



City of Olympia

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Amy Buckler
(360) 570-5847

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Monday, December 3, 2012

6:30 PM

Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.A ROLL CALL

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

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Parker would like a chance to discuss the broader issue of how the Commission will approach deliberations at the beginning of the discussion about the trends and highlights list.

Commissioner Leveen moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to approve the agenda as proposed. The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[12-0754](#) Approval of October 22, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [1. Draft Minutes](#)

Commissioner Leveen moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to approve the minutes as amended. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

[12-0771](#) Approval of October 29, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [1. Draft minutes](#)

Commissioner Leveen moved, seconded by Commissioner Horn, to approve the minutes as amended. The minutes were approved as amended by a majority vote as follows:

Aye: 8 - Vice Chair Bardin, Commissioner Horn, Commissioner Ingman, Commissioner Kiswa, Commissioner Leveen, Chair Parker, Commissioner Richards and Commissioner Tousley

Abstained: 1 - Commissioner Reddick

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Summary of comments (please listen to tape for comment details:)

Gus Guethlein, 3222 Wiggins Rd. Mr. Guethlein thanked the Commission for the time and energy they put in on the redeliberation of the Trillium Rezone (2012 Annual Comprehensive Plan amendment.) He was disappointed their recommendation did not get discussed at City Council.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

[12-0773](#)

Briefing from Washington Department of Commerce regarding the Growth Management Act

Leonard Bauer, Managing Director of the Washington Department of Commerce provided a briefing about the role of the Washington State Department of Commerce. Commerce provides financial and technical assistance to Washington cities and counties regarding growth management issues. This is somewhat different than Department of Ecology's role as final approver of the Shoreline Master Program. Commerce does not have approval authority over the City's Comprehensive Plan; they can provide assistance, answer questions, and give advice as the City moves forward. Commerce has a guidebook on their website called Keeping your Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Updates Current.

Many cities and counties complete annual amendments in addition to periodic updates. These are optional, and can occur no more than once a year, with a few exceptions outlined in the statute. A comprehensive plan is the overall framework and guiding principals for how development occurs.

The State Legislature extended the deadline for periodic updates. The new deadline is June of 2016. There is no penalty for early adoption, as long as it is clear that the action is intended to meet the final deadline for the periodic update. Mr. Bauer complimented the City of Olympia on its outreach program.

Many jurisdictions elect to phase periodic updates. There are challenges to this approach, so following these important principals can be helpful: 1) Early and continuous public participation 2) Be very clear about what is part of the adopted update. If phasing, all public notices should be clear that this part of the update and that there are other pieces. A public participation program outline should be available. 3) Upon final adoption, recap all previous steps, and make sure the plan is internally consistent and consistent with development regulations.

Mr. Bauer entertained questions from the Commission:

- What if there are things in the Plan that aren't consistent? Such as, two policies in different chapters that seem to contradict each other.

Response: watch for that while reviewing draft plan, it should be addressed before final adoption of Plan. One person's idea of inconsistent might be different from

another; that's why you are a body that works together. Perhaps more explanation is needed in the Plan to differentiate. If clearly inconsistent, change one of them prior to adoption.

-We are struggling with what sounds like somewhat conflicting requirements regarding the 6 year CFP and the 20 year plan consistent with land use plan.

How do those two things go together?

Response: This is a common question. The statute requires a 20 year planning horizon according to certain standards. When compared with the land use plan, ask where do we need services, what kind of services? The 20 year plan should show that you have a realistic way to meet those needs. Where would those services go, and what level of services? Demonstrate a fairly general level of financial feasibility. The 6 year CFP is the detailed financial plan, the laying out of 20 year plan. What are we doing within 6 years and what are the exact funding sources and amounts? This doesn't mean you have to have all money in hand, it can be a projection. Most jurisdictions update the 6 year CFP every year. In the end, you want it to add up to the 20 year plan.

