

Date	Source	Name	General Sentiment	Comment
11/19/2021	E-mail	Deborah Pattin	For	This is Deborah Pattin. I wrote you earlier this morning from my work email. As you instructed, I am sending my comments to you on the Port's RV park plan. I support the Port's plan for an RV park near Swantown Marina. I have been a member of the Port of Olympia Citizens Advisory Committee (POCAC) since 2018. Some of the POCAC sub-committees have focused on tourism and marina marketing. I also was the POCAC representative to the Destination Waterfront project where the idea of the RV park was presented and discussed. I spoke in favor of the RV park at the public meeting. A comment I made at one of those public meetings was that I thought an RV park would be good for families. As I child my family had a camper and that's what we used for our vacations. Staying in a hotel is expensive, and families might be more inclined to visit Olympia in an RV. Tourism will pick up once COVID gets more under control, and I believe that an RV park at the Port 's waterfront will draw visitors to Olympia for a variety of Port sponsored activities: the Dragon Boat Festival, Music on the Plaza (2 concerts), Olympia Brew Fest, Summer Splash (Hands-on Children's Museum – 2 event days, plus their regular programming), and especially the Harbor Days Festival. Additionally, visitors to the area for the Olympic Air Show may also choose to stay at the Port's RV park. Others may come for Lakefair or any variety of events. Renting a space in the RV park would be a similar procedure to renting a short-term slip at the Swantown Marina. The RV park would not be for long-term stays, and the spaces would rent for market rates. There is no need to worry that the Port's RV park would be a spot for full-time residents or for unhoused individuals looking for an alternative to the Ensign Road site for their RVs. It would rather be an alternative to a hotel or short-term vacation rental for tourists wishing to visit Olympia, and the waterfront location would be a big draw, bringing tourist revenue to the City and the Port.
7/7/2021	E-mail	Mary Fitzgerald	For	I would like to voice my support for the proposed change to city regulations to allow development of an RV facility at the Swantown site. A small park would be a good way to attract visitors to the downtown core that includes many restaurants, shops, the farmers market and public access to our beautiful waterfront. Many people will oppose this idea because when they think of RVs, they only think of the homeless population that appears to litter, and disrespect the city that has been most generous in allowing them to populate areas around the lake and along the road into the St. Peter hospital. Their RVs and obvious lack of ability to pay to live in a proper facility does not reflect the type and majority of visitors this facility would attract. In general RVers are responsible, clean and financially sound. Most state parks keep the RVs allowed ate kept under 23 feet feet which would help with road and turnaround space required. The Port of Port Townsend has a small RV park that is very popular and a place where boaters can meet up with RVers. Attracting both to the same area of downtown will benefit the downtown businesses that have suffered so greatly during the covid pandemic. I fully support the city's exploration of this issue and think it would be a positive use of the empty space that surrounds the Swantown/Port of Olympia peninsula.
11/19/2021	E-mail	Angelika Hagen-Breaux	Against	Please do not develop an RV site at the Port. The Port should be managed to the benefit of all citizens. RV sites are eye sores and would significantly diminish the public access and enjoyment of nearby trails.
6/13/2021	E-mail	Barbara Herman	Against	Please add my vote against this proposal. This is our city's beautiful recreational area and doesn't need to be mucked up with RV parks.
11/4/2021	E-mail	Barbara Herman	Against	The planning commission had it right the first time. We do not need RV's mucking up our waterfront more than it is already.
11/18/2021	E-mail	Betsy Brandt-Kreutz	Against	I am submitting my comment on the proposed waterfront RV park between Swantown Marina and Swantown Boatworks. I am opposed to this and I do not believe an RV park belongs there. I look at what has happened on Ensign road and cannot bear the thought of such a beautiful area becoming another eyesore. I enjoy walking in that area as do many others. I relish in the serenity the area has to offer and the views for all to enjoy. The area should be a park for all to enjoy and permits should continue to be disallowed in that area. Thank you for your time
11/18/2021	E-mail	Bette Jean Phillips	Against	Please do not allow an RV Park near the Swantown boat works and marina. The waterfront trail and entire area should be kept as an open area for all to enjoy. Adding an RV park would detract from the beauty of the amenities that include the Farmer's Market and other businesses in the area. Please reconsider your plan and leave the area as an open space.
