



City of Olympia

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Amy Buckler
(360) 570-5847

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, June 17, 2013

6:30 PM

Room 207

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

1.A ROLL CALL

Present: 9 - Chair Jerome Parker, Vice Chair Judy Bardin, Commissioner Kim Andresen, Commissioner Jessica Bateman, Commissioner Max Brown, Commissioner Darrell Hoppe, Commissioner Roger Horn, Commissioner Carole Richmond, and Commissioner Missy Watts

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Vice Chair Bardin would like to discuss the meeting schedule during Information Requests.

The agenda was approved as amended.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Associate Planner Amy Buckler announced next Tuesday, June 25, will be the General Government meeting regarding the Planning Commission work program. Also on the Council's agenda is first reading of the parking lot code amendment, previously reviewed by the Commission. The item is on their Consent Calendar, meaning the Council does not plan to discuss it unless it is pulled from their agenda.

Commissioner Horn announced he is not feeling well, and that is why he is sitting at a distance. He may leave early.

5. INFORMATION REQUESTS

Vice Chair Bardin requested better description in staff reports of what is being expected from the Commission regarding items on their agenda.

She also noted the joint meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission on June 11 ran until 10:00 p.m., and it was a lot of work. She would prefer meetings to be staggered in the future.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

[13-0353](#) Final Deliberation on Proposed Landscaping and Screening Code Amendment Related to Screening of Solid Waste Receptacles (Containers)

Waste ReSources Senior Program Specialist Ron Jones gave a briefing about the process and substance of a proposed code amendment regarding waste receptacle screening. He passed out a new bill-format copy. City Council will review the issue and make a decision later this year.

Mr. Jones indicated the biggest proposed change is removal of the requirement to provide Type I screening, which is 100 percent site obscuring. The proposed requirement is for Type II screening, which is less site obscuring. When a Type II screen is not feasible, a Type III visual buffer should be used. Screening types are defined in the code.

Mr. Jones showed photograph examples of various types of screening.

Commission Discussion and Answers to Questions:

- A developer could still opt to use Type I screening if it functions.

- During the land use review process, the developer has multiple options to discuss their project with the City's Site Plan Review Committee.

- It is possible to use a fence as the partial sight barrier.

- There was discussion about a photo of a dumpster at Capitol Way and Union Avenue with a partially site obscuring fence. This dumpster does not look like it is 100 percent site obscuring. If 100 percent site obscuring is the City's current requirement, what is going on here? Ms. Buckler said staff will look into it.

- Vice Chair Bardin shared an idea to paint dumpsters to make them more attractive. Commissioner Watts added for example, host "a great Olympia dumpster project" to paint dumpsters. Mr. Jones responded that in the past, the City has explored the idea of painting dumpsters to make them more attractive, but decided against codifying it. The City is trying to use color on dumpsters to identify between garbage, recycling, yard waste, etc.

- Vice Chair Bardin likes that green space is being included for dumpster screening.

- Discussions with developers usually start with a presubmission conference to understand the standards, then a land use review process to discuss where the dumpster will be placed on the site and accessed.

- Commissioner Horn suggested maybe Type I and II definitions could be written more like Type III, which seems easier to understand.

- Mr. Jones will look into whether or not an approved plant list would work, or whether that has been considered in the past.

- The City has a provision for a partial screening because 100 percent site obscuring is not always needed or wanted.

- The City is trying to avoid having drivers exit garbage trucks to open gates because that takes more time and is less efficient. When gates are used, there needs to be a way to secure them so the wind doesn't blow them into the truck.

- The City is looking at different ways to design enclosures so they are functional, while also aesthetic, plus easier on the developer.

- Commissioner Bateman likes that the proposal considers worker safety, decreases fuel costs, and may also reduce rates.

- Evergreen trees do a better job of blocking views, whereas deciduous trees usually will not do as good of a job in the winter.

- Commissioner Andresen likes that we are trying to build some flexibility, but wonders if we are giving too much flexibility here.

There were no members of the public present wishing to testify about the proposed code amendment. Chair Parker closed the oral hearing.

Commissioner Horn moved, seconded by Chair Parker, to extend the public hearing for written comments until 5:00 p.m. on Friday, June 21.

Aye: 9 - Chair Parker, Vice Chair Bardin, Commissioner Andresen, Commissioner Bateman, Commissioner Brown, Commissioner Hoppe, Commissioner Horn, Commissioner Richmond and Commissioner Watts

[13-0399](#) Draft 2013 Wastewater Management Plan

Water Resources Project Engineer Steve Speer gave a briefing about proposed amendments to the Wastewater Management Plan. The Department has been working on updating the plan for about a year. In September, the City Council will hold a public hearing. The guiding vision for this master plan is the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioners may offer comments to staff tonight, or submit them in writing by the end of this month.

