, and apartment projects, when these exceed five acres; and use a variety of housing types and setbacks to transition to adjacent single-family areas.</p>	March 18, 2013
57	<b>Affordable Housing</b>	<p><i>Add the following new policy under Goal 13:</i></p> <p><b>PL13.14:</b> Provide annual information on affordable homeownership and rentals in the City, including the operative definition of affordable housing, criteria to qualify for local, state, and federal housing assistance, data on current levels of market rate and affordable housing, demand for market rate and affordable housing, and progress toward meeting market rate and affordable housing goals.</p>	March 18, 2013
58	<b>Downtown Master Plan</b>	<p><i>Recommend to City Council that the Downtown Master Plan be a separate document from the Comprehensive Plan. While not part of the motion, the Commission expressed intent to recommend PL14.1 as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>PL14.1:</b> Adopt a Downtown Master Plan addressing – at minimum – housing, public spaces, parking management, rehabilitation and redevelopment, architecture and cultural resources, building skyline and views, and relationships to the Port peninsula and Capitol Campus.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[FSEIS, p.49]</p>	March 4, 2013.
59	<b>Design Review</b>	<p><i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>PL15.4:</b> Design streets with landscaping, wide sidewalks, underground utilities and a coordinated pattern of unifying details; and provide for private use of public lands and rights-of-way when in the best interest of the community.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">FSEIS p.</p>	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
60	<b>Design Review</b>	<p><i>Recommend same goals and policies as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>GL16:</b> Downtown's historic character and significant historic buildings, structures, and</p>	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>sites are preserved and enhanced.</p> <p><b>PL16.1:</b> Promote the Downtown Historic District to provide focal points of historic interest, maintain the economic vitality of downtown, and enhance the richness and diversity of Olympia.</p> <p><b>PL16.2:</b> Minimize damage to significant historic features or character during rehabilitation projects.</p> <p><b>PL16.3:</b> Design new development and renovations to be compatible and harmonious with the established pattern, alignment, size and shape of existing downtown area.</p> <p><b>PL16.4:</b> Incorporate historic buildings into redevelopment projects and restore historic facades.</p>	
61	<b>Healthy &amp; Active Lifestyles</b>	<p><i>Revise new policy proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PL17.5:</b> Encourage or require development and public improvements be consistent with healthy and active lifestyles.</p>	January 14, 2013
62	<b>Design Review, Preventing 'Fortress Style Designs'</b>	<p><i>Revise policy in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PL17.6:</b> Prevent physical barriers from isolating and separating the integration and compatibility of new developments with existing neighborhoods.</p>	January 14, 2013
63	<b>Urban Agriculture/ Local Food Production</b>	<p><i>Add the following policy under GL19:</i></p> <p><b>PL19.3:</b> Encourage use of appropriate food-producing trees to increase local food self-sufficiency.</p>	
64	<b>Urban Agriculture/ Local Food Production</b>	<p><i>Remove policy PL17.4 as proposed in the July Draft. It will be replaced with the following new goals and policies:</i></p> <p><b>GL22:</b> Local Thurston County food production is encouraged and supported to increase</p>	February 25, 2013.

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>self-sufficiency, reduce environmental impact, promote health, and the humane treatment of animals, and to support our local economy.</p> <p><b>PL22.1:</b> The City will actively partner with community organizations to provide education and information about the importance of local food systems.</p> <p><b>PL22.2:</b> The City will encourage home gardens as an alternative to maintaining grass/lawn and other landscaping that is either non-productive for local food systems or not supportive of native ecology.</p> <p><b>PL22.3:</b> The City will collaborate with community partners to ensure that everyone within Olympia is within biking/walking distance of a place to grow food.</p> <p><b>PL22.4:</b> The City will encourage for-profit gardening/farming in the community.</p> <p><b>PL22.5:</b> The City will support local food production with its own purchasing power.</p> <p><b>PL22.6:</b> The City will allow rooftop food production and consider incentives for providing food-producing greenhouses atop buildings.</p> <p><b>PL22.7:</b> The City recognizes the value of Open Space and other green spaces as areas of potential food production.</p> <p><b>PL22.8:</b> The City will partner with community organizations to measure and set goals for increasing local food production, and develop strategies to accomplish these goals.</p> <p><b>PL22.9:</b> The City will work with other local governments throughout the region to encourage the protection of existing agricultural lands, offer educational opportunities for promotion, and encourage the development of a vibrant local food economy. [Staff to change order of listed so encourage is not redundant.]</p> <p><b>PL22.10:</b> Partner with community organizations to provide education to citizens raising</p>	

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>animals for food in the City to ensure protection from predators, and to provide sanitary conditions and humane treatment for these animals.</p> <p><b>PL22.11:</b> Educate and encourage citizens to purchase from local farms and small producers as an alternative to factory farms that engage in inhumane treatment of animals</p>	
65	<b><u>Urban Green Space</u></b>	<p><i>Recommend the following new goals and policies:</i></p> <p><b><u>GOAL:</u></b> <u>Urban green space is available to the public and located throughout the community and incorporates natural environments into the urban setting, which are easily accessible and viewable so that people can experience nature daily and nearby.</u></p> <p><b><u>Policy 1:</u></b> <u>Provide urban green spaces in which to spend time. Include such elements as trees, garden spaces, variety of vegetation, water features, green walls and roofs and seating.</u></p> <p><b><u>Policy 2:</u></b> <u>Provide urban green spaces that are in people’s immediate vicinity and can be enjoyed or viewed from a variety of perspectives.</u></p> <p><b><u>Policy 2:</u></b> <u>Establish a maximum distance to urban green space for all community members.</u></p> <p><b><u>Policy 3:</u></b> <u>Increase the area per capita of urban green space and the tree canopy- to-area ratio within each neighborhood.</u></p> <p><b><u>Policy 4:</u></b> <u>Establish urban green space between transportation corridors and adjacent areas.</u></p>	February 11, 2013
66	<b>Urban Neighborhoods</b>	<p><i>Adopt the following concept and related Urban Corridor map, with the recommendation that more work needs to be done to integrate this within the existing draft. Request that it be a future work plan item for the Planning Commission.</i></p>	March 11, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b><u>OLYMPIA'S NEIGHBORHOODS</u></b></p> <p><b>GOAL:</b> Olympia's neighborhoods provide housing choices that fit the diversity of local income levels and life styles. They are shaped by public planning processes that continuously involve citizens, neighborhoods, and city officials.</p> <p><b>POLICIES:</b></p> <p><b>P1:</b> Establish 8 gateways that are entry/exit pathways along major streets to downtown Olympia and our Capitol. These streets will act as tree-lined civic boulevards that present a unified streetscape that enhances the grandeur of our Capital City.</p> <p><b>P2:</b> High-density Neighborhoods concentrate housing into a number of designated sites: Downtown Olympia; Pacific/Martin/Lilly Triangle; and West Capital Mall. Commercial uses directly serve high-density neighborhoods and allow people to meet their daily needs without traveling outside their neighborhood. High-density neighborhoods are primarily walk-dependent. At least one-quarter of the forecasted growth shall be in downtown Olympia.</p> <p><b>P3:</b> Protect and preserve the existing established Low-density Neighborhoods. Disallow medium or high density development in existing Low-density Neighborhood areas except for Neighborhood Centers... [intent is to allow what is in current zoning]</p> <p><b>P4:</b> Allow medium-density Neighborhood Centers in low-density neighborhoods to include both civic and commercial uses that serve the neighborhood. Neighborhood centers emerge from a neighborhood public process.</p>	
67	<b>Urban Neighborhoods, Map</b>	<i>Forward to City Council both the <a href="#">Future Land Use map</a> and the <a href="#">Urban Neighborhood's map</a> drafted by Commissioner Ingman, with the understanding that OPC will do some</i>	March 18, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<i>work in April to ensure the Urban Neighborhoods goal and policies are accurately reflected on the map(s.) The Commission will also identify if there are any inconsistencies to be worked out, and may recommend a future work item to further refine the proposal.</i>	
68	<b>Land Use Designation</b>	<p><i>The Commission did not vote on this update proposed by staff in the July Draft, but tabled it for a potential future work item. So, for now, the staff recommendation as follows will move forward:</i></p> <p><b>Appendix A at end of Land Use &amp; Urban Design Chapter:</b>  <b>Low-Density Housing.</b> This designation provides for low-density residential development—primarily single-family detached housing—in densities ranging from eight units per acre to one unit per five acres depending on environmental sensitivity of the area. Where environmental constraints are significant, to achieve minimum densities extraordinary clustering may be allowed when combined with environmental protection. Barring environmental constraints, densities of at least four units per acre should be achieved. Supportive land uses and other types of housing, including townhomes and small apartment buildings, may be permitted. Specific zoning and densities are to be based on the unique characteristics of each area with special attention to stormwater drainage and aquatic habitat. Clustered development to provide future urbanization opportunities will be required where urban utilities are not readily available.</p> <p>[FSEIS p.55]</p>	<p>TABLED on March 18, 2013</p> <p>Relates to Urban Corridor work item</p>
69	<b>Port Plan</b>	<p><i>After discussion, the Commission took no action on this staff proposed substantive change, so the recommendation moves forward.</i></p> <p>Port Plan Removed from Comprehensive Plan, and linked to under 'For More Information' section instead.</p> <p>[FSEIS p.106]</p>	March 18, 2013
<b>TRANSPORTATION CHAPTER</b>			
70	<b>Value &amp; Vision Statement for the Chapter</b>	<i>Integrate this Value &amp; Vision statement into the text at the beginning of the Chapter:</i>	March 13, 2013



