

OPC Sponsor Proposals

Item A3, High Density Corridor/ Neighborhoods

OPC Sponsors: HDC Subcommittee (Paul Ingman, Judy Bardin, Rob Richards, Larry Leveen) – **A revised proposal based on the 3/6/13 HDC Subcommittee meeting will be sent to Commissioners via email prior to the 3/11 meeting. The Commission has asked the Subcommittee to include recommendations on the following within their proposal:**

The following items were pulled by the Commission on either 12/17/12 or 2/25/13 for further consideration, and in conjunction with the HDC discussion. Items with red check boxes have been addressed, but are added here for context.

1. Non-Consent Item #24 - Transportation Chapter (PT16.2 was not part of the original Non-Consent items pulled on 12/17/13, but was revised on 2/25):

PT16: Bus corridors have high-quality transit service allowing people to ride the bus spontaneously, and easily replace car trips with trips by bus. **OPC voted to recommend this goal on 2/25/13.**

PT16.2: Increase the density and mix of land uses along bus corridors to support high frequency service. **OPC voted to recommend this revised policy on 2/25/13.**

PT16.4: 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. **OPC has not made a recommendation on this policy, which was pulled on 12/17/12.**

PT16.7: ~~Reduce~~ **Eliminate minimum parking requirements along bus corridors.** **OPC voted to recommend this revised policy on 2/25/13.**

2. Non-Consent #12 – Land Use & Urban Design Chapter, Appendix A-Low Density Housing

Language in July Draft:

Appendix A: Low-Density Housing. 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.

Compare to PL13.3: Encourage 'clustering' of housing to preserve and protect environmentally sensitive areas.

3. **Non-Consent #13- Land Use & Urban Design Chapter, PL13.9**

Language in July Draft:

PL13.9: 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.

4. Items pulled on 2/25/13 for further discussion by the HDC Subcommittee
***PT7.1: Measure level-of-service using the average vehicle volumes that occur during the highest volume consecutive two-hour period. Use the two-hour level of service as a screening tool to determine capacity needs at intersections and along streets. Consider location efficiency in this calculation to remove disincentives for development along Urban Corridors where increased density is desired.**

Commissioner Leveen and Horn proposed replacing goal GT12 and related policies in the July Draft with a new GT 12 and policies as shown below. The Commission approved the goal, but the policies were pulled for further discussion by the Subcommittee.

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

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

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

GT12: A mix of strategies is used to concentrate growth in the City, which both supports and is supported by walking, biking and transit. OPC voted to recommend this goal on 2/25/13.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rationale of Commissioners Leveen/Horn: Emphasizes the coordination of transportation and land use, and the importance of these corridors to achieving transformative change.

***PT25.3:** Work with the State to locate new worksites in the dense urban area, in locations that are accessible by frequent transit and that allow employees to more easily walk and bike.

Minor Concern of Commissioners Leveen/Horn Perhaps this policy should be combined with “PT14.3 Encourage public agencies to build in the Urban Corridors, so that they are easily accessible by walking, biking and transit.”

GT14 is about Urban Corridors, and GT25 is about encouraging non-SOV commute modes.

**Subcommittee’s Draft Proposal as of March 4:
(To be revised following the 3/6 Subcommittee meeting)**

HIGH DENSITY NEIGHBORHOODS

GOAL: High-density Neighborhoods (HDN) are located at a number of designated sites: Downtown; Pacific/Martin Triangle; Capital Mall, and the City of Tumwater’s Brewery District, which are primarily walk-dependent with alternatives of bikes and electrically-powered vehicles.

POLICIES:

P1 - Replace the “Urban Corridor” concept with High-density Neighborhoods (HDN: >25 Du/Ac), which concentrates affordable housing that represents locally diverse economic incomes; urban green spaces; vibrant commercial uses that serve neighborhoods directly; and allow people to meet their daily needs without traveling outside their neighborhood. One-third of the forecasted growth is downtown.

P2 - Protect and preserve Low-density Neighborhoods (LDN: 4-7Du/Ac). Disallow higher density development in existing low-density neighborhoods, except for ADU.

P3 – Medium-density Neighborhood Centers (MDNC: 8-24 Du/Ac) involve civic and commercial centers that serve LDN. [P3 is complemented with

the inclusion of existing goals and policies of Comprehensive Plan 1994, Goal LU9, p.28.] MDNC emerge from neighborhood public processes.

P4 – Replace intense commercial land-use at city entrances and along major arterials through the capital city with large-scale landscapes and tree-lined civic boulevards. [P4 is complemented by the inclusion of the existing policy: Comprehensive Plan 1994, LU 2.7, p.7. “Establish gateways to Olympia with significant, special landscaping. Establish design standards for the landscaping and buildings along Olympia entrance and exit corridors that reinforce the streets’ role as the gateways to the Capital.”]

P5 – Streets will have fewer lanes dedicated for motorized vehicles and increase human powered mobility. Typically, a major arterial is comprised of four lanes: one lane designated for buses, trolleys, and car pools; one lane designated for bike or cycle track; and two lanes designated for motorized vehicles.

P6 – Replace traditional piece-meal development with the comprehensive and longer range approach where High-density Neighborhoods emerge from public processes that continuously involve citizens, neighborhoods, and city officials.

INTRODUCTION

Today, in a decade of global uncertainty, social inequity, and environmental degradation, we have brought into question the conventional wisdom, calling for reassessment of traditional notions of urbanity.¹¹ The concept of High Density Corridors is one of those notions that compounds issues of urban inequity, internal city sprawl, and other multifaceted problems that threaten Olympia from climate change, growth, and earthquakes. As an alternative, *Green City* models compact and concentrate life’s needs into High Density Neighborhoods (HDN) and replaces traditional frame and antiquated ‘business as usual’ paradigms formed from *fossil-based urban modes* that represent: linear spatial configuration of the High Density Corridor (HDC); “...strip commercial ...” development; dependency on motorized vehicles; and the dislocation and decentralization of neighborhoods with single family housing.

This proposal summarizes a few of the negative impacts that are associated with urban issues and linked to the ‘obsolescence’ of the fossil-based High Density Corridors. This proposal provides an alternatives towards the 21st century renaissance of a Green City. Although the proposal briefly outlines a few negative impacts of HDC on Health and Neighborhoods, it does not address the

many important issues affected: greenhouse gases; energy; mobility; convenience; density; outdoor spaces; images of our state capitol city; social support systems; economic revitalization of downtown; treatment of HD arterials; and affordable housing.

Formal public hearings involving the Comprehensive Plan for HDC identified the public's lack of support for them and numerous "...contradictions ..."and "...conflicts..." associated with HDC. The purpose of this proposal is to identify a few problems associated with the HDC. The weakness of this proposal is that it does not represent all the HDC problems, and does not represent HDC's problems in an exhaustive or in depth analysis.

Although Olympia has the spatial capacity to accommodate a number of large-scale High Density Neighborhoods, the City of Olympia does not have a single High Density Neighborhood (HDN). To understand the concept and benefits of HDN, the city's work plan requires time to reveal the countless internal inconsistencies and contradictions of antiquated fossil-based urban model of a HDC.

Urban achievements, similar to Howard's Garden City, recognized the importance of relatively circular city plans. It established structural, social, and economic parameters of the city. Although urban reform requires physical arrangement, urban life is enhanced when the physical environment works in harmony with human needs rather than against them.²⁵

PROBLEM STATEMENT

On January 12, 2013, the City Council developed work plans for 2013, which revealed that the "Olympia council wants people downtown...".² The City Council wants to find "...ways to promote Olympia and its downtown core to attract visitors, but to make it more inviting to residents again."² At the same time, the Comprehensive Plan demonstrated that the total planned growth over the next 25 years in the downtown is dramatically inadequate to achieve the City Council's objectives.

First, the total planned growth for the City of Olympia in 2035 is 26,087 people. However, Olympia's downtown's total planned growth is less than 4% for the next 25 years. In other words, 24 out of every 25 new residents to Olympia will live anyway but downtown. Further, more than 2 out of every 3 new residents to Olympia within the planned growth are to live near the edges of the city limits, which exasperated urban sprawl, rather than encouraging more centralized growth in the City of Olympia's downtown urban core.

Second, testimony from formal public hearings verified that neighborhoods oppose the HDC concept.

Third, the total planned growth of the HDC, excluding the HDN, is 251 people or less than one percent of the growth for the next 25 years, while HDC land uses consume almost 1,000 acres. In other words, the HDC for the next 25 years adds 1 new resident for every 4 acres. The HDC appears no more than a Low Density Neighborhood (LDN) that is slated for "... redevelopment..."⁵ and commercialization of local neighborhoods,⁶ and the displacement and relocation of single family residential neighborhoods.