Commission Discussion & Answers to Questions:

- Does it make sense to have some mitigation measures to retrofit?

I&I - Infiltration and Inflow

Commissioner Horn marked several terms he doesn't know that are not included in the glossary.

Chair Parker suggested Commissioners should explain the things they don't understand:

- It's both a 6-year and a 20-year plan.
 - Do septic systems still fail as frequently as they used to?
 - Does this plan encourage alternative technologies?
 - How does the plan address impacts from climate change?
 - Already listing groundwater recharge, but the LOTT study hasn't been completed, so how do we know?
 - Page 91, avoiding costs vs. future costs ...
 - How much is the GFC 2013 charge? around \$8,000.
 - Relationship between LOTT and the City.
 - Relationship between Comprehensive Plan, Master Plans, CFP, regulations, etc.
 - Rates over time in constant dollars.
 - Chair Parker will send other questions via email.
- The draft was really well plain-talked.

Collect the Commission's questions, and respond in one email through staff.

The report was received.

[13-0504](#) Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) 101

Administrative Services Director Jane Kirkemo and City Manager Steve Hall gave a briefing about the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP).

Mr. Hall noted he is fascinated by the policy debate about combined storm/sewer water. He explained the CFP is a plan, but not a budget document. It gives us a pretty good idea of what we want to spend money on, and how much it will cost. Priorities and costs can change and influence what we really do.

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) says dense growth should occur in cities, and counties should stay rural. The Act establishes criteria for the Comprehensive Plan, which says how many people we are planning for, where to put them, what kind of housing, what density, and where, what kind of utilities, etc. One of the main tools for implementing that vision is the CFP. There are lots of ways we can implement the vision in the Comprehensive Plan. Examples include: utilities; services; volunteers; operating budget; advisory boards; CFP; master plans; regulations; and partnerships, such as private development, public partners, neighborhoods, civic groups, businesses, faith based groups, others.

Ms. Kirkemo's presentation included:

- The City has been doing CFP's over 30 years, before it was required by the GMA.
- The GMA says you have to plan with reason; it's no longer just a wish list.
- 135 mil . 2014 = 21.3m. Only \$1m is unrestricted.
- Non-utility = transport (impact fees and real estate exise tax 1/2 percent on property - 1/4 goes to transportation, 1/4 goes to Parks.
- Sometimes it just depends if you can use these funds for sidewalks. Typically, yes if you need to make street improvements you can tie sidewalks to it.

- 18 different revenue sources.

About 45 percent of all revenue comes from:

- Impact Fees 21 percent. Been collecting these for over 20 years. \$25m over time
- Utility Rates

2014-2019 CFP goes to City Council in early July. OPC has a role.

OPC will have a public hearing on August 5, and City Council will have a public hearing in October, deliberate in November and adopt in December.

July 17 for OPC review??

How do we prioritize projects in the CFP? Usually comes down to money. We got a grant, or restricted revenue that must be spent by a deadline. Try not to prioritize amongst categories (a park, or transportation improvement), but sometime have to.

- Pavement Management Strategy. 20-years ago looked at all road and infrastructure and rated poor, fair, and good.

2024 - 100 percent of all roads in good or fair condition. Right now at 80 percent.

If you wait until a road fails, that it is more expensive to totally reconstruct it. Better to maintain all along.

Try to divide up projects between:

- Least Cost Strategy (fair to good)
- Worst First Strategy (poor to good)

\$2.2m/year to fund this strategy

Good old days - surplus money went into Pavement Management fund. No longer a surplus. So, City implemented a Transportation Benefit District (\$20 with your tabs). Has to be spent in Olympia. TBD board said we have to use that money to fund pavement management. Same people on TBD board as City Council.

- If you have a combined wastewater system, for example, do we change that infrastructure when we put in a new road. Yes, and the other way around, too. Try to be smart about it with public and private developments. Also, try to lay conduit for fiber optic at same time.

- Least cost strategy saves money over time. Do we have a number? We can get it.

- Utility tax: Up to 6 percent by law, and we are at the max. 5 percent goes in operating budget, and 1 percent in CFP (that's the \$1m). With voter approval, you can ask voters for additional tax. We charge 9 percent - the extra 3 percent is in CFP - 2 percent for parks, 1 percent for sidewalks.

- 2004 City put more money in CFP than today. Not because we got the Parks & Pathways fund, but due to downturn in the economy we stopped having the money.

- 2006 \$3m real estate tax, 2011 less than \$800,000

- Why doesn't the City sell debt? State limit on how much debt you can issue. Councilmatic

debt (Council decides)- have to have the revenue source to pay for that within current operating debt (bond anticipation note for Parks, LED project/street lights, improvements on WA Center). Excess Levy (special project)- voter approved by 60 percent.

