



# City of Olympia

City Hall  
601 4th Avenue E  
Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Amy Buckler  
(360) 570-5847

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Wednesday, August 1, 2012

6:30 PM

Room 207

---

### Special Meeting

#### 1. Call to Order: 6:30 PM

*Chair Tousley called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.*

#### 1.A Roll Call

**Present:** 9 - Commissioner Judy Bardin, Commissioner Roger Horn, Commissioner Paul Ingman, Commissioner Agnieszka Kisza, Vice Chair Larry Leveen, Commissioner Jerome Parker, Commissioner James Reddick, Commissioner Rob Richards, and Chair Amy Tousley

#### 1.B Acceptance of Agenda

*Commissioner Ingman moved, seconded by Commissioner Parker, that the order of Items 3A and 3B be switched. Item 3B, regarding the draft letter for Councilmember Langer, will be limited to approximately 10 minutes. The motion carried by unanimous vote.*

**Commissioner Ingman moved, seconded by Commissioner Parker, to adopt the agenda as amended. The motion carried by unanimous vote.**

#### 1.C Announcements

*Commissioner Richards announced that today is the first day of the Downtown Ambassador Program, and joint program of the City of Olympia and the Capitol Recovery Center. The program will provide customer service for downtown visitors and businesses, and help clean the streets. The seven ambassadors have diverse backgrounds with connections to downtown. He handed out a Frequently Asked Questions document.*

#### 2. Public Communications (for items not on the agenda)

#### 3. Comprehensive Plan Update

3.A [12-0403](#) Comprehensive Plan Topics for Review

**Attachments:** [Imagine Olympia website](#)  
[Scope of the Comprehensive Plan Update](#)  
[Focus Meeting Summary Report](#)  
[April Draft Public Comments](#)  
[July Draft of the Comprehensive Plan](#)  
[Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement \(SEIS\)](#)  
[July Draft Substantive Changes List](#)  
[OPC Charter and Roles and Responsibilities.final](#)

*The Commission discussed and agreed on a process for brainstorming issues for their Comprehensive Plan deliberations. Commissioners had 10 minutes to identify issues on sticky-notes, and stick them to the wall. Commissioners were given 20 minutes to review sticky notes and identify patterns. Goal was to group, align and consolidate ideas. Twenty-three separate items were recorded. Staff agreed to type-up and distribute the list:*

1. Process for Comprehensive Plan review
2. Comprehensive Plan organization
3. Review timeline and schedule
4. Population estimates and projections
5. Transportation comments
6. Economy
7. Sub-area planning and neighborhood planning
8. Urban forestry and green space
9. Urban corridors (Carlyon, Gov. Stevens, Wildwood, and Harrison)
10. Density, corridors, and acreage
11. Downtown planning (open space, parks, heights, views, boundaries, and parking)
12. Form-based code
13. Ken Lake/Park Heights/Westbrook Park, steep slopes, and low-impact development
14. West Olympia
15. Street connectivity (Decatur, Fern St., Parkside, Log Cabin, etc.)
16. Views, view corridors, and heights (including the relationship to economic development and prioritization)
17. Urban agriculture, food security, local food production, and water quality
18. Sustainability as a thread throughout the Plan
19. Natural hazards (heat, air, flood, fire, drought, liquefaction, etc.)
20. \tab Adaptation and climate change
21. \tab Water uses and transportation
22. \tab Critical areas and the uniqueness of the PNW marine ecosystem
23. \tab City and Port relationship and jurisdiction (governance)

*Discussion of next steps:*

- Determine what the major categories are ("big buckets"). May be a more efficient use of meetings available.
- Use list of 23 to identify 4-5 major issues.
- Discussion of potential "buckets" or major topics.
- Staff can provide OPC with a briefing/discussion on context or assumptions that contributed to the preparation of the Plan.
- A "process-oriented" conversation will take away from the time to deliberate.
- Like to have a discussion questioning the basis for the population projections.
- Staff can provide a briefing for the basis of the July Draft; staff can also take in

requests for additional/necessary information.

- Staff requested there be a process/determination of how/when to ask staff for information, data, context, etc.
- Questions for additional information should be routed to staff through the deliberation process, and question and answer should be made available to all members.
- Process and assumptions might be something for CPU to discuss and work on.
- Concern about creating too large of "buckets." Don't want to lose track of issues that are important to the public. Need to address issues such as Decatur and Carlyon that were important to the public. Downtown, urban ag, etc. Don't feel they need to do the whole list, but can pick out 7 or 8 w/out buckets.
- Want buckets for the purpose of creating an outline, not to lose track of "smaller" issues.
- Some issues on this list can be addressed through a neighborhood planning process; doesn't feel like it benefits to look at one singular issue, like Park Heights or Ken Lake. OPC role is to work instead on the vision of the sub-area, neighborhood planning concept (ex. Seattle Dept. of Neighborhoods).
- We have a Comp Plan that says: such and such area is an urban corridor. Can't just "punt" or leave things in the Plan w/out discussion. Understand the need to look at the larger, overriding issues, such as neighborhood empowerment.
- Not sure how to address concerns about Transportation Chapter--needs another iteration, draft.