IMPACTS OF HIGH DENSITY CORRIDORS ON HEALTH

Traffic-related air pollution (TRAP) has been linked to a number of adverse health outcomes or risk factors that are associated with chronic disease development. Traffic related air pollution has been linked to cardiovascular (heart disease and stroke) mortality and overall mortality (death). Nitrogen dioxide is a TRAP gas. People with higher exposure to nitrogen dioxide from traffic have been found to have a 26% increase risk of cardiovascular death and 13% increase risk of death overall¹³. When people exposed to more TRAP were compared to those with less TRAP exposure, those with higher exposure showed markers for atherosclerosis (increased carotid artery intima media thickness (CIMT))¹⁴. Another study in California supported this finding. The study showed that those living within 300 feet of a highway had much more rapid increases in their CIMT¹⁵. Other research found, that people living within 200 meters (tenth of a mile) or less of roadway with volumes as low as 20,000-40,000 cars a day had increased C-reactive protein levels and increased pulse-pressure. Both are markers for cardiovascular disease development¹⁶. A study of over 13,000 middle aged men and women found that those that lived within 300 meters (1/5 mile) of a major road for an extended period of time had an increased risk of coronary heart disease¹⁷.

The strongest most consistent TRAP health risk has been the exacerbation or development of asthma and respiratory symptoms in children. Multiple studies in different countries have shown this risk. Children that breathe more roadway air pollution at home and at schools are at higher risk of developing asthma¹⁸. Kids that live at a distance of a tenth of a mile or less of a road having relatively low levels of vehicle traffic have been shown to have a 70% increased risk of experiencing wheezing¹⁹. A study was done in British Columbia of 38,000 children with varying exposure to air pollution in utero and during their first year of life. The study found that children were at increased odds

of developing asthma if they were exposed to air pollution and that children exposed to TRAP had the highest risk of asthma²⁰.

Traffic-related air pollution has also been found to increase the odds of pre term (early) births and preeclampsia (a pregnancy complication)^{21, 22}. A survey study in Sweden found that people who lived near road traffic noise at 64 decibels and above were more likely to report they had high blood pressure²³.

A British Canadian study looked at neighborhood design and found that urban areas that are designed-for walking may inadvertently expose their residents to higher levels of TRAP. Additionally, people of lower socio-economic status often have the highest levels of exposure. The authors highlight that their research supports policies for siting residential buildings (especially schools, daycare centers, and assisted living facilities) back from major transportation corridors²⁴.

IMPACTS OF HIGH DENSITY CORRIDORS ON NEIGHBORHOODS

Landmark studies have revealed the impact of HDC physical environments on human behavior. These studies have shown that High Density Corridors cause environmental stress in humans and as well as other outcomes. HDC were associated with less social interaction, street activity, and withdrawal from the physical environment as a result of HDC erosion of environmental quality. Further, research by J.M. Thompson calculated that living within 600 feet of a HDC had implications on people who suffered from a deteriorated environment.⁹ Contrasts between HDC and Low Density Neighborhoods (LDN) occurred in age, family composition, and the length of residence. Criteria categories for environmental quality: safety at intersections; traffic hazards; dissatisfaction with noise; vibrations, fumes and soot; dust; stress; noise; pollution; feeling of anxiety; social interaction; privacy; home territory; and environmental awareness of the physical surroundings.⁷

Most importantly, the research showed that those people in HDC with children would move elsewhere for less stressful environmental neighborhoods if they have the financial ability to do so.⁷ In contrast, residents in the HDC had a shorter length of residence than a low density street, which were predominately family streets with many children and longer length of residence which spanned decades. Danger and safety issues associated with HDC were an important consideration for residents. Findings revealed that almost no children lived near the HDC and the housing was generally inhabited by single individuals. Traffic volumes produced different human stresses, need for withdrawal, and undermined the human coping mechanism.

Elder's perceptions of the HDC stressors were revealed by descriptive words, "...unbearable..."; It's "...too much..."; "People have moved because of the noise."; and the "Disgusting amount of litter"⁷ HDC noise levels were above 65 decibels for 45 percent of the time. "Noise from the street intrudes into my home."⁷ Car noises were relatively constant and produced a steady drone of traffic but the random city buses, and the screeching of brakes at the intersections added unnecessary disruptions. High Density Corridor's traffic volumes were destructive factors in urban life.⁸

Relocation of frail resident's and knowing functional level and wellness profiles for the baseline assessment helps determine an effective process to assure due process and protection of a resident's rights. Transfers are traumatic experiences which are often referred to in the literature base as "transfer trauma". Involuntary removing seniors can lead to increased liability.¹

Social interaction in LDN showed that children played on the sidewalk and in the streets, while HDC residents kept very much to themselves and held no feelings of community. "It's not a friendly street." and "People are afraid to go into the street ..."⁷ The concept of neighborhood as social support systems for families and individuals is loss or at least compromised in the HDC. HDC residents had little or no sidewalk activities while LDN were a lively close-knit community whose residents made full use of their streets. HDC residents sense of personal home territory did not extend into the streets, while LDN resident's showed "territorial expansiveness"⁷ into the street which was one of the salient findings of the study. HDC residents experienced withdrawal from the street and lived in the back of their home. In contrast, inhabitants on Low Density Neighborhoods streets had more acquaintances. People (LDN) said, "I feel it's home. ... I don't feel alone."⁷ People living in LDN had three times as many friends than those along the HDC who had little social interaction and the contacts across the street were much less frequent.

REFERENCES:

1. Pastalan, Leon, A., Aging in Place: The Role of Housing and Social Support, New York: The Haworth Press, 1990, p.103)
2. Krotzer, Chelsea, "Olympia Council wants people downtown," *The Olympian*, January 13, 2013, p.A3.
3. City of Olympia, "Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement," Department of Community Planning and Development, Olympia, Washington, December 4, 2012, p.126.
4. Ibid., p.127.

5. City of Olympia, "Comprehensive Plan Update – July Draft," Department of Community Planning and Development, Olympia, Washington, July 10, 2012, p. 39 LU
6. Ibid., p. 43 LU
7. Appleyard, Donald, and Lintell, Mark, "The Environmental Quality of City street: The Residents' Viewpoint," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, Vol.38, No. 2, March 1972. pp. 84-101.
8. Ward, Barbara, The Home of Man, New York: Norton and Co., 1976.
9. Thompson, J.M., Motorways in London, London: Andworth and Co., Ltd., 1970
10. Walljasper, Jay, The Great Neighborhood Book, Gabriola Island, B.C.: New Society Publishers, 2007, p.7.
11. Ponce de Leon, Monica, "Letter from the Dean", *Portico*, College of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of Michigan, Spring 2010, p.1.
13. Raaschou-Nielsen, O., Anderson, Z., Jensen, S. et. al. Traffic air pollution and mortality from cardiovascular disease and all causes: a Danish cohort study. *Environmental Health* 2012 11(60). Retrieved 02/03/13 from <http://www.ehjournal.net/content/pdf/1476-069X-11-60.pdf>
14. Agulea, M.F., et. al., Association between long-term exposure to traffic-related air pollution and subclinical atherosclerosis: The REGICOR study. *Environmental Health Perspective*, December 2012, Retrieved 02/03/13 from: <http://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/ehp.1205146.pdf>
15. Kunzli, N., Jerrett, M., Garcia-Esteban, R., et.al. Ambient air pollution and the progression of atherosclerosis in adults. *PLoS one*, 2010 5(2). Retrieved 02/03/13 from <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi/10.1371/journal.pone.0009096>
16. Rioux, C.L., Tucker, K.L., Mwamburi, M., et.al. Residential traffic exposure, pulse pressure, and c-reactive protein: consistency and contrast among exposure characterization methods. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2010, 118(6). Retrieved 02/03/13 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2898857/>
17. Kan, H. Heiss, G., Rose, K.M., et.al. Prospective analysis of traffic exposure as a risk factor for incident coronary heart disease: The Atherosclerosis risk in communities (ARIC) study. *Environmental health*