	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><i>Value:</i> <b>Transportation:</b> Olympia residents value moving people and goods through the community in a manner that is safe, minimizes environmental impacts, enhances connectivity, conserves energy, and promotes healthy neighborhoods.</p> <p><i>Vision:</i> <b>Transportation:</b> Olympians, young and old, walk and bike to work, school, shopping, and recreation. Bike lanes and sidewalks are found on arterials and collectors throughout the city; all sidewalks and many bike lanes are separated from vehicular traffic by a buffer. Pedestrians and bicyclists also use trails and pathways through open areas, between neighborhoods, and along shorelines.</p> <p>Sidewalks in compact, mixed-use neighborhoods, including downtown, are filled with walkers who stop at small shops and squares in lively centers near their homes. Trees lining the streets and awnings on storefronts provide comfort and protection for walkers. Nearly all residents are within easy walking distance of a transit stop.</p> <p>Most people commute to work on foot, bicycle, transit, or carpool. Those who drive to work do so in small vehicles fueled by renewable resources. Comfortable electric buses arrive every ten minutes at bus stops along all major arterials.</p> <p>Parking lots are located on the edges of downtown, hidden from view by storefronts and office space. Convenient short-term bike parking for visitors/shoppers and long-term bike parking for employees is found onsite or near all developments. Street faces are no longer broken up by surface parking lots.</p> <p>Variable pricing of street meters and off-street facilities ensure that street spaces are available for downtown shoppers and visitors, while workers who car-commute make use of the peripheral off-street facilities.</p> <p>Driving lanes throughout town are not excessively wide and streets provide room for</p>	

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>bike lanes and parking and slow down traffic. System efficiencies, demand management and intersection improvements allow smooth traffic flow.</p> <p>Due to slower speeds, frequent safe crossings, and well-managed intersections, deaths and serious injuries from car/pedestrian and car/bicycle collisions have been nearly eliminated.</p>	
71	<b>Complete Streets</b>	<p><i>Revise goal and policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>GT1:</b> All streets are safe and inviting for pedestrians and bicyclists. Streets are designed to be human scale, while accommodating motor vehicles, and to reinforce and encourage safe driver behavior.</p> <p><b>PT1.2:</b> Build streets to be as narrow as possible in individual lane width and overall width to discourage speeding, while facilitating the movement of larger vehicles, as needed to the level appropriate for the area uses.</p> <p><b>PT1.3:</b> Establish speed limits to create a safe environment for pedestrians and bicyclists, while maintaining motor vehicle traffic flow. Speed limits shall not exceed 35 miles per hour on arterial and major collector streets and 25 miles per hour on neighborhood collector and 20 miles per hour on local access streets, and in the City Center. *Put in letter that this might be able to be addressed through sub-area planning</p> <p><b>PT1.4:</b> Mitigate the impacts of high traffic volumes by creating buffers between pedestrians and motor vehicles with on-street parking, street trees, and planter strips, building wide sidewalks, and creating interest along the street with amenities and building design. * Put in letter that City might consider buffers for bicycle lanes</p> <p><b>PT1.7:</b> Use medians for access control and to keep the number of motor vehicle lanes to a minimum.</p>	February 25, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b>PT1.8:</b> Build streets in a grid pattern of small blocks to allow streets to be narrow and low-volume, encourage walking, and provide travelers with a choice of routes.</p> <p><b>PT1.11:</b> Consider modified street design to enhance function for all modes and to support the unique identity of a street.</p> <p><b>PT1.12:</b> Provide adequate street and public pathway lighting for the safety of all modes in a manner that reduces light pollution.</p>	
72	<b>Complete Streets</b>	<p><i>Add new policies under Goal 1:</i></p> <p><b>PT1.75:</b> Use medians for pedestrian crossing islands, and to enhance the beauty of a street.</p> <p><b>PT1.95:</b> Require consolidation of driveways and parking lot connectivity for adjacent commercial areas to facilitate access from one site to another without having to access the roadway.</p>	February 25, 2013
73	<b>Street Design</b>	<p><i>Revise goal and policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>GT2:</b> As new streets are built or existing streets are reconstructed, multimodal features are added. Features defined for different types of streets are specified in the City of Olympia Engineering Design and Development Standards. {Link to the EDDS}</p> <p><b>PT2.1:</b> Build arterial streets to serve as primary routes connecting urban centers and the regional transportation network. These streets include bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips and pedestrian crossing features and other amenities that support pedestrian comfort and safety.</p> <p><b>PT2.2:</b> Build major collector streets to connect arterials to residential and commercial areas. These streets include bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips and pedestrian crossing features.</p>	