Our assessed value went down, so we lost debt capacity. Total amount of capacity is \$75m
Current liability = 55.6m + LED and WA Center. We want to be very careful about issuing debt in the future. Only \$12m left in non-voted debt capacity. We also have \$50m of capacity of voter approved debt. If a true emergency, allowed to issue debt above debt limit.

- What makes our value go down? Has to do with the national, state, local economy. Housing and commercial land values.

- Public Works Trust Fund loans - yes, we use those, especially for utilities. Interest rate is currently lower than bond rates. Loans still count as debt.

- Foreclosed homes exempt from paying real estate excise tax. Not sure if that will change.

- What is CIP funding? CIP is funding for the City's Capital Improvement Program. It funds projects that are not utility related, such as parks, transportation, and general capital facilities projects. It is made-up of 1/2 percent of the Real Estate Excise Tax (REET), which must be spent on parks or transportation projects, (although, for the period 2013 to 2016, it may be used for the operations of these facilities), 1 percent of the non-voted utility tax, interest earnings, and utility support from stormwater for transportation projects.

- If doesn't cost as much as appropriated, can go to another project.

- What if the anticipated revenue is not collected? We will have to take the money from a different project, or find another revenue source. Rare, but it happens.

- Email questions to Ms. Kirkemo, and she will try to answer to all and at a future finance committee meeting.

Commission Questions & Discussion:

- What is happening with transportation impact fees? Nothing happened at this legislature.

- The City has a long list of TBD projects. It's on the website.

- Hoping 2014 is the last year of decreasing in assessed value. As you pay off the debt and assessed value goes up, the debt capacity goes up by that amount. City Hall has 30 year debt. Isthmus debt in 3 pieces: 8 years Parks (voted utility); LED 10 years (how long it will take us to save money); WA Center is 20 year debt.

Operating budget shows how much we pay off each year.

6-year CFP, first year money is appropriated. Remaining five years - just a plan.

What was the source of money prior to impact fees, and has this made money available for

other things? Olympia was the first city to have impact fees in 1992. Over the years amount of state and federal funding for infrastructure has gone down significantly. Cost has gone up significantly due to our standards. So, no, not a lot of extra money.

Property tax limited to a 1 percent increase (we always took the 6 percent increase).

CRA - will that help our assessed value? Don't think so, not directly.

Feel free to call Ms. Kirkemo for further questions. Finance Subcommittee 1/2 day meeting with staff on the CFP is very helpful.

Ms. Buckler will forward information about the LED streetlight project to the Commission. Send additional questions to Ms. Buckler.

Finance Subcommittee meeting delayed to Monday, July 1, or July 26 if needed. Commissioners Brown, Andresen, Richmond, Horn, Chair Parker, and Vice Chair Bardin plan to attend.

The report was received.

[13-0312](#) 2013 Annual Planning Commission Retreat

The Commission selected Saturday, August 24, as the date for their retreat.

Discussion about the retreat lunch:

- Both options presented for lunch may not provide food fast enough, given the tight time frame.
- Boxed lunch is an option.
- The Wildwood Building might have a lunch facility by then. Swing is planning on opening a sandwich shop there.
- All agreed to table the lunch discussion until a future meeting.

The Commission decided to tour the neighborhood centers in 3 cars driven by staff. Commissioners have the option of driving their own car if they want.

The Commission requested staff identify potential sites to stop at and a place for lunch. The itinerary should include the centers that are difficult to develop. Take San Francisco Bakery, or other places we are all familiar with, off the list. However, talk about why these are successful. Approved master plans for village neighborhood centers should be included.

The work session was discussed and closed.

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[13-0450](#) Approval of May 6, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved as amended.

[13-0505](#) Approval of Planning Commission May 20, 2013 (5:30 Orientation) Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved.

[13-0451](#) Approval of May 20, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved as amended.

8. REPORTS

Chair Parker gave a report on the Community Renewal Area (CRA) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting. Coming up are informational meetings for the public ("Brown Bag Lunches") on June 20, June 24, and July 1, from 12:00-1:30 p.m., in Room 207 at City Hall.

Commissioner Brown announced the main topic of conversation at the last CRA meeting was the need for a Downtown Master Plan. In attendance were several stakeholders for whom downtown redevelopment is a priority.

Commissioner Hoppe reported on the last Design Review Board (DRB) meeting. The project was Copper Trail Apartments, a 252 multi-family on 14 acres on the westside. The developer will come back to DRB again. There will be subsequent public meetings.

Commissioner Andresen gave a report on the Utility Advisory Board (UAC) meeting. They reviewed the Wasterwater Management Plan, and Chair Curtz wrote a letter of support for the proposed reclaimed water code amendments.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.