- perspectives, 116(11). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2592264/>
18. McConnell, R., Islam, T., Shankardass, K., et.al. Childhood incident asthma and traffic-related air pollution at home and at school. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2010, 118(7). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2920902/>
19. Anderson, M., Modig, L., Hedman, L. et. al. Heavy vehicle traffic is related to wheeze among school children: a population-based study in an area with low traffic flows. *Environmental Health* 2011, 10(91). Retrieved 02/03/13 from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21995638>
20. Clark, N.A., Demers, P.A., Karr, C.A., et.al. Effects of early life exposure to air pollution and development of childhood asthma. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 2010 118(2). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2831931/>
21. Wilhelm, M., Ghosh, J., Su J., et.al. Traffic-related air toxics and preterm birth: a population-based case-control study in Los Angeles County, California. *Environmental Health* 2011, 10(89). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21981989>
22. Wu, J., Ren, C., Delfino, R.J., et.al. Association between local traffic-generated air pollution and preeclampsia and preterm delivery in the south coast air basin of California *Environmental Health Perspectives*, June 24, 2009. Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2801174/>
23. Bodin, T. Albin, M. Ardo, J., et.al. Road traffic noise and hypertension: results from a cross-sectional public health survey in southern Sweden. *Environmental Health* 2009 8(3). Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19744313>
24. Marshall, J.D, Brauer, M. Frank, L.D. Healthy neighborhoods: walkability and air pollution. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, July 2009. Retrieved 020313 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2801167/>
25. Johnston, Norman, J., Cities in the Round, Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1983, p.127.
-

“A society grows great when ... (elders) plant trees, whose shade they know they shall never sit in.” Greek Proverb ¹⁰

Item A3, Non-Consent Item #11, Substantive Change #30

Carried over from 2/11 HDC Topic, but not part of the Subcommittee's work

Revised Future Land Use Map Amendments (FEIS p. 88 of 145)

OPC Sponsor: Commissioner Horn

1. High-Rise Multifamily category with Heritage Park deleted.

Comment: Change is acceptable. Heritage Park (excluding fountain block) would be included in the Planned Developments designation, along with the Capitol Campus.

2. South Bay Road area proposed to change from Light Industrial to Auto Services.

Comment: We have very limited Light Industrial in the city. With recommended change #8, the only remaining areas currently designated as light industrial in the city would be in the Fones Road area (reduced from size in prior map), the Olympia portion of Mottman Industrial Park, and a small piece along the south side of 101. With recommendation #6, the Port would be the only remaining areas currently designated Industrial. The area on South Bay proposed to change to Auto Services is not large (less than 10 acres). The rationale for the change is that the area is bordered by residential on all sides. Given the limited amount of Light Industrial in the city, I recommend we keep the designation as light industry and have separate designations on the future land use map for Light Industry and Industry rather than lumping them together. If we do make a change, Auto Services may be too limiting. Also, the Auto Services designation (18.06.020(B)(3)) is written specifically to support the regional Auto Mall and doesn't fit the South Bay parcels. If Light Industry does not seem appropriate, General Commerce may be a better choice.

3. Capitol Campus proposed to change from Capitol Campus/Commercial Services High Density (CC/CSHD) to Planned Development.

Comment: Planned Development seems like a reasonable designation for Capitol Campus. Other Planned Development areas include the Courthouse Hill area, Briggs Village, the development on the west edge of the city on Mud Bay/Harrison, Bentrige, an area in the far NE corner of the city, and Trillium. (Note: Since Trillium is now zoned Residential 4 to 8, it may no longer be appropriate for the Planned Development category. Staff will be discussing the issue with Council.)

4. Henderson Park to change from CC/CSHD to General Commerce.

Comment: This is a small area (four lots, seven acres) south of the traffic circle as you exit I-5 coming north at Exit 105. It is just beneath the Wildwood neighborhood. Currently there is an approved binding site plan for a hotel and other uses; there is no application pending

at moment. The next step would be for owner to seek building permits consistent with the binding site plan. There is no other development in that area east of I-5.

The proposed map eliminates CC/CSHD as a designation. Given the binding site plan, the designation as General Commerce is probably the best choice. However, note that the site is on former wetlands and, I believe, opposed by the Wildwood neighborhood.

5. Two Professional Office blocks in vicinity of City Justice Center changing to Central Business District.

Comment: These blocks are west of Eastside Street and, therefore, are in the area we define as City Center/Downtown. I recommend we accept the proposed change of designation to Central Business District.

6. LOTT treatment plant changing from Industry to Urban Waterfront.

Comment: This proposal would designate the LOTT plant parcel to Urban Waterfront. I recommend we accept this designation. If LOTT moves, it would be inappropriate to limit the use in that location to industrial.

7. Description of Auto Services added to text.

Comment: I have no objection to the new description (LU chapter, page 42 of 44). However, see discussion in #2 above. The designation would still apply to the Auto Mall even if we don't use it for the South Bay properties.

8. Light Industry designation for area southwest of the intersection at Kaiser Road and Highway 101 changed to General Commercial.

Comment: From the FEIS: "Each area (#1 and #8) is bordered by relatively low density residential uses (with resulting potential for land use conflicts), lacks quality freight access (both are about one mile from the nearest freeway interchange and border streets lacking sidewalks and other improvements, and have relatively high potential for contaminating ground or surface water is accidental spills occur." My concern, again, is reducing further our limited light industrial areas. We have controls to limit spills in areas near wellheads and not all light industry needs close-by freeway access. Currently a small industrial park is located on the site and there is very little residential nearby. I recommend the Commission retain the area as Light Industry unless the environmental concerns expressed by Public Works make LI untenable.

Future Land Use Map Items Not Included in FEIS discussion L2 (page 88 of 145)

1. Urban Corridor designation: The proposed Future Land Use map defines the Urban Corridor area as one-quarter mile on either side of 4th, State, Harrison, Martin, Pacific, and Capitol Way south of I-5 (Carlyon/Wildwood/Governor Stevens neighborhoods), and the entire

Capital Mall area. The prior map did not include the Carlyon, etc. area, the areas north and south of 4th and State, or the areas north and south of Harrison as High Density Corridor (now Urban Corridor). The new map also designates as UC formerly General Commercial areas between Pacific and Martin.

Comment: Increasing the density for this amount of land in Olympia seems excessive. It would change the character of the most historic neighborhoods in the city with the exception of the South Capitol neighborhood. The recommendation on these changes will be provided by the Urban Corridor sub-group.

VALUES & VISION SUBCOMMITTEE PROPOSAL

All text in italic is intended to facilitate review of the following material by the Planning Commission. It would not be included in revisions to the July draft adopted by the Planning Commission.

The following "Introduction" is taken from the "Vision" chapter in the July draft. This proposed "Introduction" would be a stand alone chapter. The major portion of this proposed "Introduction" is taken from the first chapter in the July draft, "Olympia's Vision".

This proposed "Introduction" explains the context of the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, it attempts to describe the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, the organization of the Plan, the provisions in state statute governing the Plan, the background for comprehensive planning in Olympia, the background for the Plan in terms of both data and intent, and key challenges to the City that the Plan addresses.

The "values" section of the "Olympia's Vision" chapter in the July draft has not been included in the proposed "Introduction". A significantly revised statement of values and a formulation of "visions" based on these values compose a new chapter, "Values and Visions".

The subcommittee incorporated the values from the July draft into one inclusive value for each of the chapters in the July draft. The subcommittee then formulated a "vision" for each chapter. This "vision" is intended to provide a textural link between the value each chapter reflects and the specific goals and policies based on that value.

The subcommittee recommends that the value and vision specific to each chapter that compose the proposed "Values and Visions" chapter be repeated as an introduction to each of the subsequent chapters.

=====

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 ~~has~~ 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 OOlcal government.

Olympians expressed that they are willing to accept growth as long as our 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 develop an integrated framework to compare 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; prevention of rural and internal city sprawl. In addition, citizens need to identify housing and service programs for increased populations of elders 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, the site of many historic buildings and places, and home to many theaters, galleries, and unique shops as well as the State Capitol, 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, 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 strike the right balance between growth and using our resources wisely.

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 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.

VALUES AND VISION TO BE DISPERSED IN EACH CHAPTER

At the subcommittee meeting of 2/20 we agreed that there would NOT be a separate Values and Vision Chapter. On 2/26 we reversed this decision and agreed to have a separate "Values and Vision" chapter. We also agreed to put the value and the vision specific to each chapter at the beginning of that chapter.

On 2/20 we agreed to have a single value for each chapter. This means that some of the values many of the bullets identified under these values in the July draft may not be included as explicit statements in the recommended OPC draft. However, these values are either stated or clearly reflected in the vision and the specific goals and policies.)

The intent of the revised values and the newly formulated visions is to provide a context for the specific goals and policies in each chapter and to maintain a link between values, visions, and goals and policies.

VALUES AND VISIONS

Values for the Following Chapters in the Olympia Comprehensive Plan

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 and 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 Sound, and the role that reuse and recycling plays in conserving energy and materials.

Public Health, Parks, Arts and Recreation Chapter: Olympia residents value role of parks, open space, and the arts to our physical, spiritual and 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, and use of schools as community gathering places and recreational centers.

Visions for the Following Chapters in the Comprehensive Plan

The values identified by the public through the Imagine Olympia process suggest a vision that helps to visualize a future guided by the specific goals and objectives of each chapter.

Public Participation and Partners: 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.