11/14/2021	E-mail	Bette Jean Phillips	Against	Please do not add an RV Park next to Swantown Boatworks. It would ruin the entire area. Keep that area an open area. What about runoff into the sound from the RV's. Are they to be lived in??
7/19/2019	E-mail	Bob Jacobs	Against	Please accept this email as my testimony on Item 6A of your agenda this evening, Recreational Vehicle Parks in the Urban Waterfront Zoning District. Waterfront areas are the most valuable land in the state, as indicated by the fact that they have their own statewide zoning law, the Shorelines Management Act (SMA). The city of Olympia largely follows the spirit of the SMA in its regulation of this uniquely precious area. For instance, by forbidding parking lots in the shoreline area. This Port of Olympia proposal is, in my opinion, out of step with both the spirit of the SMA and Olympia's regulations. It seems quite inappropriate to allow recreational vehicle parks in the shoreline area. A possible exception would be if these RV parks were for homeless people to use on a temporary basis, since homelessness is a serious problem.
11/18/2021	E-mail	Bob Ziemek	Against	Cari, Follow the rules already set in place. No RVs. Why don't you all open your eyes and see what you are doing to this city? We all see it. How is the providence park going out by the hospital, not good! Capital lake! Not good! People work hard here in Olympia and pay a lot of taxes. You and your team continue to let this go on and it's turning our city into a RAT HOLE!! I had a long time friend form Buffalo NY who was retiring and want to check out Olympia . Him and his wife came out to stay with us for a week. At the end of the week he said, I love the area but I couldn't live here because of the down town area. Vote NO

11/15/2021	E-mail	Charlotte Persons	Against	<p>Since the Planning Commission's letter of August 16 that recommended "no" to the RV Park, some changes and suggested changes now negate the reason for that recommendation. Two objections remain, that the code amendments would (1) Restrict and/or discourage waterfront accessibility and (2) Are inconsistent with the goals and objectives of the Olympia Comprehensive Plan. Page 2 of that letter states the Comp Plan has "values of walkability, open-space, vibrancy, environmental stewardship, and recognition of the importance of land near water." Here is a suggestion to honor those values and preserve the only current public access to the water. Add this suggested language to the "uses" part of the draft Code Change Amendment: If a public trail or sidewalk along the shoreline is present in the RV site, preserve both a public trail along the shoreline and its views of the near and far shore.</p> <p>Second, from the agenda items, it is not clear what the Planning Commission will be considering for recommendation because changes proposed by the Port of Olympia in their presentation on Nov. 1 are not included in the Draft Amendment or tonight's agenda packet. For example, the Port stated that not 40 but rather 24 RV sites would be built. This could considerably widen the spaces between RV berths and allow more landscaping and privacy between berths, a considerable amenity. If included in the draft amendment, the public could be assured that the RV park really might be "best in class". Most important, to avoid the appearance that the code change is to benefit one property owner, the Port suggested that the code amendment language be changed to apply to private as well as public marinas. This would allow an RV park adjacent to West Bay Marina. However, a second shoreline RV park will further restrict public water access and not honor the values of the Comp Plan.</p> <p>In addition, the only empty parcel within the Urban Waterfront Zone is south of West Bay Marina, and comes with its own set of problems. That parcel is within a 100-year flood zone with an elevation of 14 feet. It is also sandwiched between two parcels, one the Marina itself, that have had toxic cleanups. Before voting to expand the code language, the Planning Commission should have staff evaluate and report on the new land area affected. More broadly, I suggest the Planning Commission should NOT change the code amendment to apply to both public and private marinas. The public record will show that the code change was, and arguably is, to benefit one property owner, the Port.</p> <p>The harm is already done, and the appearance of benefiting one property owner is probably de minimis. Given the size of the Port's RV project, the lack of public comment, and the expense of legal battles, it is highly doubtful anyone will pursue legal action. Please request a staff report on the area affected by applying the code change to land adjacent to West Bay Marina, or just keep the code amendment as first proposed.</p>