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b>PT2.3:</b> Build neighborhood collectors to provide circulation within and between residential and commercial areas. These streets include sidewalks and planter strips, and may include pedestrian crossing features. Selected neighborhood collectors include bike lanes, or signs and markings to designate a bike route (see Appendix D, Bike Network Map and List).</p> <p><b>PT2.4:</b> Build local access streets to provide direct connections to properties within neighborhoods. All new local access streets include sidewalks and planter strips. Local access streets may include signs and markings to direct cyclists to the larger bicycle network.</p> <p><b>PT2.5:</b> Provide transit stops and service accommodations, based on Intercity Transit's criteria. Include sidewalk access to all designated stops and consider pedestrian crossing improvements to facilitate access, including mid-block crossing islands on high volume streets.</p> <p><b>PT2.6:</b> Install or allow traffic-calming devices on local access, neighborhood collector, and some major collector streets, where speeds, volumes and other conditions indicate a need. Consider pedestrian, bicyclist and transit bus safety and access when installing traffic calming devices.</p> <p><b>PT2.7:</b> Allow on-street parking on local access and neighborhood collector streets, to provide direct access to properties.</p> <p><b>PT2.8</b> Prioritize adding bulb-outs for shorter pedestrian crossings and traffic calming on existing arterials and major collectors with on-street parking. Consider building bulb-outs on neighborhood collector streets with on-street parking where overall narrowing of the street is not possible.</p>	
74	<b>Efficient delivery of goods and services</b>	<i>Revise policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i>	February 25, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b>PT3.2:</b> Designate and enforce appropriate linear curb space for loading and unloading of commercial vehicles in urban areas.</p> <p><b>PT3.3:</b> Consider large vehicle movement in the design of arterial and major collector streets, particularly at intersections and on streets in industrial zoned areas and mixed use areas.</p> <p><b>PT3.4:</b> Require alleys and retain alleys as public right-of-way.</p> <p><b>PT3.5:</b> Require alleys behind lots fronting on arterials and collectors, so that houses or businesses can face the street, sidewalks are continuous, and vehicles can access properties from behind.</p>	
75	<b>Efficient delivery of goods and services</b>	<p><i>Add policy:</i></p> <p><b>PT3.55:</b> Maintain functionality of alleyways for delivery and service vehicles by ensuring they are not blocked by trash receptacles, cars or other obstructions.</p>	February 25, 2013
76	<b>Efficient delivery of goods and services</b>	<p><i>Delete policy as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>PT3.6:</b> Provide access to individual properties from the smallest type of street when a lot fronts more than one street.</p>	February 25, 2013
77	<b>Connectivity</b>	<p><i>Revise policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT4.1:</b> Connect streets in a grid-like pattern of smaller blocks. Block sizes should range from 250 feet to 350 feet in residential areas and up to a maximum of 500 feet along arterials.</p> <p><b>PT4.3:</b> Build new street and pathway connections so that people walking, biking, or accessing bus stops have direct route options, making these modes more inviting.</p> <p><b>PT4.8:</b> Build new arterials, major collectors and neighborhood collectors based on the general location defined on the Transportation Maps in Appendix B. Require use of the</p>	February 25, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>Engineering Design and Development Standards {link} for such roadways.</p> <p><b>PT4.10:</b> Require that new developments connect to the existing street network and also provide for future street connections to ensure the gridded street system is built out concurrently with future development.</p> <p><b>PT4.13:</b> Build an adequate network of arterials and collectors to discourage heavy traffic volumes on local access streets. [For more information see: Appendix B: Transportation 2030 Street Capacity and Connectivity Project List and Maps.]</p> <p><b>PT4.14:</b> Build a dense grid of local access and collector streets to provide multiple points of ingress/egress from a neighborhood, and so that local traffic does not have to use arterial streets for trips within the neighborhood.</p> <p><b>PT4.15:</b> Only allow cul-de-sacs as the result of topographic and environmental constraints. Cul-de-sacs that are built should have a maximum length of 300 feet and be built with pedestrian and bike connections to adjacent streets, or to destinations such as schools, parks and trails wherever possible.</p>	
78	<b>Connectivity</b>	<p><i>Revise policy PT4.21 as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT 4.21:</b> Pursue all street connections. When a street connection is proposed, the developer, City, or County will analyze how not making the street connection will impact the street network. This information will be shared with the neighborhood and other stakeholders before any final decision is made. At a minimum, this evaluation will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on directness of travel for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and motorists</li> <li>• Impact on directness of travel for emergency - public, - and commercial-service vehicles</li> <li>• An assessment of travel patterns of the larger neighborhood area</li> <li>• An assessment of traffic volumes at the connection and at major intersections</li> </ul>	January 28, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>in the larger neighborhood area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of major topographical barriers or environmental constraints that make a connection infeasible</li> <li>• Involve the neighborhood and other stakeholders in the identification of potential mitigation measures for the new connection</li> <li>• Bicycle and pedestrian safety</li> <li>• Noise impacts and air pollution</li> <li>• Likelihood of diverting significant cross-town arterial traffic onto local neighborhood streets</li> <li>• Effectiveness of proposed traffic-calming measures.</li> </ul>	
79	<b>Pathways</b>	<p><i>Revise policy as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT5.2:</b> Require new development to provide pathways and connect to adjacent developed properties in order to provide direct bicycle and pedestrian routes. These will be at the same interval spacing as street spacing requirements or at closer intervals.</p>	February 25, 2013
80	<b>Pathways</b>	<p><i>Add new policy:</i></p> <p><b>PT5.4:</b> The City will coordinate with the State regarding increasing bicycle and pedestrian permeability of the Capitol Campus.</p>	February 25, 2013
81	<b>Systems Capacity</b>	<p><i>Revise policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT7.1:</b> Measure level-of-service using the average vehicle volumes that occur during the highest volume consecutive two-hour period. Use the two-hour level of service as a screening tool to determine capacity needs at intersections and along streets. Consider location efficiency in this calculation to remove disincentives for development along Urban Corridors where increased density is desired.</p> <p><b>PT7.2:</b> Determine the need for, and feasibility of, motor vehicle capacity improvements by considering street hierarchy and street spacing criteria; environmental, social, and urban form impacts; cost; and physical constraints.</p>	February 25, 2013  Except, <b>highlighted</b> policy recommended on March 11, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b>PT7.3:</b> No street will exceed the width of five general purpose auto lanes (two in each direction and a center turn lane) mid-block when adding capacity to the street system. Turn lanes may be added as appropriate, with careful consideration of pedestrian and bicyclist safety.</p> <p><b>PT7.4:</b> Consider roundabouts as a strategy to maintain mobility.</p> <p><b>PT7.5:</b> Establish and maintain appropriate level-of-service using the following guidelines; (see street system maps in Appendix B and Corridor map in Appendix H):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level-of-service E will be acceptable on arterials and major collectors in the City Center and along Urban Corridors</li> <li>• Level-of-service D will be acceptable in the rest of the City and Urban Growth Area</li> <li>• Higher levels of service may be maintained in parts of the City because of low-traffic demand</li> <li>• For some intersections, level-of-service is F is acceptable</li> <li>• On Strategy Corridors, where widening is not an option, levels-of-service may fall below adopted standards.</li> </ul>	
82	<b>Systems Capacity</b>	<p><i>Add new policy:</i></p> <p><b>PT7.25:</b> Consider signal upgrades and signal timing as standard elements in addressing congestion.</p>	February 25, 2013
83	<b>Systems Capacity</b>	<p><i>Revise goal and policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>GT8:</b> The impacts of new land-use development on the transportation system are mitigated appropriately.</p> <p><b>PT8.1:</b> Require mitigation for new developments so that transportation level of service does not fall below adopted standards except where adopted policies allow.</p>	February 25, 2013