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. In spite of 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 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 ~~has helped~~ 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 are found on arterials and collectors throughout the city, many of them separated from vehicular traffic by a buffer or small posts. Pedestrians and bicyclists also use trails and pathways that wind 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, non-polluting solar-powered ~~and~~ electric vehicles. Comfortable, attractive 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. Large areas of the parking lots are devoted to secure bicycle parking. Street faces are no longer broken up by surface parking lots. Variable pricing of street meters and off-street lots ensure that street spaces are available for downtown shoppers and visitors, while workers who car-commute make use of the off-street lots.

Driving lanes throughout town have been narrowed to make room for bike lanes and parking and slow down traffic.

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

Utilities: Olympia has been able to meet the water needs of an increased population through increased water use efficiency and conservation based rates,.

Monitoring of-reclaimed water allows increased use of this resource.

As a result of the improved treatment of wastewater and stormwater prior to discharge Budd Inlet supports 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 and local solid waste incentives 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. 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 bike lanes 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 expansion of traffic calming devices and enforcement of traffic laws, contributes to the dramatic increase of walking in Olympia.

The City sponsors and support 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 for 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 speciality or boutique stores. Regional shopping nodes, such as Capital Mall, provide high-density housing and easier 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 has 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 provides additional diversity in local employment and reduced 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 both 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.

LIST B PROPOSALS

☑Topic: #B1, Urban Green Space

OPC Sponsor: ~~Rob Richards~~

COMPLETED 2/11

☑Topic: #B2, Cluster Subdivision

OPC Sponsor: ~~Rob Richards~~

COMPLETED 2/11

☑Topic: #B3, Sea Level Rise - Revision to Proposed PN6.5

OPC Sponsor: Judy Bardin

COMPLETED 2/11 – Other Natural Disaster topics tabled

☑Topic: #B4, Downtown Planning

OPC Sponsor: Rob Richards

COMPLETED 3/4

Topic: #B5, Protect and Preserve Olympia’s Single-Family Neighborhoods

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4

Topic: #B6, Public Participation

OPC Sponsor: Roger Horn

Proposed new goal and policies to address Peter Guttchen’s letter and testimony of

10/29/12: I am recommending this goal go between current goals GP2 and GP3.

Goal: Citizens and other key stakeholders feel their opinions and ideas are heard, valued, and used by policy makers, advisory committees, and staff.

Policy: Build trust between all segments of the community through collaborative and inclusive decision making.

Policy: 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.

Policy: Clearly define public participation goals and choose strategies specifically designed to meet those goals.

Policy: Evaluate public participation strategies to measure their effectiveness in meeting desired goals.

Policy: Select strategies from the full spectrum of public participation tools and techniques.

Rationale:

From Peter’s letter: “In Pete’s (Pete Peterson, Davenport Institute for Public Engagement and Civic Leadership) experience, public officials only turn to more effective strategies to build trust and engage their communities when all else has failed. When they are simply exhausted and have no other place to turn. I think we’ve reached that point on many issues in our community and we still continue to repeat our mistakes. Yes—effective public engagement requires time and resources. The only thing that requires more is bad public process that ends up polarizing the community and that forces citizens to turn to the courts and the ballot box to get their voices heard.”

The proposed policy above is meant to address Peter’s concern by encouraging the city to utilize more effective processes for engaging with the public. In my view, the budget and SMP roundtables held by Council, testimony by panels followed by Q&A at the Planning Commission’s July public hearings, and the community café discussions held during Imagine Olympia were all superior to the typical public hearing three-minute testimony often used for public input. While I understand that time is a legitimate constraint in many cases, where possible meaningful alternatives should be used.

Non-Consent Item #4 – Public Participation - RECOMMENDATION COMPLETED 2/11

Topic: #B7, Port of Olympia

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kiszka

1. Scope of the topic.

I request adding a chapter on Port of Olympia into the Comprehensive Plan Update. The Port is located inside the city limits, and the relationship of the Port and City has to be described. Tax payers have to benefit from the Port's activity – as requested during public hearing.

Additionally, please clarify the following City statement: “**Converting the Port Peninsula** (partially into city park - A.K.) **would be inconsistent with the established purpose of a legally established unit of government that is unlikely to be eliminated in the next 20 years.**” Clarify the “established purpose of the Port”. I demand that its purpose is to serve population, for example by providing water taxi, airline connection etc., instead of conducting “the economic development” using tax money for profit.

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

Lack of clarification contradicts the statement on page 5 of the Comprehensive Plan: “Development (...) does not mean to protect economic development of few.” Currently, our tax dollars support harmful activities of the Port (export of raw material abroad, trucks polluting kindergarten backyard on Plum Street, damage to the roads). It is also alarming that, according to City Council Karen Rogers, the Port is going to take the City to court if Olympia does not cooperate with Port.

It is critical to describe the relationship between the Olympia City/Port in great details to legally protect the City and to be able to take care of this prime piece of real estate inside the city limits.

3. Is this topic addressed in the July Draft? It is not adequately addressed in the July draft.

It is not adequately addressed in the July draft.

4. Provide the specific goal /motion:

Provide a new chapter on the Port of Olympia in the Comprehensive Plan Update.

5. Where should this new or revised language be located in the Plan? CPU.

Topic: #B8, Affordable Housing

Services for the Public Chapter

OPC Sponsor: James Reddick

Adequate and affordable housing is critical to a healthy community. The Growth Management Act directs that planning for housing:

- Encourage affordable housing for all economic segments of the population

- Promote a variety of residential densities and housing types
- Encourage preservation of existing housing stock
- Identify sufficient land for housing, including government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities

The strategies of this chapter depend on well-formulated design standards to promote flexibility and stimulate innovation while preserving and enhancing the character of neighborhoods. We seek to establish and encourage diversity in housing opportunity and link diverse neighborhoods. With a strong foundation in preserving our heritage, our community can incorporate new housing and other developments in a manner that continues our legacy of well-planned neighborhoods. The housing goals and policies below provide a framework for residential land uses in Olympia's area. The City's related programs for supporting affordable housing are found in the Public Services chapter. An apartment building being added to the City's housing stock.

Many factors contribute to the need for more housing of various types:

- Olympia's growing residential population
- Household incomes vary
- The capitol's legislative session creates a demand for short-term housing
- College students seek affordable housing near transportation corridors and services
- Household sizes are declining
- The proportion of senior citizens is increasing
- **The City should provide annually information to the citizens on affordable housing, family incomes, and market rate housing.**

Olympia is a part of a larger housing market extending throughout Thurston County and beyond. Thus planning for housing is done based on anticipated shares of this larger area. The 2010 Census indicated that Olympia and its urban growth area included almost 26,000 housing units. Of these, as estimated in the TRPC Profile, 57% were single-family homes, 39% were multi-family (shared wall) units, and 4% were manufactured housing. As amended in 2008, the Buildable Lands Report for Thurston County estimates that over 11,000 new housing units will be needed by 2030 to accommodate population growth in the Olympia urban growth area. Of these, about 60% are expected to be single-family homes.

Based on existing zoning and development patterns, that report indicates the area can accommodate almost 15,000 units. In addition to large areas zoned for single-family development, almost 400 acres of vacant multi-family and duplex zoned land is available, and an additional 500 acres of vacant, partially-used, and redevelopable commercial land is also available for new housing. Because Olympia generally allows small group homes and manufactured housing wherever single-family homes are permitted, allows larger group homes by special approval, and does not discriminate with regard to government-assisted housing,

foster-care, or low-income housing, the area is expected to be adequate to accommodate all types of housing.

Similarly, the Thurston County Consolidate Plan of 2008 for affordable housing indicates that there is no shortage of land for affordable housing. However, there is a "mismatch" between the availability of affordable housing and the need for such housing, both at the lowest end of the income scale and the upper end of the moderate income bracket. That Plan and the Public Services Chapter describe efforts to close these gaps and make adequate provisions for all economic segments of the community.

To meet this need, the community will use compact growth to preserve space for future residents and reduce costs of providing public services. To ensure a variety of options, the community will need to allocate sufficient land for a variety of housing including detached homes, duplexes, group homes, small cottages, apartments, special needs housing, manufactured housing, and accessory dwellings. This approach can provide both variety and affordable options. For example, factory-built manufactured housing governed by federal standards and modular housing built to state standards are often less expensive than site-built housing. This Plan provides for these types of units and more luxurious and higher-priced shared-wall housing, including condominiums and townhouses. Housing types and sizes can be blended.