- Do some jurisdictions have a 20 year constrained plan?

Response: It's been done a lot of different ways. The 20 year plan does not have the detail of the 6 year plan. It should identify some funding sources. Mr. Bauer suggested the physical maps in the 20 year plan show generally where facilities will go. Indicate the level of service for those without a hard infrastructure. What would that mean in terms of the overall projects that would be likely? What would be an overall estimate of the cost of those? What are the policies, processes, and practices you would use to achieve that?

- Is it just confined to the Land Use element?

Response: That 's the driver, but the Plan has to be comprehensive. They will have considerations that will need to go into the CFP as well.

- Based on questions taken from public testimony by Mike McCormick and Holly Gadbaw, one key question surrounds their assertion that all plans have to be done concurrently. In other words, the City should not move from the Shoreline Master Program to the Comprehensive Plan. And the assertion that the development regulations need to be updated concurrently with Plan update so they come together. Can you speak to that?

Response: There are a number of ways to get there. Doing it at same time may be the cleanest for consistency sake. The Growth Management Act (GMA) doesn't require all the pieces be done all at once, it requires consistency. The trick is to develop a phased approach that achieves consistency. Commerce does not recommend spending a lot of time (i.e., 6 years) between the elements. When doing it in a successive approach, providing clarity of process to the public from beginning to end is extremely important. He suggests a work plan and public involvement plan be mapped out.

- There is a question about the population projections being used. Understand the estimates will not be ready until the end of 2013. Is it prudent - would it be challengeable - to proceed prior to allocation of population projections?

Response: This is a difficult task for Olympia due to the legislative timeline extension. When Olympia started this process, they thought it would be done before new allocations would be complete. The most recent Office of Financial Management projections are to be included in the finally adopted update.

- Would be prudent to consider those once adopted by Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC). TRPC is working on the Sustainable Thurston Plan.

Is there a requirement that this Plan be consistent with Sustainable Thurston?**What does consistency mean?**

Response: Commerce is a partner in Sustainable Thurston. That is a region-wide effort to look at sustainability efforts. This is not addressed in the GMA. However, it is probably desirable for all comprehensive plans in region to be consistent with a regional strategy like that.

-Staff has said the housing element is included in various chapters, but it doesn't have it's own chapter. Is that okay?

Response: Commerce has discussed this with staff. The GMA requires an "element," whether that is a chapter or not, the GMA does not say. The Plan should be very clear to the reader where the housing element is. Mr. Bauer suggested there be a one page table of contents that points out where the required elements are.

- The GMA requires affordable housing. Understand we don't have too much writing on that in the draft Plan. There is a lot of writing re: high density housing along corridors. Judging from experience of many cities, this type of development raises the price of housing stock. This seems opposite of the affordable housing requirement. Does GMA require analysis to describe result?

- Response: There are 5-6 pieces of the housing requirement. One policy goal is to provide housing for all economic elements. Commerce is updating a guidebook on how to do that - what can the city do to encourage that. Should be published in March or April. Doing that analysis is important. Housing planning is done through other planning efforts which should be integrated into the Comprehensive Plan .

- Can you speak to the GMA required element on environmental protection?

One of the 14 goals of the GMA is to address the environment. There are specific requirements around critical areas that must be addressed, plus the Shoreline Master Program. Beyond that, if there are other environmental policies that the city chooses to address, make sure you've clearly identified what those are and what the policies are. There is a separate goal regarding open space.

- Can you explain how Commerce verifies jurisdictions are meeting their population targets?

Response. Commerce has no approval authority. However, Commerce does review draft plans and comment on many of them. One thing they look for is whether it is clear what the planning projection is? Is it consistent among all the elements?

- Would the population projection be substantiated by showing density per acer and number of acres?

Yes, that is a direct requirement of the GMA. Once you have that number from TRPC, a key component of the GMA is to determine that you have the density and land to accommodate the projected population.

- What is the definition of "open space?"