7/27/2021	E-mail	Esther Kroenberg	Against	<p>I write in opposition to the proposed change in the Comprehensive Plan to allow the Port of Olympia to site an RV park on the waterfront. The Port once was the site of heavy industrial activity. A 1947 photo shows logs everywhere. These logs were treated with creosote, chromated copper arsenic, diesel oil and other toxic chemicals that were routinely dumped into the water. The logs themselves were sprayed with DDT, a chemical relative of Agent Orange.</p> <p>The sediments on the Port were tested and analyzed about 20 years ago by Dr. Kate Jenkins, dioxin expert at the EPA. Prior to testing the Cascade Pole site, she was the expert who analyzed contamination at Love Canal and Tynes Beach, Missouri. She reported that the sediments at Cascade Pole were magnitudes more contaminated than these other infamous sites. Her consultant was Alan Fixdel, who later became the Executive Director of the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council. Similar toxic sediments are at the site of this proposed neighboring campground, including polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, one particularly nasty toxin which vaporizes in temperatures over 50 degrees.</p> <p>Despite the Port's claim that Cascade Pole is being cleaned up, it has merely been contained, and contamination continues to leak from it.</p> <p>The idea of hosting overnight stays for families and children in the summer on an extremely toxic site with no adequate cleanup should stop this project in its tracks. Will families want to camp at a place emitting toxic vapors where their children and pets cannot even touch the water because it is so contaminated? Will the Port and City include the history of this site and the findings of the extremely high level of toxics found there in their advertising? To not do so would be, in my opinion, immoral. I am certain that the toxic nature of the site will become common knowledge, if it is not already, dissuading many campers from stationing themselves on top of it. People should not be allowed, let alone encouraged to live on top of toxic sites, even for a night.</p> <p>Also, the Port's own Destination Waterfront Survey tallied less than 25% approval for the idea of RV camping at the Port. The public does not support this idea.</p>
11/14/2021	E-mail	Esther Kroenberg	Against	<p>Please accept this email as a public comment on the proposed RV campground on Port property. I am opposed to the change in zoning to allow an RV campground on Port property. It does not conform to the wishes of the public expressed in the Port's own vision 2020 which found most of Olympia wants increased public access to the waterfront. This project removes a portion of that waterfront for local use. People from Olympia are not going to spend a lot of money to camp at the Port.</p> <p>More importantly, the Port site is one of the most toxic sites in the State. The Cascade Pole site had dioxin levels hundreds of times worse than Love Canal and Tines Beach, MO. The sediments in the East Bay are so toxic, people can't even touch the water without risking dangerous exposures to the stew of toxic chemicals that were used for wood treatment before the 1970's. These chemicals are persistent and are still present on the site. Polychlorinated Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) are not only persistent and dangerous, they also vaporize in hot weather and contribute to toxic air.</p> <p>I don't believe it is ethical to put a camping site that will undoubtedly have lots of young people, families and children on top of this former toxic industrial site. Whatever mitigations have been done are merely a coverup. It has not removed these dangerous chemicals that persist in the water, sediment and when heated on a summer day vaporize into the air. People will be staying for days, not just a quick trip to the Farmer's Market, increasing their risk of exposure. Will a disclaimer about what this site used to be and what chemicals are still present be disclosed to potential visitors as part of the contract?</p> <p>This is not an appropriate use for this site. It does not serve the public, and in fact, endangers those who would use it. The Port needs to follow the Vision statement and make this area available to local residents.</p>
11/19/2021	E-mail	Eva Rooks	Against	<p>I am writing in against the Port of Olympia's request to change code to allow for RV parks in the city's Urban Waterfront Zone. I don't see any value that it will add to our downtown experience and doesn't seem consistent with other activities that are currently in the city's Urban Waterfront Zone. I NEVER write in about issues, but I feel strongly, and I hope others do as well, that this is a wrong action for the Port of Olympia to make at this time</p>
11/19/2021	E-mail	Gordon Wheat	Against	<p>I want to make a public comment about the proposed waterfront RV Park next to Swantown Marina. I went to the planning commission website but could not see how to do so. I am opposed to siting an RV park on this land. I consider this land to be held by the port in the interest of the citizens of Olympia. The idea that the planning commission would even consider changing the zoning of this parcel to allow for an RV park is unconscionable. This is a public trail which my wife and I walk on frequently. This is a public good. Any other use of this land must also be a public good. We support the port with our taxes and put land in their trust to use responsibly. I am highly suspicious of the motives of the port for even considering such a proposal. An ugly trailer park on this parcel is unacceptable to me and to everyone I know. Please let me know if this suffices, or if there is somewhere else I need to register my public comment!</p>