Housing costs in the Olympia area rose rapidly from 1990 until the economic recession of 2008. In general the cost of owner-occupied housing rose more rapidly than income, while rents roughly corresponded to income changes. Those changing costs and availability of land for development, combined with public preferences, resulted in gradual changes in the area's ownership. While county-wide owner-occupancy rose from 65% to 68% between 1990 and 2010, the City of Olympia trended in the opposite direction with owner-occupancy declining from 52% to 50% of all housing units. The type of housing structures being added to the housing stock has varied as a result of similar factors. As a result, multi-family housing county-wide increased gradually from about 16% in 1970 to about 22% by 2010. In the Olympia city limits multi-family structures provided 28% of the housing in 1970, and gradually increased to about 42% by 2010 as most new apartments were being built inside the urban areas.

The following is the proposal from the July Draft. Sponsor's proposes new policy PL13.4 in red.

GL13: The range of housing types and densities are consistent with the community's changing population needs and preferences.

PL13.1 Support increasing housing densities through well-designed, efficient and cost-effective use of buildable land, consistent with environmental constraints and affordability. Use both incentives and regulations such as minimum and maximum density limits to achieve such efficient use.

PL13.2 Adopt zoning that allows a wide variety of compatible housing types and densities.

PL13.3 Encourage 'clustering' of housing to preserve and protect environmentally sensitive areas.

PL13.4 Disperse low and moderate-income and special needs housing throughout the urban area.

PL13.5 Support affordable housing throughout the community by minimizing regulatory review risks, time and costs and removing unnecessary barriers to housing, by permitting small dwelling units accessory to single-family housing, and by allowing a mix of housing types.

PL13.6 Promote home ownership, including by allowing manufactured homes on individual lots, promoting preservation of manufactured home parks and allowing such parks in multi-family and commercial areas, all subject to design standards ensuring compatibility with surrounding housing and land uses.

PL13.7 Allow single-family housing on small lots, but prohibit reduced setbacks abutting conventional lots.

PL13.8 Encourage and provide incentives for residences above businesses.

PL13.9 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.

PL13.10 Require effective, but not unduly costly, building designs and landscaping to blend multi-family housing into neighborhoods.

PL13.11 Require that multi-family structures be located near a collector street with transit, or near an arterial street, or near a neighborhood center, and that they be designed for compatibility with adjacent lower density housing; and be 'stepped' to conform with topography.

PL13.12 Require a mix of single-family and multi-family structures in villages, mixed residential density districts, and apartment projects exceeding five acres; and utilize a variety of housing types and setbacks to transition to adjacent single-family areas.

PL13.13 Encourage adapting non-residential buildings for housing

PL13.14 Provide information about what is affordable housing regarding home owning and apartment renting yearly in the City of Olympia. This should include information regarding the a percentage of annual income limit for affordable housing, what the average family average family wages are yearly in the City of Olympia, and what is the annual market rate

housing is yearly in the City of Olympia. The implementation (action) should report yearly on how the city is doing regarding there being affordable housing in Olympia.

Staff Note: *Additional goal and policies regarding affordable housing are in the Services for the Public Chapter. See GS3 and related policies (page 3 of the chapter.)*

Topic: #B9, Earthquake Preparedness & Liquefaction

OPC Sponsor: Roger Horn

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B10, Index

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kiswa

1. Scope of the topic.

I request adding an index to the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Definition of index: *“in a nonfiction book, alphabetical listing of places, topics and names along with the numbers of the pages on which they are mentioned or discussed, included in or constituting the back matter.”*

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

Clarity of the document is critical. According to the lawyer conducting training for City Planning 2012, it is illegal for jurisdiction to produce documents that are unclear.

3. Is this topic addressed in the July Draft?

It is not addressed in the July draft.

4. Provide the specific goal /motion:

Provide Index and if subjects are scattered thru the whole document - reorganize the content of the main document.

5. Where should this new or revised language be located in the Plan?

At the end of the CPU.

Topic: #B11, How many and where will Olympia people live?

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4

Topic: #B12, Graphics, Visual Images

OPC Sponsor: Jerry Parker

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B13, Edits to Transportation Chapter

OPC Sponsors: Roger Horn/Larry Leveen

COMPLETED ON 2/25/13 – WITH SOME PROPOSALS TABLED FOR HDC DISCUSSION

Topic: #B14, Neighborhood Plans

OPC Sponsor: Amy Tousley

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Olympia Planning Commission
FROM: Amy L. Tousley, Planning Commission
SUBJECT: Olympia Comprehensive Plan – Neighborhood / Sub-Area Planning

It was my intent to set aside the topic of Neighborhood/Sub-Area Plans so that the Commission could have an opportunity to assess if the proposed Olympia Comprehensive Plan has established the initial structure for the future development, adoption and implementation of such ancillary documents. This would also incorporate the City's future Implementation Strategy/Action Plan.

First and foremost, the entire Comprehensive Plan provides a framework for Sub-Area Plans such as the goals and policies in the following chapters:

- Vision and Values
- Public Participation
- Natural Environment
- Land Use and Design
- Transportation
- Utilities
- Park, Arts and Recreation
- Economy
- Public Services
- Capital Facility Plan

Coalition of Neighborhood Associations

In July 2012, the Coalition of Neighborhood Associations (CNA) and the Olympia City Council entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establishing a city-neighborhood association partnership for conducting forums and other activities affecting neighborhoods. This includes the structure for sub-area planning.

The first steps in this forthcoming process will be presented to the Council's Land Use and Environment Committee on May 23rd. The presentation between the staff and members of the CNA will consist of considering the first steps in developing a process for sub-area plans. Status reports of this work will be presented to the Committee on July 25th and September 26th. I presume the Committee will then provide a recommendation to the Council with formal action taking place afterwards.

Below is an excerpt from the CNA's 2013 Action Plan (see attached). The Action Plan was presented to Land Use and Environmental Committee on January 30th. The excerpt outlines the CNA's proposal for developing the Implementation Strategy and Sub-Area Plans.

B. Comprehensive Plan Implementation Strategy

The Comprehensive Plan's Vision Section provides that "Neighborhood groups [should] take an intimate role in the planning and decision-making affecting their neighborhoods. The vehicle for this will be an Action Plan or Implementation Strategy. When the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Strategy is prepared by the city, neighborhoods will focus on the following key areas:

- *Ensuring that development regulations are made consistent with the Comprehensive Plan*
- *Making city programs more neighborhood centric*
- *Incorporating neighborhoods in the land use decisions of government organizations*

C. Sub-Area Plans

1. A new Organizational Structure for Neighborhoods

CNA has been working to increase the number of areas in the city which are covered by a neighborhood association. In some areas of the city, consolidations of neighborhoods are already occurring. The City's proposed Comprehensive Plan includes neighborhood involvement in land use in the context of 10 sub-areas. CNA will propose a new framework for neighborhoods based on the City of Olympia's sub-area model so that all areas of the city have a neighborhood association point of contact.

2. Working Group for Sub-Area Planning

One sub-area of the city will be selected as a pilot for the sub-area planning process involving neighborhoods and the City Department of Community Planning and Development. CNA will provide assistance to that neighborhood as needed and support the allocation of neighborhood matching grant funds to assist the neighborhood in the planning process. Developing a final sub-area could take 1-2 years.

If deemed appropriate, the Planning Commission as well as other City Citizen Advisory Boards should provide feedback to the Council and CNA regarding the 2013 Action Plan. To avoid any missteps, it is important that continuity and coordination with the City's master plans and subsequent development regulations and the efforts of the CNA occur.

I believe that there will be a great deal of work accomplished in the 2013 Action Plan and in subsequent years, including answers about how to address certain specifics in Sub-Area Plans, such as:

- Do the Sub-Area Plans contain any regulatory authority?
- What will be the public involvement process in developing Sub-Area Plans?
- How will the City's regulatory framework be integrated toward the implementation of Sub-Area Plans?
- How will it be determined if Sub-Area Plans are consistent with and further the overall Comprehensive Plan for the City?
- What is the overall timeframe for addressing the 12 Sub-Area Plans (A through K, and Downtown)? The CNA indicates that a template will be created for the first plan.
- What are the obligations for implementation of Sub-Area Plans by the City Council? What is the process for the development and adoption (1 to 2 years per plan)?
- In addition to the Neighborhood Match Grants, what other funds for Sub-Area Plans will be used?
- Will there be a Sub-Area Plans for the Urban Growth Area – Thurston County?

Olympia Sub-Area Map

Based on its deliberations, the Commission should consider forwarding a recommendation on whether to accept or amend the proposed Olympia Sub-Areas Map. It is my understanding that the CNA has developed its own map. Although this was not submitted to the Commission during the open record, it will most likely be presented to the Council during its Comprehensive Plan process. The Commission may opt to defer any recommendation on the proposed map due to the proposal by the

CNA. However, absent any change, the July Draft proposal will then be forwarded to the Council.