	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b>PT8.2:</b> Construction of improvements or contribution of funds may be required of new development to help the function and safety of the street, such as installation/upgrades/timing/re-timing of traffic signals, installation of bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, turn pockets, special lanes for buses and conversion of signalized intersections to roundabouts.</p>	
84	<p><b>Connectivity, Decatur St &amp; Fern/16<sup>th</sup> Ave</b></p>	<p><i>Strike the paragraph in Appendix A of the Transportation Chapter on page 40-41 of the July Draft [third paragraph under the title "Decatur Street and 16th Avenue Connections"] that starts with "The majority of users ..."</i></p> <p><i>Add a footnote that these connections would be made contingent upon completion of Phase 2 of the Olympia West Access study.</i></p>	January 28, 2013
85	<p><b>Connectivity, Kaiser Rd &amp; Black Lake Blvd</b></p>	<p><i>Strike the paragraph in Appendix A of the Transportation Chapter on page 41-42 of the July Draft [second paragraph under the title "Kaiser Road &amp; Black Lake Boulevard"] that starts with "A neighborhood collector ..."</i></p> <p><i>Add a new second paragraph that states:</i>  <i>"If at some future time Kaiser Road is extended to Black Lake Boulevard, extension of Park Drive to Kaiser Road may be considered in order to provide access for bicycles, pedestrians, and emergency vehicles."</i></p>	January 28, 2013
86	<p><b>Connectivity, 16<sup>th</sup> &amp; Fern</b></p>	<p><i>Edit Appendix B [on page 46 of the Transportation Chapter in the July Draft] to include the 16th Ave SW &amp; Fern St connection to the list of "Street Connections."</i></p>	January 28, 2013
87	<p><b>Systems Capacity</b></p>	<p><i>Revise goal as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>GT9:</b> In designated Strategy Corridors, when road widening is not an option, mobility and system capacity is increased through the addition of walking, biking and transit facilities, supportive land use, and by eliminating system inefficiencies.</p> <p><i>Recommend same new policies as proposed in July Draft:</i></p>	February 25, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b>PT9.1:</b> Add bike lanes and sidewalks, improve transit services, and use demand management measures to ensure that transit, bicycle and pedestrian transportation are attractive and easy to use during peak travel periods on all streets, especially Strategy Corridors.</p> <p><i>Revise policy as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT9.2:</b> Review and update concurrency ordinances as appropriate to implement multimodal and system efficiency strategies in Strategy Corridors. (See Concurrency Report explanation in Appendix A.)</p> <p><i>Recommend same new policies as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>PT9.3:</b> Expand network connectivity for all modes to help address capacity problems through construction of street connections, pathways and trails.</p>	
88	<b>System Capacity</b>	<p><i>Revise goal as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>GT10:</b> System capacity improvements focus on moving people and goods more efficiently, minimizing congestion by replacing car trips with walking, biking and transit trips, and by increasing system operational efficiency and reliability.</p>	February 25, 2013
89	<b>System Capacity</b>	<p><i>Recommend same goal and policies as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>PT10.1:</b> Pursue a person-trip concurrency program in order to allow construction of bicycle, pedestrian and transit system improvements as concurrency mitigation.</p> <p><b>PT10.2:</b> Seek voluntary concurrency mitigation measures separate from other transportation mitigation measures required by either State Environmental Policy Act or</p>	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		the City's Transportation Impact Fee policies and programs.	
90	<b>Land Use/Transportation</b>	<p><i>Replace Goal 12 and related policies proposed in the July draft with these revisions and additions:</i></p> <p><b>GT12:</b> A mix of strategies is used to concentrate growth in the City, which both supports and is supported by walking, biking and transit.</p> <p><b>PT12.1:</b> Consider upzoning in the downtown core and along parts of the Urban Corridor, while maintaining lower densities in the periphery of the City.</p> <p><b>PT12.2:</b> Consider a geographically-influenced impact fee based on costs that would likely incentivize (re)development in the downtown core and along parts of the Urban Corridor.</p> <p><b>PT12.3:</b> Consider incentives to address the specific challenges downtown redevelopment faces.</p> <p><b>PT12.4:</b> Promote infill in close-in neighborhoods and densification in activity centers and downtown in order to reduce sprawl, to reduce motor vehicle trips and make the best use of the existing transportation network.</p> <p><b>PT12.5:</b> Allow residential uses in commercial and employment areas in order to reduce commute and errand trip distances and increase the feasibility of alternatives to driving alone.</p> <p><b>PT12.6:</b> Allow neighborhood centers in residential areas to reduce commute and errand trip distances and increase the feasibility of alternatives to driving alone.</p>	March 11, 2013
91	<b>Land Use/Transportation</b>	<p><i>Revise goal and policies proposed in July draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>GT13:</b> Greater density along priority Bus Corridors optimizes investments in transit and makes transit an inviting mode of travel. (See Appendix H, the Corridors map for Bus</p>	February 25, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>Corridors.)</p> <p><b>PT13.1:</b> Encourage transit-supportive density and land-use patterns along priority Bus Corridors, through zoning, incentives and other regulatory tools.</p> <p><b>PT13.2:</b> Guide transit-dependent land uses to locate on priority Bus Corridors. This includes schools, public services, major employers, and senior and multi-family housing.</p>	
92	<b>Urban Corridors</b>	<p><i>Revise policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT14.1:</b> Retrofit City streets in Urban Corridors to City Street Standards to attract new development and increase densities.</p> <p><b>PT14.3:</b> Encourage public agencies to build in the Urban Corridors, so that they are easily accessible by walking, biking and transit and support the City's transportation-efficient land use goals.</p> <p><b>PT 14.4:</b> Partner with the cities of Lacey and Tumwater to pursue the coordinated transportation and land use objectives associated with the region's premier transit corridors of Martin Way, East 4th and State Avenues, Pacific Avenue and portions of Capitol Way/Boulevard.</p>	March 11, 2013
93	<b>Bus Corridors</b>	<p><i>Recommend same goal and policies as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>GT16:</b> Bus corridors have high-quality transit service allowing people to ride the bus spontaneously, and easily replace car trips with trips by bus.</p> <p><b>PT16.4:</b> Coordinate with Intercity Transit to implement signal priority, bypass lanes, exclusive transit lanes, and other transit priority measures where needed for transit speed and priority.</p> <p>[FSEIS, p. 126]</p>	February 25, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
94	<b>Bus Corridors</b>	<p><i>Revise policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT16.1:</b> Develop a system of bus corridors with fast, frequent and predictable service. Transit service should operate at least every 15 minutes on weekdays where supported by land use.</p> <p><b>PT16.2:</b> Increase the density and mix of land uses along bus corridors to support high frequency service.</p> <p><b>PT16.7:</b> Eliminate minimum parking requirements along bus corridors.</p>	February 25, 2013
95	<b>Bus Corridors</b>	<p><i>Add new policy:</i></p> <p><b>PT16.8:</b> Give priority to sidewalk investments and mid-block pedestrian crossings that enhance access and safety on high frequency Bus Corridors.</p>	February 25, 2013
96	<b>Intercity Transit</b>	<p><i>Revise policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT17.1:</b> Support Intercity Transit's existing and planned services and facilities by ensuring that street standards, system operational efficiencies, land uses, site design support transit along current and future routes.</p> <p><b>PT17.5:</b> Require new development to provide facilities to support the transit rider, as they walk or bike to and from stops. These include such things as transit shelters, awnings, bike parking, walkways, benches, and lighting.</p>	February 25, 2013
97	<b>High-capacity Transportation</b>	<p><i>Revise policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT18.3:</b> Integrate land use and high-capacity transportation planning so that dense urban centers are developed around future rail stations.</p> <p><b>PT18.4:</b> Encourage the Washington State Department of Transportation and the Thurston Regional Planning Council to identify and address deficiencies in regional</p>	February 25, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		commuter services.	
98	<b>High-capacity Transportation</b>	<i>Add policy:</i>  <b>PT 18.5:</b> Achieve the land use necessary to support high capacity transportation.	February 25, 2013
99	<b>Rail System</b>	<i>Revise goal and policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i>  <b>GT19:</b> The rail system is a cost effective and efficient method of moving materials long distances.  <b>PT19.1:</b> Work with regional partners and the Washington State Department of Transportation to support and expand freight rail to and from the region.	February 25, 2013
100	<b>Rail System</b>	<i>Add policy:</i>  <b>PT20.8:</b> Allow payment of a fee-in-lieu for sidewalks in certain instances so that sidewalks and other pedestrian improvements can be constructed in the locations they are most needed.	February 25, 2013
101	<b>Walking</b>	<i>Revise policy as proposed in July Draft to state:</i>  <b>PT21.2:</b> Focus City sidewalk construction on major streets, where heavy traffic volumes and speeds make it difficult for walkers to share space with motor vehicles. Priorities for sidewalk construction are based on street conditions, presence of transit and proximity to destinations.	February 25, 2013
102	<b>Walking</b>	<i>Revise policies proposed in July Draft to state:</i>  <b>PT22.1:</b> Build new streets and retrofit existing streets with crossing islands and curb bulb-outs to increase pedestrian safety.	February 25, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b>PT22.3:</b> Add safe mid-block crossings for pedestrians to new and existing streets. This is especially important on major streets that have long distances between signalized crossings, and those with high frequency transit service.</p> <p><b>PT22.5:</b> Consider use of pavers or colored, patterned concrete on crosswalks in commercial or mixed-use areas to increase motorist awareness of pedestrians, and to improve the appearance of an area, when doing so will not negatively affect cyclists or pedestrians.</p>	
103	<b>Walking</b>	<p><i>Add policy:</i></p> <p><b>PT22.6:</b> Consider the needs of the elderly and disabled in all crosswalk design and signal timing.</p>	February 25, 2013
104	<b>Walking</b>	<p><i>Revise policies proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT23.3:</b> Provide sidewalks of sufficient width to ensure adequate space for all appropriate streetscape elements to create more public space and support active street life. In heavily-peopled areas, install benches, artwork and other features to make streets interesting and inviting, while maintaining safe walking surfaces and adequate space for those in wheelchairs.</p> <p><b>PT23.4:</b> Require continuous awnings over the sidewalk along building frontages in densely developed areas to protect pedestrians from weather, and encourage them everywhere else.</p>	February 25, 2013
105	<b>Bicycling</b>	<p><i>Revise goal and policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>GT24:</b> Bicycling is safe and inviting, and many people bike to meet their travel and activity needs.</p> <p><b>PT24.1:</b> Retrofit streets to provide safe and inviting bicycle facilities. Use the Bicycle</p>	February 25, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>Master Plan (2009) to guide facilities development, but look for other opportunities to provide bicycle facilities where possible.</p> <p><b>PT24.2:</b> Build bike lanes on new major streets: arterials, major collectors and selected neighborhood collectors. Bike facilities planned for specific streets are defined in the Engineering Design and Development Standards.</p> <p><b>PT24.9:</b> Partner with businesses, schools, developers and employers to support bicycling through effective site and building design and provision of end-of-trip facilities and promotion of bike use.</p> <p><b>PT24.11:</b> Educate drivers about and enforce regulations that protect the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians.</p>	
106	<b>Bicycling</b>	<p><i>Add policy:</i></p> <p><b>PT24.45:</b> Ensure that pedestrian crossing islands provide adequate refuge space for family cycling.</p>	February 25, 2013
107	<b>Multi-Modal Transportation</b>	<p><i>Delete policy proposed in July Draft (being combined with policy 24.4 below):</i></p> <p><b>PT25.6:</b> Work with employers and employees of the City Center to create programs that reduce drive-alone commuting.</p>	February 25, 2013
108	<b>Multi-Modal Transportation</b>	<p><i>Revise policies proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT25.4:</b> Encourage all employers in the City to reduce employee drive-alone commute trips. Provide specific emphasis for worksites in the City Center.</p> <p><b>PT25.5:</b> Provide infrastructure to support walking, biking, transit, and ridesharing.</p> <p><b>PT25.10:</b> Encourage employers to allow telecommuting and compressed work weeks to</p>	February 25, 2013