There was a request for staff to provide a response to the 23 issues to help inform the decisions (i.e., this one, there isn't enough time; this one, there is a lot of room for change.) Planning Manager Mr. Todd Stamm noted the staff report for the next meeting is due tomorrow, so it is not possible to provide for the next meeting.

Associate Planner Ms. Stacey Ray confirmed staff has been discussing Mr. Mike McCormick's comments, has been using the GMA checklist, and is meeting with Commerce tomorrow. It has been going through an ongoing process to ensure compliance with the GMA.

There was a request for staff to provide a briefing describing how all these pieces fit together (a timeline, legal requirements for alignment, integration of SMP, CFP, CP, GMA, etc.) Ms. Ray confirmed staff will provide such a briefing in the future.

Staff will collate, type up all the sticky note comments and distribute in a staff report, if possible.

**The report was received.**

### 3.B [12-0412](#)

**Attachments:** [July 25 draft ltr to Councilmember Langer](#)

Commissioner Parker gave a brief introduction to the letter. It is an attempt to put before the Council some of the issues that may delay the process or are deserving of further evaluation/investigation. Commissioner Ingman urged all or a majority of the Commission to share the letter with the Land Use & Environment Committee (LUEC).

Commission Discussion:

- Mr. Mike McCormick's public comments about the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) update timing are of particular concern.
- Planning Manager Todd Stamm clarified that staff has proposed that changes to the 20-year portion of the CFP be reviewed by the Planning Commission in 2013, and integrated into the 2014-2019 CFP document. Mr. McCormick argues the Growth

Hearings Board would find such a proceeding not valid if challenged; staff disagrees and believes the process would be compliant with the GMA.

- At the Commission's public hearings, six members of the public argued the City should "slow" the review process, and this should be noted for LUEC.
- LUEC was noticed at their last meeting of the forthcoming letter.
- Questions and discussion on merits, relevance, or timeliness of points noted in the draft letter:
  - 7-11 decision could be wrapped up in litigation for a year or two. Could result in the Comprehensive Plan being viewed as a regulatory document.
  - Arguments against including details in the Plan: not compelled by a "what if" regarding 7-11 decision; such a ruling would require all cities to re-write their Comprehensive Plans.
  - Argument for including details in the Plan: if we are going to fail, rather fail by being more precise now; if we have the opportunity and the research is available, we should include the information; prescriptive documents protect society from development guided by fast gain; heard it is unconstitutional if documents are vague.
  - The population projection is critical and a foundation of the Comprehensive Plan. This is a huge gap in the current document; there is no grounding and no citation.
  - Can't always wait for every bit of new information.
  - There is no such thing as a perfect document.
  - Edit the letter: Add "the following concerns may affect the adopted schedule:" preceding the bulleted list.
  - The letter is premature. The Commission should go through the issue identification first, then decide if there is enough time for review or not.
  - Commission wants to hear more from staff regarding timeline and requirements for the implementation steps.
  - The 2016 deadline also says the regulations implementing the Comprehensive Plan need to be done by 2016 also.
  - A Comprehensive Plan is an iterative process. It will be updated again in 8 years, and there is an annual amendment process.
  - Current Comprehensive Plan will still be in place until a new Plan is adopted.
  - While the Commission reviews the Plan Update, no development regulations will be updated and the work plan will continue to be delayed.
  - Drop the paragraph about reconsidering the Charter's target completion date of January 2013. The intent is that these are just issues to prepare for the discussion on 8/13.

The Commission took a straw vote for who would be interested in signing the letter: Commissioners Parker, Bardin, Ingman will sign. Commissioners Leveen and Richards may sign the second draft.

Staff will make the second (final) draft available for Commissioners at the front desk of CP&D for signatures.

**The report was received.**

#### 4. Reports

Finance Sub-Committee: Commissioner Horn reported on the 7/30/12 Finance Sub-Committee meeting- the topic was the long-range 20-year look at the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). - The Planning Commission's CFP recommendation letter should include a recommendation for a long-range, 20+ year view of the City's investment in the built environment. -Commissioner Leveen: The Finance Sub-committee is refining last year's CFP recommendation letter focusing on elements still relevant; assembling staff questions. Next Finance Sub-Committee meeting is scheduled for August 10, at 8:00 a.m.

- Commissioner Parker: Found problematic Thera Black's insistence that the Plan be financially sound; if things in the Plan can't be financed, the Plan needs to be changed. Can staff address how close that nexus is between the CFP and the elements in the Comp Plan?

Leadership Team: - Chair Tousley: Requested a fact sheet that addresses plan alignment, deadlines, required tasks prior to 2016. Discussed agenda and process/format for the August 1 meeting.

- Commissioner Leveen: Staff willing to talk about Growth Management Act (GMA) compliance, and tell the story of how we are responding to GMA. Need to respond to discomfort in community and with the Planning Commission.

- Commissioner Richards: Have one-page summary on GMA, add to website, have available at meetings (staff to confirm briefing at August 8 or August 20.)

- Chair Tousley: Reminded Commissioners of Joint Plan amendments with Thurston County for rezones in the Urban Growth Area - a briefing is scheduled for September 17 and a public hearing with the Thurston County Planning Commission on Wednesday, October 10.

## 5. Adjournment

Chair Tousley adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.

## Upcoming Meetings

[12-0413](#)

**Attachments:** [OPC Work Schedule as of Aug 1 2012](#)