Future Land Use Map

Based on its deliberations, the Commission should consider forwarding a recommendation on whether or not to accept or amend the proposed Olympia Future Land Use Map. This includes any indication on the designation of land use areas as well as neighborhood centers or nodes versus villages. It is important that Commission review the designations and defined terms for the following land use classifications since these classifications will then be used as a basis for the underlying zoning categories.

- Low-Density Housing
- Medium-Density Housing
- Mixed Residential
- Neighborhood Center
- Residential Mixed Use
- Planned Developments
- Professional Offices & Multi-family
- Urban Corridors
- Urban Waterfront
- Central Business District
- General commercial
- Auto Services
- Medical Services
- Industry

Continued on next page ...

As stated earlier, the entire Comprehensive Plan provides a framework, however the goals and policies listed below should be considered essential in ensuring consistency between Sub-Area Plans established in the City.

Neighborhoods, Villages and Planning Sub-Areas	
GL 17	“Development maintains and improves neighborhood character and livability.”
PL 17.1	“Require development in established neighborhoods to be of a type, scale, orientation, and design that maintains or improves the character, aesthetic quality, and livability of the neighborhood.”
PL 17.2	“Unless necessary for historic preservation, prohibit conversion of housing residential areas to commercial use; instead, support redevelopment and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods to bolster stability and allow home occupations (except convalescent care) that do not degrade neighborhood appearance or livability, create traffic, noise or pollution problems.”
PL 17.3	“Allow elder care homes and senior-only housing and encourage child care services everywhere except industrial areas; but limit hospice care to multi-family and commercial districts.”
PL 17.4	“Support local food production including urban agriculture, and provide for a food store with a transit stop within one-half mile of all residents.”
PL 17.5 “new”	“Encourage development and public improvements consistent with healthy and active lifestyles.”
PL 17.6 “new”	“Discourage ‘fortress-style’ and unnecessarily secure designs that isolate developments and separate neighborhoods.”
GL 18	“Neighborhood centers are the focal point of neighborhoods and villages.”
PL 18.1	“Establish a neighborhood center at each village site, encourage development of designated neighborhood centers as shown on Future Land Use Map and allow designation of additional centers where compatible with existing land uses and where they are more than one-half mile from other commercial areas.”
PL 18.2	“Locate neighborhood centers along collector arterial streets and within

	about 600 feet of a transit stop.”
PL 18.3	“Include housing, a food store, and a neighborhood park or civic green at all neighborhood centers. Allow churches, schools, and convenience businesses and services that cater primarily to neighborhood residents. Prohibit auto-oriented uses. Vary the specific size and composition of such centers for balance with surrounding uses; focus commercial uses on the civic green or park, and limit the size of commercial uses. (Note: a larger urban center is permitted in the Briggs Urban Village.)”
PL 18.4	“Allow neighborhood center designs that are innovative and provide variety, but that ensure compatibility with adjoining uses. Consider appropriate phasing, scale, design and exterior materials, as well as glare, noise and traffic impacts when evaluating compatibility. Require buildings with primary access directly from street sidewalks, orientation to any adjacent park or green and to any adjacent housing, and signage consistent with neighborhood character.”
PL 18.5	“Locate streets and trails for non-arterial access to the neighborhood center.”
GL 19	“Trees help maintain strong and healthy neighborhoods.”
PL 19.1	“Use trees to foster a sense of neighborhood identity.”
PL 19.2	“Identify, protect and maintain trees with historic significance or other value to the community or specific neighborhoods.”
Sub-Area Planning	
GL 20 “new”	“Each of the community’s major neighborhoods has its own priorities.”
PL 20.1 “new”	“In cooperation with residents, landowners, businesses, and other interested parties, establish priorities for the sub-area shown on the Planning Areas Map. The specific area, content and process for each sub-area is to be adapted to the needs and interests of each area. (See public involvement regarding public involvement goals.)
PL 20.2 “new”	“Create sub-area strategies that address provisions and priorities for community health, neighborhood centers and places assembly, streets and paths, cultural resources, forestry, utilities and open space and parks.”

PL 20.3	“Develop neighborhood and business community approaches to beautification that include activities in residential and commercial areas.”
‘Villages’ and other Planning Developments	
GL 21	“Mixed use developments, also known as “villages,” are a planned with a pedestrian orientation and a coordinated and balanced mix of land uses.”
PL 21.1	“Require planned development sites shown on the Future Land Use Map to develop as coordinated, mixed-use projects.”
PL 21.2	“Provide for any redevelopment or redesign of planned developments including the Evergreen Park Planned Unit Development to be consistent with the ‘village vision’ of this Plan.”
PL 21.3	“Require ‘master plans’ for villages that encompass the entire site and specific the project phasing, street layout and design, lot arrangement, land uses, parks and open space, building orientation, environmental protection and neighborhood compatibility measures.”
PL 21.4	“Proved for a compatible mix of housing in each village with pleasant living, shopping and working environment, pedestrian-oriented character, well-located and sized open spaces, attractive well-connected streets and a balance of retail stores, offices, housing, and public uses.”
PL 21.5	“Require a neighborhood center, a variety of housing, connected trails, prominent open spaces, wildlife habitat, and recreation areas in each village.”
PL 21.6	“Require that villages retain the natural topography and major environmental features of the site and incorporate water bodies and stormwater ponds into the design to minimize environmental degradation.”
PL 21.7	“Locate parking lots at the rear or side of building, to avoid pedestrian interference and to minimize street frontage. Landscape any parking adjacent to streets and minimize parking within villages by reducing requirements and providing incentives for shared parking.”
PL 21.8	“Require village integrity but provide flexibility for developers to respond to market conditions.”

PL 21.9	“Limit each village to about 40 to 200 acres; require that at least 60% but allow no more than 75% of housing to be single-family units; and require at least 5% of the site be open space with at least one large usable open space for the public at the neighborhood center.”
PL 21.10	“Require that 90% of village housing be within a quarter mile of the neighborhood center and a transit stop.”
PL 21.11	“Provide for a single ‘urban village’ at the intersection of Henderson Boulevard and Yelm Highway; allowing up to 175,000 square feet of commercial floor area plus an additional 50,000 square feet if a larger grocery is included; and requiring that on 505 of the housing be single-family.”
Public Participation and Partners	
GP 4	“Sub-area planning conducted through a collaborative effort by community members and the City and is used to shape how neighborhoods grow and develop.”
PP 4.1	“Work with neighborhoods to identify the priorities, assets and changes 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.”
PP 4.2	“Encourage wide participation in the development and implementation of sub-area plans.”
PP 4.3	“Define the role that sub-area plans play in City decision-making and resource allocation.”
PP 4.4	“Allow initiation of sub-area planning by either neighborhoods or the City.”
PP 4.5	“Encourage collaboration between neighborhoods and City representatives.”

Topic: #B15, Shoreline Master Program, Restoration Plan

OPC Sponsor: James Reddick

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B16, Environmental Protection – Restoration, Daylighting Creeks, Corridors

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kiswa

1. Scope of the topic.

Day-light creeks in Olympia - as an environmental demonstration project. Restoration of creek in Elma, Washington, is a good example to follow. This project would:

- Bring attention to salmon protection (food protection) and environment in general;
- Generate landmarks in Olympia; and
- Generate public works.

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

Recent events related to the climate change force us to reconsider our impact on environment. Forcing fish to swim inside the dark pipes is an example of negative impact that we have on environment and is has to be reversed.

Is this topic addressed in the July Draft?

It is not addressed in the July draft.

Provide the specific goal /motion:

Start with reopening of the Creek along Cherry Street, creating a bike route along the creek/along the City Hall and connecting it with the Port area.

Where should this be located in the Plan?

Two chapters: Environmental and Park/Recreation.

Topic: #B17, Capital Facilities Element

OPC Sponsor: Amy Tousley

Continued on next page ...

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Olympia Planning Commission
FROM: Amy L. Tousley, Planning Commissioner
SUBJECT: Olympia Comprehensive Plan – Capital Facilities Plan

My intent for setting aside the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) was for the Commission to have an opportunity to discuss the City's current strategy for ensuring compliance with the Growth Management Act.

Below is the current proposal outlined in the July Draft. This should also be considered as the documentation for evaluating impacts within the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). There are other policies in the proposed plan which affect the implementation of the City's CFP in addition those below cited in the EIS.

Review of the CFP element of the Comprehensive Plan will not be part of the Planning Commission's public process and review in 2012.

The CFP goals and policies will be reviewed by the Planning Commission in 2013. The Commission will review these goals and policies in conjunction with their review of the 2014-2019 CFP (6-year planning document). Their review will include a public hearing, followed by a recommendation to the City Council.

Beginning in 2014, the entire CFP element - background, goals, policies, and 6-year financing plan - will be located in one PDF document. This webpage will link to that PDF.