2/22/2021	E-mail	Helen Wheatley Part 1	Against	<p>The Planning Commission is being asked to consider language presented by Thomas Architecture Studios, on contract to the Port of Olympia, regarding a proposed RV Park in the Marina District of the Port. The Port earlier asked for a change to the Shoreline Master Program to include RV Parks as “water-oriented recreation.”</p> <p>Now it is asking for change to the municipal code to alter permitted uses under the Urban Waterfront Plan. Why is this necessary? Because up until now, neither the Port of Olympia Strategic Plan, nor the change to the Olympia comprehensive plan in order to implement the Downtown Strategy, have allowed camping on the urban waterfront.</p> <p>Not in the Plans</p> <p>The proposed RV campground is located in what the Port’s comprehensive scheme designates as part of its “Marina District.” A commercial RV camping facility introduces a new land use to the Port’s strategic plan for that district. Yet the Port has not formally modified its strategic plan. Nor has it initiated a process to formally do so. In fact, both comprehensive plans currently exclude camping. For Olympia, modification to the strategic plan based on the Downtown Strategy (Ordinance No. 7032) is extremely specific in its exclusion of RV camping: Suggested permitted and conditions uses for a UW-F2 Commercial District specifically exclude RV Parks under the section on “Services, L: This chart demonstrates that the Port is asking the Planning Commission to consider a change to the strategic plans of both governments. The Planning Commission should deliberate with a full awareness of what is being requested of it by the Port.</p> <p>The City should ask the Port when and how it intends to modify its comprehensive plan to permit RV camping in its marina district, because it hasn’t happened yet.</p> <p>The current “Destination Waterfront” process in which the Port is engaged, like its Vision 2050 Plan, is an outreach process only and not a modification to the strategic plan. Before moving forward, the city should demand greater clarity from the Port regarding its plans to update its actual strategic plan.</p> <p>Despite years of strategic planning, the city of Tumwater is currently engaged in a protracted and, so far, failed effort to get the Port of Olympia to engage in completion of a development agreement regarding the New Market Industrial Campus. As a neighbor and partner, Olympia may want to consider more deliberately the extent to which Port plans and promises should be backed by solid policy-making procedures.</p> <p>Olympia Should Demand Consideration of Other Land Uses When it worked on its Downtown Strategy, the City of Olympia was quite clear about the fact that there are other land use considerations for the Port Peninsula. When the city worked on its Downtown Strategy, it did not include the Port’s Boatworks and Marina Districts (designated under the Port’s comprehensive plan) in its consideration of land use changes. Indeed, the city specifically recognized a need for “Recognition of the importance of lands near water.” The City emphasized that the focus of the change to the Comprehensive Plan for the Downtown Strategy and any accompanying code changes were specifically aimed at “built’ land uses such as housing and commercial structures and development patterns.” It left “complementary parks, open spaces and natural areas” to be “addressed in the Public Health, Parks, Arts and Recreation and Natural Environment chapters.” The City also states in regard to the Downtown Strategy that “the Future Land Use Map...is not a zoning map.” (emphasis added). Rather, it is a guidance for zoning and other regulations to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Zoning Map presented with the Packet is consistent the Future Land Use map, but it is crucial to note that it is not consistent with the Shoreline map under the SMP:</p> <p>At the time the city changed its comprehensive plan for the Downtown Strategy, the City was clearly deferring discussion of shoreline land use, to a significant degree, to revision of the SMP. Concerning the shoreline of the Port’s Urban Waterfront, the SMP specifically calls out the importance of being consistent with the Port comprehensive scheme in its section on marine recreation, 2.9(F): “The City recognizes the Port’s responsibility to operate its marine facilities and plan for this area’s future use through the development and implementation of its Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements.”</p> <p>The SMP language change to include RV camping is therefore somewhat ill-considered and creates some inadvertent internal contradiction, because camping is not yet a strategic plan option for urban shorelines. In addition, adding the RV language to the SMP sows some confusion because Olympia has created its own term, “water-oriented recreation” which elides confusingly the more conventional policy distinction between waterbased recreation and water-enhanced recreation.</p>