	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>eliminate commute trips.</p> <p><b>PT25.12:</b> Require end-of-trip facilities, such as clothes lockers, showers and bike parking for walking, biking and transit users at schools and worksites.</p> <p><b>PT25.14:</b> Develop mutual policies with the school districts to site new schools in locations where students can easily walk or bike to school, and where school employees and students can use transit to commute to and from the site. Consider multi-story buildings on smaller lots to accommodate capacity needs closer to the urban core and to reduce disruption to the street grid.</p>	
109	<b>Funding Transportation</b>	<p><i>Revise policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT27.1:</b> Plan and prioritize projects consistent with available and projected funding to advance the community's transportation vision.</p> <p><b>PT27.2:</b> Utilize master plans, subarea plans and facilities programs to identify system needs and funding strategies, evaluate competing priorities and trade-offs and define short-term actions.</p> <p><b>PT27.7:</b> Partner with community organizations to help complete projects.</p>	
110	<b>Funding Transportation</b>	<p><i>Add policy under Goal 27:</i></p> <p><b>Policy:</b> Enhancing transportation system operational efficiency is a high priority for City funds.</p>	February 25, 2013
111	<b>Regional Planning</b>	<p><i>Revise policies as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PT29.2:</b> Establish and maintain compatible street standards with Thurston County and</p>	February 25, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>the cities of Lacey and Tumwater.</p> <p><b>PT29.3:</b> Work with the cities of Lacey, Tumwater and Thurston County on Transit Corridor development.</p> <p><b>PT29.6:</b> Coordinate with the Port of Olympia on truck access routes and freight rail. Work with the Port of Olympia, as needed, to address air and water transportation needs.</p>	
112	<b>Electric Vehicles</b>	<p><i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>PT29.10:</b> Work with the region to support the infrastructure needs of electric vehicles or other alternative fuel vehicles.</p>	<p>December 17, 2012</p> <p>(Consent Agenda)</p>
<b>UTILITY CHAPTER</b>			
113	<b><u>Values &amp; Vision Statements for the Chapter</u></b>	<p><u><i>Integrate this Value &amp; Vision statement into the text at the beginning of the Chapter:</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Value:</i></u>  <b><u>Utilities:</u></b> <u>Olympia residents value a water supply under the ownership and control of the City, effective treatment of wastewater and stormwater prior to discharge to the Puget Sound, and the role that reuse, reduction and recycling plays in conserving energy and materials.</u></p> <p><u><i>Vision:</i></u>  <b><u>Utilities:</u></b> <u>Olympia has been able to meet the water needs of an increased population through increased water use efficiency, conservation based rates, and use of reclaimed water. As a result of the improved treatment and reduction of wastewater and stormwater prior to discharge, Budd Inlet and our streams support increased aquatic life.</u></p> <p><u>A majority of Olympia households use urban organic compost on their landscapes.</u></p>	<p>March 13, 2013</p>

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><u>Artificial fertilizers no longer contaminate local water bodies.</u></p> <p><u>State and national packaging standards, local solid waste incentives, and voluntary citizen actions reduce the volume of materials in Olympia requiring landfill disposal.</u></p>	
114	<b>Utilities</b>	<p><i>Recommend same policies as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>PU1.5:</b> Ensure that public utility and transportation related facilities constructed in Olympia and its Growth Area meet appropriate standards for safety, constructability, durability and maintainability through Olympia's <a href="#">Engineering Design and Development Standards</a>, which are regularly updated.</p>	<p>December 17, 2012</p> <p>Unanimous (Consent Agenda)</p>
115	<b><u>Sea Level Rise</u></b>	<p><i>Revise GU11 and related policies proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>GU 11:</b> <u>The City has used best available information to devise and implement a sea level rise strategy.</u></p> <p><b>PU 11.2:</b> <u>Coordinate with other key stakeholders, such as downtown businesses, LOTT Clean Water Alliance and the Port of Olympia, environmental and other public interest groups, and downtown residents.</u></p> <p><b>PU 11.3:</b> <u>Incorporate flexibility and resiliency into public and private infrastructure in areas predicted to be affected.</u></p> <p><b>PU 11.4:</b> <u>Maintain public control of downtown shorelines that may be needed to serve flood management functions.</u></p> <p><b>PU 11.5:</b> <u>Engage the community in a discussion of the different mitigation scenarios and adaptation strategies together with the cost.</u></p>	<p>February 25, 2013</p>
116	<b>Utilities, Undergrounding</b>	<p><i>Revise goal and policies as proposed in July Draft to state*:</i></p>	<p>January 14, 2013</p>

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b>GU16:</b> Public and private utilities are located underground to protect public health, safety and welfare, and to create a more reliable and aesthetic utility system.</p> <p><b>PU16.1:</b> Place new public and private utility distribution lines underground wherever practicable. This should be based on sound engineering judgment, on consideration of health, safety and aesthetics, and in accordance with the regulations and tariffs of the Washington Utilities Transportation Commission and the City's Engineering Development and Design Standards.</p> <p><b>PU16.2:</b> Encourage placing existing public and private utility distribution lines underground, in accordance with the regulations and tariffs of the Washington Utilities Transportation Commission and the City's Engineering Development and Design Standards.</p> <p><b>PU16.3:</b> Coordinate the undergrounding of both new and existing public and private utility lines consistent with policies PU 3.1 and PU3.2.</p> <p><b>PU16.4:</b> Apply utility undergrounding requirements to all public and private development projects.</p> <p><b>PU16.5:</b> Develop and maintain a management plan, consistent with the Olympia Municipal Code and the Engineering Development and Design Standards, for underground and overhead utilities as part of the City's franchise agreements. The management plan will also address undergrounding of the City's aerial facilities as well as other franchise utilities. (See <a href="http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/olympia/">OMC telecommunications Chapter 11 regarding permitting and leasing &lt;http://www.codepublishing.com/wa/olympia/&gt;</a>.)</p> <p><i>*Move the word "aesthetics" to the end of the series in each policy. Delete the word "PSE" and add an "s" to the end of the word "agreement."</i></p>	
117	<b>Utility Infrastructure</b>	<i>Recommend same goal as proposed in July Draft:</i>	December 17, 2012