Final Environmental Impact Statement

Section 3: Policy Regarding Maintenance and Operations
Policy PN 2.7 Practice maintenance and operations that reduce the City's environmental impact.

Section 4: Policies Regarding Public Infrastructure Investments
Goal E4 The City achieves maximum economic, environmental and social benefit from public infrastructure.

Policy PE 4.1 Design infrastructure investments to balance economic, environmental social needs, support a variety of potential economic sectors, and shape the development of the community in sustainable patterns.

Policy PE 4.3 Base public infrastructure investments on analysis determining the lowest life-cycle cost and benefits to environmental, economic and social systems.

Growth Management Act

RCW 36.70A.070 - Mandatory Elements.

(3) A capital facilities plan element consisting of: (a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities; (b) a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities; (c) the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities; (d) at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and (e) a requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent. Park and recreation facilities shall be included in the capital facilities plan element.

RCW 36.70A.120 – Planning activities and capital budget decisions – Implementation in conformity with comprehensive plan.

Each county and city that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall perform its activities and make capital budget decisions in conformity with its comprehensive plan.

Recommendation:

For me, I strongly believe that there is a requirement for ensuring compliance with the sections cited above. The key to ensuring compliance will be the timing of the Commission's review of the 2013 amendments of the goals and policies as well as the 2014-2019 CFP.

The Council should not take formal final action on adopting the updated Comprehensive Plan without the integration of the 2013 amendments. These actions could take place concurrently.

It is my recommendation that the March transmittal to the Council refer to the existing Volume Three: Capital Facilities Plan along with the current 2013 to 2018 Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan since these are documents currently adopted. As indicated in the July Draft, the Commission will forward a recommendation on any proposed amendments to the Council in 2013. I realize that this has already been discussed, however I believe it is important to refer to these documents to ensure that they are part of the Commission's 2013 Work Program especially in the early part of the schedule.

There is a lot of work ahead for the Commission and it is essential that this component be given a high priority. It is hoped that the scope of work will recognize the continued efforts by the Commission to develop a Long-term Capital Facilities Planning, Strategies and Priorities document which will hopefully be part of the final adopted Comprehensive Plan.

<http://olympiawa.gov/documents/OlympiaPlanningCommission/2011/Comp%20Plan%20CFP%20Update%2001052011/UpdatedCPVol3CFP.pdf>

<http://olympiawa.gov/city-government/~media/Files/AdminServices/CapitalFacilitiesPlan/2013-2018%20CFP/2013%20Final%20CFP-rs.pdf>

Listed below are the adopted goals and policies in the Olympia Comprehensive Plan:

GOALS AND POLICIES	
<p>The goals and policies set out in this section implement the State Growth Management Act requirements and Thurston County County-Wide Planning Policies. Unless otherwise noted, the City of Olympia--or Thurston County where indicated take responsibility for implementing the following goals and policies:</p>	
GOAL CFPI*	To annually develop a six-year Capital Facilities Plan to implement the Comprehensive Plan by coordinating urban services, land use decisions, level of service standards, and financial resources with a fully funded schedule of capital improvements.
<p>The Capital Facilities Plan is the mechanism by which the City and County schedule the timing, location, projected cost, and revenue sources for the capital improvements identified for implementation in other Comprehensive Plan elements. These capital facilities will be integrated into the Urban Growth Management Areas as urbanization occurs.</p>	
POLICIES:	
CFP 1.1*	<p>Provide needed public facilities and services to implement the Comprehensive Plan, protect investments in existing facilities, maximize the use of existing facilities, and promote orderly compact urban growth. This Capital Facilities Plan:</p> <p>a. Is subject to annual review and adoption respectively by the planning commissions and City Council or Board of County Commissioners, as appropriate;</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; c. Defines the scope and location of capital projects or equipment; d. Defines the project's need and its links to established levels of service, Comprehensive Plan goals and policies, facility plans, and other capital facilities projects; e. Includes the construction costs, timing, funding sources, and projected operations and maintenance impacts; f. Establishes priorities for capital project development; g. Includes a twenty-year forecast of future capital facilities needs, and an inventory of existing capital facilities; h. Monitors whether, or to what degree, land use and capital facilities goals are being achieved; and i. Is coordinated with Thurston County, school districts, telecommunications carriers, and private utility providers.
CFP 1.2	Encourage active citizen participation throughout the process of developing and adopting the Capital Facilities Plan.
CFP 1.3*	Support and encourage joint development and use of cultural and community facilities with other governmental or community organizations in areas of mutual concern and benefit.
CFP 1.4	Emphasize capital improvement projects which promote conservation, preservation, or revitalization of commercial, industrial, and residential areas in Olympia and its Growth Area.
CFP 1.5	<p>Evaluate and prioritize proposed capital improvement projects using all the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is needed to correct existing deficiencies, replace needed facilities, or provide facilities needed for future growth; b) Eliminates public hazards; c) Eliminates capacity deficits; d) Is financially feasible; e) Phasing and priorities are established in the Comprehensive Plan;

	<p>f) Site needs are based on projected growth patterns; g) Serves new development and redevelopment; h) Is compatible with plans of state agencies; and i) Local operating budget impact is acceptable.</p>
CFP 1.6*	Adopt by reference, in the appropriate chapters of the Comprehensive Plan, all facilities plans, their level of service standards, and future amendments. These plans must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
CFP 1.7	Adopt by reference the annual update of the Capital Facilities Plan as part of this Capital Facilities element.
CFP 1.8	Adopt by reference the annual update of the Olympia School District Capital Facilities Plan as part of this Capital Facilities element.
GOAL CFP2*	To meet current needs for capital facilities in Olympia and its Growth Area, correct deficiencies in existing systems, and replace obsolete facilities.
It is a major challenge to balance existing capital facilities needs with the need to provide additional facilities to serve growth. It is important to maintain our prior investments as well as serve new growth. Clear, hard priority decisions are facing City and County policy makers.	
POLICIES:	
CFP 2.1*	Give priority consideration to projects mandated by law and those by State and Federal agencies.
CFP 2.2	Give priority consideration to projects already initiated and to be completed in subsequent phases.
CFP 2.3	Give priority consideration to projects already initiated and to be completed in subsequent phases. Give priority consideration to projects that renovate existing facilities, preserve the community's prior investment or reduce maintenance and operating costs.
CFP 2.4	Give priority consideration to projects that remove existing capital facilities deficiencies, encourage full use of existing facilities, or replace worn-out or obsolete facilities.

GOAL CFP3*	To provide capital facilities to serve and direct future growth within Olympia and its Urban Growth Area as these areas urbanize.
<p>It is crucial to identify, in advance of development, sites for schools, parks, fire and police stations, major stormwater facilities, greenbelts, open space, and road connections. Acquisition of sites for these facilities must occur in a timely manner and as early as possible in the overall development of the area. Otherwise, acquisition opportunities will be missed, with long-term functional or financial implications.</p>	
POLICIES:	
CFP 3.1*	Provide the capital facilities needed to adequately serve the future growth anticipated by the Comprehensive Plan, within projected funding capabilities.
CFP 3.2*	Give priority consideration to projects needed to meet concurrency requirements for growth management.
CFP 3.3*	<p>Plan and coordinate the location of public facilities and utilities in advance of need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Coordinate urban services, planning, and standards by identifying, in advance of development, sites for schools, parks, fire and police stations, major stormwater facilities, greenbelts, and open space. Acquire sites for these facilities in a timely manner and as early as possible in the overall development of the area. b. Provide capacity to accommodate planned growth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Assure adequate capacity in transportation, public and private utilities, storm drainage systems, municipal services, parks, and schools; 2) Protect groundwater supplies from contamination and maintain groundwater in adequate supply by identifying and reserving future supplies well in advance of need.
CFP 3.4*	Design and establish a Concurrency Management System to determine whether or not adequate capacity of concurrency-required public facilities is available to maintain the level of service standards for each proposed new development. The system may reserve the capacity that is needed for approved development commitments and permits until such time as the capacity is needed and used.
CFP 3.5*	Use the type, location, and phasing of public facilities and utilities to direct urban expansion where it is wanted and needed. Consider the

	level of key facilities that can be provided when planning for various densities and types of urban land use.
CFP 3.6*	Provide adequate levels of public facilities and services, in cooperation with Thurston County, prior to or concurrent with land development within the Olympia Urban Growth Area.
CFP 3.7	Encourage land banking as a reasonable approach to meeting the needs of future populations.
CFP 3.8	Coordinate future economic activity with planning for public facilities and services.
GOAL CFP4*	To provide adequate funding for capital facilities in Olympia and its Growth Area to ensure the Comprehensive Plan vision and goals are implemented.
<p>The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that the Land Use element be reassessed if funding for capital facilities falls short of needs. The intent is to ensure that growth does not occur if the capital facilities needed to serve that growth are not provided. Capital Facilities Plans developed after the advent of the GMA will always balance costs and revenues. Many options are available that fall into five general categories: increase revenues, decrease level of service standards, decrease the cost of the facility, decrease the demand for the public service or facility, and others.</p>	
POLICIES	
CFP 4.1	Manage the City of Olympia's fiscal resources to support providing needed capital improvements. Ensure a balanced approach to allocating financial resources between: (1) major maintenance of existing facilities, (2) eliminating existing capital facility deficiencies, (3) providing new or expanding facilities to serve growth.
CFP 4.2	Use the Capital Facilities Plan to integrate all of the community's capital project resources (grants, bonds, city funds, donations, impact fees, and any other available funding).
CFP 4.3	Ensure consistency of current and future fiscal and funding policies for capital improvements with other Comprehensive Plan elements.
CFP 4.35	To the extent possible growth should pay for growth. Developers who install infrastructure with excess capacity should be allowed latecomers agreements wherever practical.