		Helen Wheatley Part 2		<p>What is “orientation?” Other governments, as well as professional literature concerning the recreation and leisure industry, distinguish between water-based recreation, which requires water, and water-enhanced recreation, which benefits from water but does not require it. Water-based recreation is understood to mean such activities as boating and fishing, or even the viewing of landscape and wildlife unique to water and shorelines that cannot be viewed in a strictly land-bound area.</p> <p>The continued designation of the Port’s Marina as Marine Recreation shoreline (Reach 5C) rather than changing the area to Waterfront Recreation or Urban Intensity under the current revision, certainly implies an intention that shoreline recreational use continue to be water-based in Reach 5C. Adding the RV language in one section of the SMP without changing the zoning or environment designations mapped, creates an unresolved internal contradiction within the SMP. The City should not move forward on the RV Park until it resolves this contradiction. The Shoreline Management Act is very clear about preserving public access, which raises an interesting policy question about whether it would be appropriate under the SMP to replace a shoreline area that is now fully accessible to the public for recreation (and with significant water-based viewing opportunity), in order to turn it into commercial space not accessible to the general public (for water-enhanced private camping). The SMP includes stated goals and policies to “Increase public access to publicly-owned areas of the shoreline” and “Increase recreational opportunities for the public in the shoreline.” This would seem to imply that public access should be preferred over privatization of recreation.</p> <p>Setting aside questions about recreational use of the land, and just looking at commercial use, Section B(4) of the SMP discusses the intention for the Urban Waterfront District shoreline (18.06.060 F2 Commercial District) with the following phrases:</p> <p>“Encourage high-amenity recreation, tourist-oriented, and commercial development which will enhance public access and use of the shoreline”; “Encourage development that...preserves a sense of openness on the waterfront”: “Encourage water-dependent and water-related development (as defined in the Shoreline Master Program for the Thurston Region) on shoreline properties and permit light manufacturing uses which support nearby industrial and marine related uses” (emphasis added)</p> <p>In regard to optimizing shoreline use, the SMP actually provides a roadmap for the city of Olympia to consider land use changes on the shoreline to achieve preferred use. No net loss is one stated policy, but so is the including of “incentives to restore shoreline ecological functions where such functions have been degraded by past actions.” It lists “restoration and enhancement of shoreline ecological functions” as “high priorities” that are to be “applied to all uses, developments and activities that may occur within the shoreline jurisdiction.” It also calls for “Provision of direct physical access to the water where appropriate,” and “provision of a shoreline trail where feasible and consistent with applicable laws.” It calls for restoration of native vegetation. It calls for “bulkhead removal and replacement of hardened shoreline with soft structural stabilization measures water-ward of Ordinary High Water Mark where appropriate.” It states that “Space for preferred shoreline uses should be reserved. Such planning should consider upland and in-water uses [and]...public access and views.” In the Marine Recreation Environment section, the SMP states that preferred uses “Encourage bulkhead removal and replacement of hardened shoreline with soft structural stabilization measures.” When considering land use within the Marine Recreation Environment, economic development is placed within a matrix that includes “a variety of benefits to the community including boat moorage...public access, water enjoyment, recreation,” and “wildlife habitat.”</p>

		Helen Wheatley Part 3		<p>And most importantly, the City clearly calls in the SMP for changes in land use to be wrapped into a "jointly developed shoreline restoration and stabilization plan for Reaches 5C and 6A." The SMP makes it very clear: after a restoration and stabilization plan is developed, "the City will initiate a limited amendment to the SMP to implement this Plan." The proper time to consider changes to the code in regard to RV camping, would be after a decision is made to allow RV camping on the shoreline. And the proper way to consider such a revision of land use, is to jointly develop a restoration and stabilization plan for the shoreline. The Timing is Wrong City preferences for restoration and stabilization under the SMP must be duly considered and incorporated. Climate change must be duly considered. Preserving and enhancing public access to the shoreline and