- The terminology differs between different jurisdictions. The requirement is that jurisdiction provide for parks and open space within the urban growth boundary. This can be called "open space" or "green space."

- What is your definition of "continuous public participation?"

The Commerce guidebook mentions it in the beginning. Have a public participation plan (document) from the beginning. Olympia did a lot early on, which provides a good example. Continuous would be the hearings had by the Planning Commission, and there may be an opportunity to have workshops at the City Council level. There is no line in the sand until you get to the Growth Hearings Board.

Chair Tousley thanked Mr. Bauer for coming.

The report was received.[12-0785](#)

Final Deliberations: Determine the Planning Commission's 'Trends and Highlights' List

Attachments: [1. Final Deliberation Process](#)

Commissioner Parker commented that he is concerned about the Olympia Planning Commission's (OPC's) role in this process. They had extensive public involvement. Reading through all the public comments on the Imagine Olympia Process page has taken untold hours. Organizing those by topic takes a great deal of time. He understands one OPC role is to adequately address public comment and deliberate on whether they agree with it. He does not think OPC can do that in the time given. There is a strong need for a comment response document from staff. If this is not provided, he does not think they are serving the public. Otherwise, OPC may have to make clear to the public that they can't give comments the attention they deserve. OPC received considerable comments after July. Wonders how staff be using those comments?

Staff clarified that the comments received after July were intended for OPC. (A response to those comments would flow from OPC's deliberations.) Commissioner Bardin urged Commissioner Parker to make a motion that July Draft comments be summarized, including where the topics are addressed in the Draft and how they may have changed the draft between April and July. She stressed this will help OPC choose topics. Commissioner Richards asked that the topic of the July Draft Comment summary be discussed at a later time.

Commissioner Richards provided a briefing regarding how the Comprehensive Plan Update Subcommittee recommends OPC proceed to choose Trends & Highlights topics. Commissioners will go around, name their top priority, and that topic will be written on the white board. A topic needs 3 votes to stick. Commissioners will get an equal number of topics, and topics will be grouped in batches of nine. All topics in each batch will have equal priority for final deliberations. If a Commissioner's priority topic is already taken or doesn't get 3 votes, s/he should move to their next item.

Commissioner Richards clarified that topic sponsors need to bring specific proposals for final deliberations. This will help OPC deliberate and provide a solid proposal to the City Council. The order of topics - as written on the list - is the order they will come up.

The Commission completed the exercise. The Trends and Highlights list will be maintained by staff and included in the packet for December 17.[12-0720](#)

Final Deliberations: Visions and Values

Attachments: [1. July Draft of the Comprehensive Plan](#)
[2. Comprehensive Plan Vision and Values. February 2011](#)
[3. 1994 Comprehensive Plan Vision Statement](#)

Chair Tousley gave a brief introduction.

Commissioner Richards proposed adding a whole new section to the Vision and Values. He proposed this new language:

"Olympian's Value One Another:

- We honor diversity and encourage cultural celebrations .
- We protect one another from discrimination and hate .
- We provide support and opportunities to our neighbors in need .
- We encourage public participation in our planning processes , and reach out to a range of community and affinity groups to ensure a diversity of opinion is represented in our planning documents."

Commission Discussion:

- There are a couple statements under the first bullet in the July Draft that would also fit under Commissioner's Richards proposed value, that could be merged.
- Peter Guttchen said the Vision & Values statement in the July Draft is flat and lifeless. It doesn't speak to geography or environment, nor does it inspire. Want something far more inspirational.
- Cynthia Stewart and Carole Richards proposed a nice vision statement on November 3. It might not be perfect, but it's a good start. That vision statement would be in addition to value statements.
- Like the Value and Vision statements. It's useful, like a checklist. Also impressed by Stewart's and Richards' work. They shouldn't be setting policy, but the format is good.
- These issues are complex, and can't be addressed in the amount of time left tonight.
- The previously submitted comments from Commissioner Parker regarding the organization of the Olympia's Vision chapter should be addressed later.