CFP 4.4	<p>Pursue funding strategies that derive revenues from growth that can be used to provide capital facilities to serve that growth in order to achieve and maintain adopted level of service standards. These strategies include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Collect Impact Fees: Transportation, Parks and Open Space, Fire Protection and Suppression, Schools. b. Allocate sewer and water connection fees primarily to capital improvements related to urban expansion. c. Develop and implement other appropriate funding mechanisms to ensure new development's fair share contribution to other public facilities such as recreation, drainage, solid waste, and congestion management services and facilities (car/van pool matching, transit shelters, bike racks, street trees, and sidewalks).
CFP 4.5*	<p>Assess the additional operations and maintenance costs associated with acquisition or development of new capital facilities. If accommodating these costs places an unacceptable burden on the operating budget, capital plans may need to be adjusted.</p>
CFP 4.6*	<p>Promote efficient and joint use of facilities through such measures as interlocal agreements and negotiated use of privately- and publicly-owned land for open space opportunities.</p>
CFP 4.7*	<p>Explore regional funding strategies for capital facilities to support comprehensive plans developed under the Growth Management Act.</p>
CFP 4.8*	<p>Investigate potential new revenue sources for funding capital facilities such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Growth-induced tax revenues b. Additional voter-approved financing c. Regional tax base sharing d. Regional cost sharing for urban infrastructure e. Voter-approved real estate excise transfer tax f. Street utility g. County-wide bond issues
CFP 4.9	<p>Use the following available contingency strategies should the City be faced with capital facility funding shortfalls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Increase Revenues Bonds</u>

	<p>General Revenues Rates User Fees Change Funding Source(s) Establish a Street Utility</p> <p>b. <u>Decrease Level of Service Standards</u> Change Comprehensive Plan Change Level of Service Standards Reprioritize Projects to Focus on Those Related to Concurrency</p> <p>c. <u>Decrease the Cost of the Facility</u> Change Project Scope</p> <p>d. <u>Decrease the Demand for the Public Service or Facility</u> Moratorium on Development Develop Only in Served Areas Until Funding is Available Change Project Timing and/or Phasing</p> <p>e. <u>Other Considerations</u> Developer Voluntarily Funds Needed Capital Project Develop Partnerships with Lacey, Tumwater, and Thurston County (The metropolitan service area approach to services, facilities, or funding) Regional Funding Strategies Privatize the Service Mitigate under SEPA</p>
CFP 4.10	Secure grants or private funds, when available, to finance capital facility projects.
CFP 4.11	Maintain the City of Olympia's A+ bond rating by limiting bond sales.
GOAL CFP5*	To ensure the Capital Facilities Plan is current and responsive to the community vision and goals.
<p>The role of monitoring and evaluation is vital to the effectiveness of any planning program, particularly for the Capital Facilities element. Revenues and expenditures are subject to economic fluctuations and are used to predict fiscal trends in order to maintain adopted level of service standards for public facilities. This Capital Facilities Plan will be annually reviewed and amended to verify that fiscal resources are available to provide public facilities needed to support adopted LOS standards.</p>	
POLICIES:	
CFP 5.1*	Monitor the progress of the Capital Facilities Plan on an ongoing basis,

	including completion of major maintenance projects, expansion of existing facilities, and addition of new facilities. Evaluate this progress with respect to trends in the rate and distribution of growth, impacts upon service quality, and Comprehensive Plan directives.
CFP 5.2*	Review, update, and amend the Capital Facilities Plan annually. Reflect in the amendments the rates of growth, development trends, changing priorities, and budget and financial considerations. Make provisions to reassess the Comprehensive Plan periodically in light of the evolving Capital Facilities Plan. Take appropriate action to ensure internal consistency of the elements of the plan.
CFP 5.3*	Coordinate with other capital facilities service providers to keep each other current, maximize cost savings, and schedule and upgrade facilities efficiently.
CFP 5.4*	The year in which a project is carried out, or the exact amounts of expenditures by year for individual facilities may vary from that stated in the Comprehensive Plan due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Unanticipated revenues or revenues that become available to the city with conditions about when they may be used, or b. Change in the timing of a facility to serve new development that occurs in an earlier or later year than had been anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) denotes text material adopted by Thurston County as the joint plan with Olympia for the unincorporated part of the Olympia Growth Area.

Topic: #B18, Action Plan

OPC Sponsor: James Reddick

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B19, Gateways to the City, Civic Boulevards

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4

Topic: #B20, Historic Preservation

OPC Sponsor: Judy Bardin

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B21, Revisions to the Economy Chapter

OPC Sponsor: Jerry Parker

PROPOSED LANGUAGE NOT YET RECEIVED

Topic: #B22, Artist Live/Work Space

OPC Sponsor: Roger Horn

July Draft Goal and Policies:

The Parks, Arts and Recreation Chapter of the July Draft includes the following goal and policies. It is one of two goal sections on Arts. The other goal in the section (GR7) pertains to placement of public art.

GR8: Arts in Olympia is supported.

PR8.1: Pursue a regional community arts center.

PR8.2: Pursue affordable housing and studio space/rehearsal space for artists

PR8.3: Encourage broad arts participation in the community.

PR8.4: Provide opportunities for the public to learn about and engage in the art-making process.

PR8.5: Provide opportunities that highlight the talent of visual, literary, and performing artists.

PR8.6: Provide technical support to arts organizations.

PR8.7: Formalize a theater and entertainment district.

PR8.8: Create a range of opportunities for the public to interact with art; from small workshops to large community events.

PR8.9: Encourage early arts education opportunities.

Sponsor Proposals:

PRs 8.1, 8.2, 8.7, and 8.9 are new policies. I propose changes to PR8.2 and PR8.7, as follows:

PR8.2: Pursue affordable housing and studio space/rehearsal space for artists, including support for, or participation in, establishing buildings or sections of buildings that provide living and work space exclusively for artists.

Rationale: Buildings with artist live and work space have been established in many cities. These buildings provide affordable housing for artists, but also have had a positive effect on the communities in which they are located. They attract young, vibrant residents; host numerous arts events; revitalize old, underused buildings; can maintain the affordability of housing spaces; enhance the community's awareness and enjoyment of the arts; bring activity and liveliness to the surrounding area. A non-profit organization called the Olympia Artspace Alliance is working on establishing this type of facility in the City.

PR8: Establish a theater and entertainment district in Downtown Olympia.

Rationale: "Establish" is a stronger term that may create more momentum toward creating a theater and entertainment district in the city. Downtown has many art galleries, theaters, and music venues; linking these establishments as a theater and entertainment district, if only to create a stronger identity and market their offerings, would provide a boost to downtown. Downtown is the logical location for such a district; the policy should explicitly say so.

Topic: #B23, Measurable Goals

Entire Plan

OPC Sponsor: Agnieszka Kizza

1. Scope of the topic.

I am asking to introduce the set of Measurable Goals to the Comprehensive Plan Update.

2. Why does this issue demand attention?

To be useful, a goal has to be specific and measurable. For example, new development along busy streets has to meet requirements of green buffer. Large development has to have access to the parkland area - goal: 3 acres per 1000 people, maximum distance – half mile.

3. Is this topic addressed in the July Draft?

It is not adequately addressed in the July draft.

4. Provide the specific goal /motion:

When possible, provide measurable goals.

OPC Final Deliberations
Comprehensive Plan Update
Date: March 11, 2013

5. Where should this new or revised language be located in the Plan?

Next to goals.

Topic: #B24, Reduction of Cars and Trucks Downtown

OPC Sponsor: Paul Ingman

PER COMMISSIONER INGMAN, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO HDC DISCUSSION ON MARCH 4