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<b>GU22:</b> The City should make provisions in its policies, regulations and Engineering Design and Development Standards for a fiber optic conduit system as part of its municipal infrastructure.	(Consent Agenda)
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH, ARTS, PARKS &amp; RECREATION CHAPTER</b>			
118	<b>Chapter Name</b>	Change the chapter name from “Parks, Arts & Recreation” to the above.	March 13, 2013
119	<b>Values &amp; Vision Statements for the Chapter</b>	<p><i>Integrate this Value &amp; Vision statement into the text at the beginning of the Chapter:</i></p> <p><i>Value:</i>  <b>Public Health, Parks, Arts and Recreation Chapter:</b> Olympia residents value the role of parks, open space, and the arts to our physical, spiritual and emotional well-being and to our sense of community.</p> <p><i>Vision:</i>  <b>Public Health, Parks, Arts and Recreation:</b> Parks and other public open space in every neighborhood play a key role in maintaining our health. The Olympia School District works with the City to allow maximum feasible public use of School District gyms and playgrounds.</p> <p>The School District, local and state health agencies and the City provide programs to encourage good nutrition and exercise. These programs complement the City regulations to encourage both urban agriculture and markets for sale of local and regional produce.</p> <p>Olympia has continually expanded and upgraded the bicycle facility network and has witnessed major increases in bike use for both commuting and recreation. The City has provided separated bike facilities on selected streets where there are high levels of use or potential conflict with motorized traffic.</p> <p>All neighborhoods have sidewalks on at least one side of major collector streets. This, together with continued pedestrian crossing improvements and neighborhood pathways, use of traffic calming devices and enforcement of traffic laws, contributes to</p>	March 13, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p>the dramatic increase of walking in Olympia.</p> <p>The City sponsors and supports music and art events and festivals. These attract widespread involvement of Olympia residents and residents of surrounding communities. The City takes advantage of provisions in state law to fund art throughout the City.</p>	
120	<b>Artist Live/Work Space</b>	<p><i>Add the following policies under GR8:</i></p> <p><b>PR8.2:</b> Pursue affordable housing and studio space/rehearsal space for artists, including support for, or participation in, establishing or constructing buildings or sections of buildings that provide living, work and gallery space exclusively for artists.</p> <p><b>PR8.7:</b> Establish and promote a theater and entertainment district in Downtown Olympia.</p>	March 13, 2013
121	<b>Urban Agriculture/Local Food Production</b>	<p><i>Revise PR9.1 as proposed in July Draft to state:</i></p> <p><b>PR9.1:</b> Provide opportunities that promote a mentally and physically active lifestyle and healthy food including participation in local food production.</p>	February 25, 2013
<b>ECONOMY CHAPTER</b>			
122	<b>Values &amp; Vision Statements for the Chapter</b>	<p><i>Integrate this Value &amp; Vision statement into the text at the beginning of the Chapter:</i></p> <p><i>Value:</i> <b>Economy:</b> Olympia residents value our community's businesses as a source of family wage jobs, goods and services and recognize the importance of our quality of life to a healthy economy.</p> <p><i>Vision:</i></p>	March 13, 2013

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		<p><b>Economy:</b> The Olympia economy is stable in relation to the economies of comparable cities throughout the state and region. The City's investment in the downtown has led to many specialty or boutique stores. Regional shopping nodes, such as Capital Mall, provide high-density housing and transit and pedestrian access.</p> <p>Young entrepreneurs, attracted by the amenities of the City and its open and accepting culture, have created new businesses and helped existing businesses expand.</p> <p>The increased commercial activity and the number of small start-ups have diversified the job market and the economy, making it less vulnerable to downturns in state government employment.</p> <p>Continued expansion of small farms at the urban fringe and local food producers provide additional diversity in local employment and reduces the vulnerability of local residents to the rising cost of imported food.</p>	
123	<b>Sustainable Economy</b>	<p><i>Recommend same goal and policies as proposed in July Draft:</i></p> <p><b>GE4:</b> The City achieves maximum economic, environmental and social benefit from public infrastructure</p> <p><b>PE4.1:</b> Design infrastructure investments to balance economic, environmental, and social needs, support a variety of potential economic sectors, and shape the development of the community in sustainable patterns.</p> <p><b>PE4.3:</b> Base public infrastructure investments on analysis determining the lowest life-cycle cost and benefits to environmental, economic and social systems.</p>	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
124	<b>Contaminated Lots</b>	<p><i>Recommend policy concept as proposed in July Draft, but staff should rewrite for consistency with writing style throughout the Plan:</i></p> <p><b>PE4.6:</b> The City acknowledges that uncertainty associated with contamination can be a</p>	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)

	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
		barrier to development in downtown. The City will identify potential tools, partnerships, and resources that can be used to create more certainty for developments that fulfill public purposes in the downtown.  [FSEIS p.	
125	<b>Home Based Businesses</b>	<i>Recommend same policy as proposed in July Draft:</i>  <b>PE12.2:</b> Allow for more home based businesses.	December 17, 2012  (Consent Agenda)
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES CHAPTER</b>			
126	<b>Values &amp; Vision Statement for the Chapter.</b>	<p><i>Integrate this Value &amp; Vision statement into the text at the beginning of the Chapter:</i></p> <p><i>Value:</i>  <b>Public Services:</b> Olympia residents value protection provided by police, fire, and emergency medical services; code enforcement to maintain neighborhood quality; adequate and affordable housing for all residents; community gathering places and recreational centers.</p> <p><i>Vision:</i>  <b>Public Services:</b> The City has assured that all residents have achieved their basic housing needs by adopting “affordable” housing program criteria. One consequence has been the virtual disappearance of homelessness. This, in turn, has reduced the cost of City police and social services and has made the downtown more attractive for commercial activity. The City’s diverse housing typology accommodates the needs of young adults, middle class families, and aging populations.</p> <p>Within each neighborhood, a strong code enforcement program has assured the protection of the distinct identity of all neighborhoods. Code enforcement emerges from citizen and neighborhood involvement.</p>	March 13, 2013
127	<b>Sustainability</b>	<i>Move PO1.2, PO1.3 &amp; PO1.4 as proposed in July Draft to this chapter</i>	March 13, 2013



	Staff Proposed Change/ Topic	OPC Recommendation	Date of Deliberation and Preliminary Vote (Final Motion for all was 3/18/13)
128	<b>Preparedness for Earthquakes &amp; Liquefaction</b>	<p><i>Add new policies under Goal 13:</i></p> <p><b>PS13.9:</b> Educate citizens about the possibility, and potential impacts, of a Cascadia subduction zone earthquake and actions they can take to prepare for such an event.</p> <p><b>PS13.10:</b> Address the severe and extended impacts of a Cascadia subduction zone earthquake in the City's emergency response plans and preparations.</p> <p><b>PS13.11:</b> Continue to gather best available information on the impacts of a Cascadia subduction zone earthquake, including the potential magnitude and impacts of vertical movements and tsunamis.</p>	March 13, 2013
<b>CAPITAL FACILITIES CHAPTER (CFP)</b>			
The Planning Commission will review CFP goals and policies in 2013 as part of their annual review of the 6-year CFP financing plan (their review usually takes place between August-October.) Other potential revision to this element is currently being discussed at the Council level.			

## **INTRODUCTION TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

The City of Olympia’s Comprehensive Plan builds upon our community’s values and our vision for the future. A set of goals and policies provides more detailed direction for the realization of the values and vision. In turn, these serve as the framework upon which City regulations, programs and other plans are formed.

As many as 20,000 additional people are expected to join our community over the next two decades. This Plan is our strategy for maintaining and enhancing our high quality of life and environment while accommodating both the changes since the 1994 Comprehensive Plan was adopted and the changes projected over the next 20 years.

The Comprehensive Plan is not just a plan for City government. Developed out of input from thousands of people in our community at different times over decades, the Comprehensive Plan truly is the community’s plan. Many of the goals and policies listed call for coordination and collaboration among individual citizens, neighborhoods and civic groups, and City government. As always, there will be challenges and change, but the intent is to build on the creativity and strength of our community to shape how we develop.

### **How to Use this Document**

This Comprehensive Plan is separated into nine chapters:

- Olympia’s Vision;
- Public Participation and Partners;
- Natural Environment;
- Land Use and Urban Design;
- Transportation;
- Utilities;
- Economy;
- Public Health, Parks, Arts and Recreation;
- Public Services.