Staff clarified that the Subcommittee - since it will be a formal advisory body making a recommendation to the full Commission - needs to meet in an open public meeting. The Commission agreed that the Subcommittee meeting will be unstaffed .

Commissioner Parker moved, seconded by Commissioner Horn, to form a sub-committee of the Olympia Planning Commission to prepare a proposed vision and value statement. The proposal will be emailed and brought forward at the OPC meeting on December 17. The motion passed unanimously.

The subcommittee will be comprised of Commissioners Parker, Ingman and Horn. They will meet Monday, December 10 and Wednesday, December 12 (if needed) at 6:30 p.m.

7. REPORTS

Associate Planner Amy Buckler reported that the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statements (FSEIS) is available for the Commissioners tonight, and will be published online. She noted there are a few outstanding responses to the "Commissioner Information Requests." There will be a briefing on December 17 regarding the Role of the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations.

Commissioner Richards reported that the Comprehensive Plan Update (CPU) Subcommittee has sunsetted.

Commissioner Reddick reported on the 2013 Officer Nominating Committee. He and Commissioner Ingman talked to all Commissioners to gauge their interest. Nominated are Commissioner Parker for Chair, Commissioner Bardin for Vice-Chair, and Commissioner Horn for CFP Finance Subcommittee Chair. Chair Tousley asked if anyone else is interested. None responded.

Commissioner Bardin reported there is a Utility Advisory Committee (UAC) meeting

this Thursday, and she may be calling in. They will be discussing land acquisition and the 2013-2014 work plan. She also mentioned the UAC will be drafting a new Wastewater Master Plan in 2013.

Chair Tousley reported that she acted as a docent at the Historic Holiday Homes Tour on Saturday, December 2, 2012.

Chair Tousley reported that the Commission still needs to select liaison assignments for 2013. She will no longer be able to serve as liaison to the Heritage Commission effective in January, and hopes someone else will step up.

Commissioner Richards moved, seconded by Commissioner Ingman, to vote for the 2013 Planning Commission officers tonight. The motion passed unanimously.

Following discussion, Commissioner Reddick moved, seconded by Commissioner Richards, to elect for 2013 Commissioner Parker as Chair; Commissioner Bardin as Vice Chair; and Commissioner Horn as Finance Subcommittee Chair. The motion passed with a majority vote of 8 Commissioners. Chair Tousley abstained.

8. OTHER TOPICS

[12-0786](#)

Review Commissioner Parker's Draft Letter to the City Council

Attachments: [1. Draft letter](#)

Chair Tousley announced she forwarded the draft letter prepared by Commissioner Parker to the full Council via email. The letter will be presented to the Land Use and Environment Committee at their next meeting.

Commissioner Richards announced the draft letter in the packet has been revised, and Planner Ray passed out copies. The new draft letter reflects that the Commission is asking for a meeting with the City Council.

Commissioner Richards moved, seconded by Commissioner Reddick, to adopt the letter passed out by Planner Ray and submit it to the City Council. The motion carried by a 7-2 vote, with Commissioners Horn and Tousley voting nay.

Commissioner Horn expressed that he voted no because he did not think it was necessary for the Commission to write a letter to the Council in order to request a meeting with them.

[12-0772](#)

Response to Commissioner's Information Requests, Part 3

Attachments: [1. List of Commissions' Information Requests](#)
 [2. Responses to Info Requests, Part 3](#)

9. ADJOURNMENT

Accommodations

The City of Olympia is committed to the non-discriminatory treatment of all persons in employment and the delivery of services and resources. If you require accommodation for your attendance at the City Advisory Committee meeting, please contact Community Planning and Development at 360.753.8314 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. For hearing impaired, please contact us by dialing the Washington State Relay Service at 7-1-1 or 1.800.833.6384.