preventing net loss of water-based recreational opportunities must be duly considered. Finally, given an increasing emphasis on environmental justice and the element of recreational access within that policy concern, the benefit of the balance of Port recreational activities to all residents of the Port district should be duly considered. The Port is jumping the gun in bringing forward changes to the city code. Clearly, it needs to work jointly with the city on developing a strategic plan for the shoreline, instead of simplistically rolling the Port's marine shoreline into a more general suggested planning guideline of "urban waterfront" that covers the whole of the peninsula except for the Marine Terminal. Together, the City and the Port should decide whether an RV constitutes a preferred shoreline use. Only then should the City consider changing its code to accommodate this brand new land use. The City of Olympia, unlike the Port, has another urgent consideration.</p> <p>The City of Olympia is currently engaged in dialogue with other local governments regarding homeless mitigation. RV camping is a big part of that conversation. It seems tone-deaf, at the very least, to consider RV camping as profit-earning recreation only, when there is an urgent local need for RV camping for housing mitigation. The City could consider, and decide, that it wants a mitigation site on the Port peninsula. This is absolutely possible under the Port RCWs. Other Ports provide mitigation sites. As noted, at present the section of the Port shoreline being considered for an RV campground is not included in the downtown residential strategy. It could be appropriate to locate a mitigation site in this area as a commercial zone. The proposed RV campground is not directly adjacent to Swantown Marina. RV ("land yacht") mitigation site residents would not impinge on or displace Swantown Marina "liveaboard" boat residents, or on the "urban intensity" zoned areas. It seems reasonable to assume that the public would expect consideration of this possibility, given the immediacy and urgency of the housing crisis.</p>
11/19/2021	E-mail		Against	<p>Please accept my comments for the public hearing on the Urban Waterfront Code Amendments. I lost power on Monday and was not able to attend the Zoom meeting or submit comments. I appreciate the Commission extending the deadline for comments.</p> <p>Comments for the 11/15/21 Hearing on the Urban Waterfront Code Amendments.</p> <p>I am writing to oppose the change in Olympia's Municipal Code that would allow RV parks on our waterfront (Urban Waterfront zoning districts). I support the Olympia Planning Commissions initial decision not to recommend RV parks and their rational for their decision which is outlined in their letter to the City Council, i.e., it will limit public access to the waterfront, does not follow three Olympia City plans, and benefits only one entity.</p> <p>Our waterfront, is a precious resource that is greatly utilized by many Olympians and visitors to Olympia. As Olympia and the state densify, more people will want to use our waterfront for recreational purposes. It will become an ever more important asset for the public. Recently we have seen very high temperatures in Olympia in the summer. This trend is projected to worsen with climate change. Having access to the waterfront will help people cool off with warmer temperatures.</p> <p>The SMP prefers or even mandates uses that are particularly dependent on a waterfront location. RV parks are not. There are many already established RV parks, especially in nearby State parks. RV parks on the waterfront will limit public access both physically and visually. These parks will benefit a few people who have an RV. It would change a shoreline area that the public can enjoy into a commercial space not available to the general public. The Port's idea to get Olympia to allow RV parks on both public and private lands would expand the use of these parks to two specific locations within Olympia's Urban Waterfront zone. This just makes a bad idea worse. Additionally, waterfront RV parks are not even in the Port's Strategic Plan. Please, stay with your original recommendation, not to allow RV parks on Olympia's waterfront.</p>
7/7/2021	E-mail	Karen and George Bray	Against	<p>As folks who have lived on the shores of Budd Inlet for over 50 years, we are concerned that the Port is not taking the Thurston Climate Mitigation Plan very seriously. RV owners, and we have been one, run generators, are sloppy about emptying their holding tanks and generally produce a lot of non recyclable trash. Private and State Parks seem to be doing a fine job of filling that need.</p> <p>As the Ports closest neighbor on East Bay Drive we already live with light pollution, excessive noise, and air pollution from logging trucks and equipment.</p> <p>We have attended city meetings in the past about sea level rise mitigation. What we learned from those meetings is that the natural shoreline is important to absorb the rise and we need to be creating more. We taxpayers have been supporting the Port quite handily over the years. What about a park for "We Olympians" so kids can actually put their feet in the water, view shore birds, learn about the tides, and picnic.</p>