*(A tenth chapter, Capital Facilities, will be reviewed and approved by the City Council as an element in the Comprehensive Plan in 2013.)*

There are many issues that connect these chapters. For example, policies related to trees exist in the Natural Environment chapter as well as under Land Use, Transportation, Utilities and even Economy. Likewise, policies related to walk-ability are included under both Land Use and Transportation. If viewing an electronic version, use the ‘search’ function to find all of the policies related to specific topics.

The goals in this Plan are the end states we hope to achieve as a community; some will take longer than others to realize. Policies describe how the City will act in a broad sense to achieve these goals. At times, goals or policies may seem to be in conflict with each other. For

example, a goal to increase density may seem to conflict with a goal to preserve open space. The complex challenges and opportunities we face as a community often require us to strike a balance between different goals and policies to provide the best outcome for the community as a whole. Thus, individual goals and policies should always be considered within the context of the entire Plan.

There may be a period of time after the City Council adopts changes to the Plan before staff, the public and policy makers are able to take action to implement the plan. The City will make every effort to quickly and reasonably develop, review and adopt any new or revised regulations to conform to this Plan.

### **Implementation**

This Update to the Comprehensive Plan does not include specific actions or measurements. A companion document to the Plan is an "action plan" or "implementation strategy" that includes specific timeframes and actions for implementing the Plan. This strategy will establish priorities, set responsibility and determine how we will measure progress toward our goals. This is also an important tool for communicating and tracking what the City and Olympia residents are doing to help our community achieve its vision.

The City looks for partners from all sectors of the community: residents, businesses, developers, non-profits, the faith community, schools, neighborhood associations, other government agencies and organizations to help implement the Comprehensive Plan. Partnerships will help our community work together to realize our common vision.

There are many different types of actions that could be taken to implement this Plan. Some elements in the Plan are implemented through the development code and Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS), which, along with other government actions, must be consistent with the Plan under state law. Other elements in the Plan depend heavily or exclusively on community involvement.

### **Context for the Comprehensive Plan**

In the early 1990s, the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) was passed in response to rapid and sprawling growth in many parts of the state that was causing a decrease in quality of life, negative effects on the environment, and increased costs for municipal infrastructure and maintenance. Revision of our Comprehensive Plan was a requirement for Olympia under GMA and Olympia adopted a revised Comprehensive Plan under the Act in 1994.

The Act requires most urban counties and cities in the state to prepare comprehensive plans to address how they will manage expected growth. It directs urban areas, like Olympia, to absorb more of the state's population growth than rural areas, thereby preserving forests, animal habitat, farmland, and other important lands. Focusing growth in urban areas also reduces

traffic, pollution, and the costs of providing city services that protect the health, safety and quality of life of citizens.

The Act defines 13 goals, plus a shoreline goal, to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans. These focus on “smart growth” principles that maximize use of land and existing utilities, protect historic and natural resources, and lower traffic and housing costs. Fortunately, Olympia has been taking this approach for a long time.

Olympia has long understood the merits of planning for the future and had a Comprehensive Plan as early as 1959. In many ways, our earlier plans created the community we have today.

For example, during community outreach for the 1994 plan, citizens expressed a desire for Olympia to become a “City of Trees.” In response, the community developed several goals and policies to guide a new Olympia Urban Forestry Program. Since then, we’ve planted thousands of street trees, and been consistently recognized by the National Arbor Day Foundation as a Tree City USA.

### **A Changing Community**

Since the 1970s, the population and economy of the Puget Sound region have been growing. According to the [Thurston County Profile](#), the county’s population more than doubled between 1980 and 2010. Forecasters expect Olympia’s population and employment will continue to increase over the next 20 years. In 2010, the estimated population of Olympia and its Urban Growth Area was 58,310 residents. Forecasters expect our population will increase to 84,400 by 2035, a rate of approximately 2% per year. A majority of this increase will be due to in-migration. People are attracted to living here because we have a relatively stable economy, a beautiful environment, friendly and safe neighborhoods, good schools and lower living costs than our neighbors to the north. Many of these new residents will work within the current City limits and the unincorporated Urban Growth Area.

### **Olympia and its Urban Growth Boundaries**

In 2012, Olympia’s urban growth area was about 16,000 acres. This includes about 12,000 acres within City limits and 4,000 acres in the unincorporated area, which may eventually be annexed into the City. In cooperation with Olympia, Lacey and Tumwater, Thurston County has established and periodically reviews Urban Growth Areas. In these areas, urban growth is encouraged; outside of them, rural densities and services will be maintained.

Much of the land in the City is already developed, but there is still adequate room to accommodate our expected population and employment growth. This land capacity analysis can be found in the Thurston County [Buildable Lands Report](#).

### **Preserving Our Sense of Place and Connections**

The City embraces our Comprehensive Plan as an opportunity to enhance the things Olympians care about. As we grow and face change, Olympians want to preserve the unique qualities and familiarity of our community. We draw a sense of place from the special features of our city: walk-able neighborhoods, historic buildings, views of the mountains, Capitol and Puget Sound, and our connected social fabric. These features help us identify with our community, enrich us, and make us want to invest here socially, economically and emotionally.

During development of this Plan, many people expressed a desire to maintain a “small town feel.” Olympians want to feel connected to each other and to our built and natural environment. We want to live in a friendly and safe community where we know our neighbors and shopkeepers, and run into friends along the sidewalk. We value harmony with nature, thriving small businesses, places to gather and celebrate, and an inclusive local government.

Olympians expressed that they are willing to accept growth as long as our environment and sense of place is preserved. That means protecting the places and culture that we recognize as “Olympia,” even if those things are a little different for each of us. It also means focusing on our community values and vision as we grow.

### Key Challenges

Beyond our community's values and vision are other influences that present both challenges and opportunities. Implementation of this Plan will require creative solutions to:

**Become a More Sustainable City:** The City needs to make investments based on an integrated framework that compares lifecycle costs and benefits of all City investments and to encourage sustainable practices by individuals and organizations through education, technical assistance, and incentives.

**Accommodate Growth:** Increased growth in Olympia is anticipated. Citizens need to integrate the: quantity of new residents, demographics, likely places of residence, housing typology, and prevention of rural and city sprawl. In addition, citizens need to identify housing and service programs for increased populations of seniors and homeless.

**Integrate Shoreline Management Program (SMP):** Special coordination is necessary to integrate the SMP with the Comprehensive Plan. Olympians value ample public space along their marine shoreline and waterways to balance growth downtown.

**Revitalize Our Downtown:** Located on Puget Sound and along the Deschutes River, downtown is the site of many historic buildings and places, and is home to many theaters, galleries, and unique shops as well as the State Capitol. At the same time, Olympia’s downtown has yet to become the walkable, comfortable place the community desires. To add vibrancy while retaining our desired small town feel will require more downtown residents, better amenities, attractive public places, green space, thriving local businesses, and integrated standards for design.



public places, green space, thriving local businesses, and integrated standards for design.

**Conserve and Protect Limited Natural Resources:** As we grow, Olympia will become a higher density city and our land and water supplies will need to support more people. We can take advantage of growth as a tool to reshape our community into a more sustainable form; to do so we must balance growth, use our resources wisely and consider the carrying capacity of the land.

**Address Climate Change and Sea-Level Rise:** Sea-level could rise in Olympia by 50 inches or more over the next century due to warming of the oceans and settling land. This will put much of Olympia's downtown at risk of flooding since it lies only one to three feet above the current highest high tides. Over the next 20 years, the City will continue to explore how to address sea-level rise impacts on our downtown.

**Fund a Long-term Vision:** The economy fluctuates and funding circumstances change. This affects our ability to carry-out planned actions over the years. Present resources are already stretched thin, and there is little ability to take on new programs without new revenue sources. We must identify funding strategies, explore operating efficiencies and develop partnerships to provide the diversity and flexibility to fund our vision.

#### **For More Information**

- The [Washington State Growth Management Act](#)  establishes rules to guide the development of comprehensive plans and development regulations that shape growth over a 20-year horizon
- The [Buildable Lands Report](#)  prepared for Thurston County by the staff of the Thurston Regional Planning Council helps Olympia to determine the quantity of land to provide for population and employment growth.
- The City of Olympia [Sustainability web pages](#) have information about what the City is doing to put sustainability into action.

## COMMUNITY VALUES AND VISION CHAPTER

### Community Values

Through extensive public participation in *Imagine Olympia*, members of the public have expressed the values they wish to see reflected in the Comprehensive Plan. These are distilled for each of the chapters in the Plan.

**Public Participation:** Olympia residents value meaningful, open, respectful, and inclusive dialogue as a shared responsibility to make our community a better place.

**Natural Environment:** Olympia residents value our role as stewards of the water, air, land, vegetation, and animals around us and our responsibility to our children, our children's children, and all life, to restore, protect, and enhance our environmental birthright.

**Land Use:** Olympia residents value accommodating growth without sprawl or excessive reliance on automobiles; neighborhoods with distinct identities; historic buildings and places; a walkable and comfortable downtown; increased urban green space; local production of food; and public spaces for citizens in neighborhoods, downtown, and along shorelines.

**Transportation:** Olympia residents value moving people and goods through the community in a manner that is safe, minimizes environmental impacts, enhances connectivity, conserves energy, and promotes healthy neighborhoods.

**Utilities:** Olympia residents value a water supply under the ownership and control of the City, effective treatment of wastewater and stormwater prior to discharge to the Puget Sound, and the role that reuse, reduction and recycling plays in conserving energy and materials.

**Public Health, Parks, Arts and Recreation Chapter:** Olympia residents value the role of parks, open space, and the arts to our physical, spiritual and emotional well-being and to our sense of community.

**Economy:** Olympia residents value our community's businesses as a source of family wage jobs, goods and services and recognize the importance of our quality of life to a healthy economy.

**Public Services:** Olympia residents value protection provided by police, fire, and emergency medical services; code enforcement to maintain neighborhood quality; adequate and affordable housing for all residents; community gathering places and recreational centers.

### Community Vision Statements

**Natural Environment:** Recognizing that gifts of nature define in large measure its greatness, Olympia works closely with the surrounding governments to preserve, protect and-restore our natural heritage.

A dense tree canopy throughout the City provides aesthetic, health, environmental, and economic benefits. Despite the increased population, Olympia's air and water are cleaner. Seals, sea lions, orcas, and otters roam the waters of southern Puget Sound. Wildlife habitat has been preserved to maintain a biologically healthy diversity of species. As a result, salmon return to the streams where they were born to spawn and to die.

**Land Use and Urban Design:** Pedestrian-oriented streetscapes, livable and affordable neighborhoods, safe and meaningful street life, and high-quality civic architecture have made Olympia a showcase, fulfilling its potential as the capital city of the Evergreen State. Olympia has collaborated with Tumwater and the Port of Olympia to make our urban waterfront a shared and priceless asset. This shoreline follows the Deschutes River from Tumwater's historic buildings, past Marathon and Heritage parks to Percival Landing and the Port Peninsula.

People walk throughout downtown, shop at its small businesses, enjoy its artistic offerings and gather at its many fine restaurants and meeting places. The historic Capitol Way boulevard linking the waterfront and downtown to the Capitol Campus invites and attracts residents to enjoy the City's civic space. Plazas, expanded sidewalks, and art in public places have stimulated private investment in residential development, which, in turn, has greatly increased downtown's retail and commercial vitality.

Olympia has established "urban nodes" characterized by higher density and mixed use development, walkability, transit feasibility and lower costs for urban services.

Infill projects and remodels help to meet the demands of population growth while creating more walkable communities. Older neighborhoods have been rejuvenated. Historic buildings are valued, preserved and adapted to new uses.

Olympia achieves its development and redevelopment goals through "sub-area planning." These plans determine where and how to increase density, how to retain green space, and how to enhance mobility. They assure safe and convenient access to the goods and services needed in daily life - grocery stores selling local products, schools, neighborhood parks, community gardens and neighborhood gathering places.

**Transportation:** Olympians, young and old, walk and bike to work, school, shopping, and recreation. Bike lanes and sidewalks are found on arterials and collectors throughout the city; all sidewalks and many bike lanes are separated from vehicular traffic by a buffer. Pedestrians and bicyclists also use trails and pathways through open areas, between neighborhoods, and along shorelines.

Sidewalks in compact, mixed-use neighborhoods, including downtown, are filled with walkers who stop at small shops and squares in lively centers near their homes. Trees lining the streets



and awnings on storefronts provide comfort and protection for walkers. Nearly all residents are within easy walking distance of a transit stop.

Most people commute to work on foot, bicycle, transit, or carpool. Those who drive to work do so in small vehicles fueled by renewable resources. Comfortable electric buses arrive every ten minutes at bus stops along all major arterials.

Parking lots are located on the edges of downtown, hidden from view by storefronts and office space. Convenient short-term bike parking for visitors/shoppers and long-term bike parking for employees is found onsite or near all developments. Street faces are no longer broken up by surface parking lots.

Variable pricing of street meters and off-street facilities ensure that street spaces are available for downtown shoppers and visitors, while workers who car-commute make use of the peripheral off-street facilities.

Driving lanes throughout town are not excessively wide and streets provide room for bike lanes and parking and slow down traffic. System efficiencies, demand management and intersection improvements allow smooth traffic flow.

Due to slower speeds, frequent safe crossings, and well-managed intersections, deaths and serious injuries from car/pedestrian and car/bicycle collisions have been nearly eliminated.

**Utilities:** Olympia has been able to meet the water needs of an increased population through increased water use efficiency, conservation based rates, and use of reclaimed water. As a result of the improved treatment and reduction of wastewater and stormwater prior to discharge, Budd Inlet and our streams support increased aquatic life.

A majority of Olympia households use urban organic compost on their landscapes. Artificial fertilizers no longer contaminate local water bodies.

State and national packaging standards, local solid waste incentives, and voluntary citizen actions reduce the volume of materials in Olympia requiring landfill disposal.

**Public Health, Parks, Arts and Recreation:** Parks and other public open space in every neighborhood play a key role in maintaining our health. The Olympia School District works with the City to allow maximum feasible public use of School District gyms and playgrounds.

The School District, local and state health agencies and the City provide programs to encourage good nutrition and exercise. These programs complement the City regulations to encourage both urban agriculture and markets for sale of local and regional produce.

Olympia has continually expanded and upgraded the bicycle facility network and has witnessed major increases in bike use for both commuting and recreation. The City has provided

separated bike facilities on selected streets where there are high levels of use or potential conflict with motorized traffic.

All neighborhoods have sidewalks on at least one side of major collector streets. This, together with continued pedestrian crossing improvements and neighborhood pathways, use of traffic calming devices and enforcement of traffic laws, contributes to the dramatic increase of walking in Olympia.

The City sponsors and supports music and art events and festivals. These attract widespread involvement of Olympia residents and residents of surrounding communities. The City takes advantage of provisions in state law to fund art throughout the City.

**Economy:** The Olympia economy is stable in relation to the economies of comparable cities throughout the state and region. The City's investment in the downtown has led to many specialty or boutique stores. Regional shopping nodes, such as Capital Mall, provide high-density housing and transit and pedestrian access.

Young entrepreneurs, attracted by the amenities of the City and its open and accepting culture, have created new businesses and helped existing businesses expand.

The increased commercial activity and the number of small start-ups have diversified the job market and the economy, making it less vulnerable to downturns in state government employment.

Continued expansion of small farms at the urban fringe and local food producers provide additional diversity in local employment and reduces the vulnerability of local residents to the rising cost of imported food.

**Public Services:** The City has assured that all residents have achieved their basic housing needs by adopting "affordable" housing program criteria. One consequence has been the virtual disappearance of homelessness. This, in turn, has reduced the cost of City police and social services and has made the downtown more attractive for commercial activity. The City's diverse housing typology accommodates the needs of young adults, middle class families, and aging populations.

Within each neighborhood, a strong code enforcement program has assured the protection of the distinct identity of all neighborhoods. Code enforcement emerges from citizen and neighborhood involvement.