6/15/2021	E-mail	Karen Bray	Against	<p>We are hopeful that considerations concerning reduction of CO2 emissions and sea level rise will prevail and the Port's application will be denied. It does not seem an appropriate use considering the adoption of the Climate Mitigation Plan. We have been sailors most of our lives, but the last few years we have explored land by RV, albeit a very small one. We are familiar with RV parks and opportunities for holding tank mishaps and excessive use of generators. All of which are inconsistent with improving water and air quality.</p> <p>As a nearby neighbor of the Port we already live with light and noise pollution. We have participated in the Audubon Christmas bird count and Cornell backyard bird count for almost 50 years. There has been a dramatic decrease in numbers and species in the East Bay area....and reduction in salmon return to Moxley Creek. As city taxpayers we would like to see that parcel used for a place where Olympians can gather on the near shore...perhaps restore a marsh area for habitat for birds, amphibians and fish. Perhaps a place where children could actually put their feet in the sea water. instead of a concrete artificial stream at the East Bay Plaza. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this application.</p>
11/13/2021	E-mail	Karen Bray	Against	<p>If one looks at an aerial view of the Port Peninsula; it is striking to see how much of the land is impervious surface....Swantown boat yard, log storage areas, parking for vehicles and boats, plus paved parking lots at North Point(required because of contamination by Cascade Pole). Certainly our ongoing Climate Summit is reminding us that we need to make a renewed effort to mitigate mistakes of the past and renew our efforts to make meaningful changes. I don't believe we should be "developing" open space" that thankfully we still have. I mentioned in my previous comment the risks of an RV Park. What we need is more trees on the port, a place for residents to gather and enjoy East Bay. Keeping that parcel of land pervious and the shoreline undeveloped should be a priority.</p>
11/19/2021	E-mail	Linda Kunze	Against	<p>I am quite alarmed and appalled at the proposal to build an RV park near the Swantown Marina. The waterfront should be a place for the public, not a place for folks with their RVs to reside. We have so little undeveloped waterfront and the public has long indicated that it is a precious resource for all to enjoy as reflected in the zoning. I don't know why the Port of Olympia is proposing this but it seems seriously misguided. I request that the Olympia Planning Commission vote against rezoning the area for use as an RV park</p>

11/4/2021	E-mail	Lisa R.	Against	<p>The Port of Olympia owns the Swantown marina area, on East Bay of Budd Inlet, Puget Sound. This area is not currently authorized to have an RV park. Currently they serve 200 boats there at the marina? The parking is often difficult for those of us who put our boats in the water there. The City of Olympia Comprehensive Plan did not make provisions for this RV site location, it is next to Budd Inlet and stormwater issues for that part of East Bay are of great concern. Plus this proposed RV park does not follow the Shoreline Management Plan, SMP, to protect Budd Inlet.</p> <p>East Bay has huge pollution problems, what with the outfall of polluted water coming from the City culvert near 222 East Bay DR., and the LOTT Sewer treatment plant discharge 500 feet into Budd Inlet from that location, (a friend told me the sewage smells in the summer, are awful!) Public comment is on a Monday, Nov. 15th zoom meeting, see below. Please send in comments saying "No" to this Plan.</p>
8/2/2021	E-mail	Loretta Seppanen	Against	<p>I am writing in opposition to approving an RV Park on Port's waterfront property. Like most of the people who many provided feedback via Survey 1 of Destination Waterfront on opportunities to consider, I did not choose RV Park as an opportunity I would consider. Less than 25 people out of about 425 respondents selected the RV park as the opportunity of interest while 5 other categories were selected by 50 people each.</p> <p>The community has a low level of interest in an RV Park at on the waterfront. Public access and recreation are greater interest, yet the RV Park might negatively impact public path through the project area. It does not make sense to threaten the item of interest to offer an opportunity of lesser interest</p>
11/19/2021	E-mail	Margaret Foley	Against	<p>I am writing to voice strong opposition to the Port of Olympia's request to change code to allow for RV parks in the city's Urban Waterfront Zone. There are significant quality of life, environmental and traffic impacts that such a project would inflict on the City and its citizens. The Port must not be allowed to turn this section of the City's already limited waterfront area into its own version of a "Diamond parking lot" for oversize RVs. I trust the Olympia Planning Commission will continue its effort to oppose this truly terrible idea!</p>
11/19/2021	E-mail	Melanie Peters	Against	<p>I am a resident of downtown Olympia and would like to share my comments in opposition of the proposed RV site in the Urban Waterfront Zone (adjacent to the shoreline near the south end of Swantown Marina and Swantown Boatworks). This area is beautiful and the surrounding paths are used by many residents for pleasant walks with outstanding views. It would be an assault to our eyes, ears and noses to have this area filled with diesel-spewing RV's (along with their omni-present "spare car" or other "toys"), their generators running constantly and their 55" inch big screen TV's which they set up outside their RV's for their "camping" entertainment. And this is only addressing the effect to humans – I haven't even mentioned the detrimental effects this proposed RV park would have on the current resident and migrating wildlife .</p> <p>Please continue pass this request along to the Planning Commission to deny this horrible idea so we can continue to have our unique mountain and water views unobstructed by RV's</p>
11/19/2021	E-mail	Petya Pacheva	Against	<p>This is a comment regarding the port planning an RV park between Swantown marina and the boatworks buildings: The port should really consider the rising homelessness and crime problems in the area when making this decision, as well as the RV traffic through the downtown streets of Olympia. My family and I would be adamantly against such a decision. If generating revenue is the consideration, a better alternative would be food trucks. An event venue - against the backdrop of the marina would make an excellent wedding venue for example, the same space could be used for holiday bazaars or workshops or any number of things in the winter. Perhaps consider expanding the boatworks shipyard - add a 300 ton travel lift for larger vessels, if the intention is to keep up with the nautical arena, and seeing as how Puget Sound only has a few options for haul out for larger vessels and the wait times can be burdensome to fishing fleets for example. There are so many better options for such a great prime location in downtown. Maybe an RV park might be better near the airport if it is so desperately needed, but not downtown. Thank you for your time and consideration! ~Petya</p>
11/18/2021	E-mail	Rita Sammons	Against	<p>I am writing to express my concern regarding the Urban Waterfront Code Amendments. I understand the Port of Olympia would like to allow an RV park along the shoreline by the Swantown Marina. I think that would be a terrible use of the land. I am one of the many citizens that enjoy walking along that trail. Having some sort of RV park would drastically change the natural beauty of that area and have such a negative impact on the folks that enjoy it. I do hope the Olympia Planning Commission will not allow the land use policies to be changed.</p>
11/18/2021	E-mail	rpbarosk	Against	<p>I totally agree with planning commission decision to not allow an RV Park near Swantown Marina. It does not fit and there must be a better public use of that land.</p>
11/19/2021	E-mail	Sheila Grauer Fay	Against	<p>We strongly oppose the creation of an RV park on this property given the disastrous present situation with RV's littering the downtown are as well as the area near St Peter Hospital. There are many other more appropriate areas to consider for RV parks in Thurston County. Such an area would encroach upon the wonderful public spaces that now exist including the trail.</p>
11/18/2021	E-mail	Stephani Ross	Against	<p>We are very concerned about the Port's proposal to allow RVs to park along Marine Drive. Can you direct me to the online access for public comments?</p>
11/4/2021	E-mail	Suzanne Cravey	Against	<p>I am writing to state my objection with changing the zoning to allow the Port Authority to build a RV park on the waterfront. Who is this to benefit in our community? Sparse undeveloped Port waterfront land needs to benefit the people who pay the taxes that support the Port Authority. Thurston county residents will not be staying in the Port RV park. What is the objective here? Why not make it a low impact park that residents can enjoy and learn about protecting our beautiful Puget Sound?</p>
11/19/2021	E-mail	Suzanne Perritt	Against	<p>I am writing to state my objection with changing the zoning to allow the Port Authority to build a RV park on the waterfront. Who is this to benefit in our community? Sparse undeveloped Port waterfront land needs to benefit the people who pay the taxes that support the Port Authority. Thurston county residents will not be staying in the Port RV park. What is the objective here? Why not make it a low impact park that residents can enjoy and learn about protecting our beautiful Puget Sound?</p>
11/18/2021	E-mail	Thad Curtz	Against	<p>I hope you will not recommend allowing RV Parks in the Urban Waterfront Zone. That area in and adjacent to downtown is gradually adding market rate housing and supporting businesses to take advantage of the attractions offered by proximity to the water. A lot full of parked RVs will be a really unattractive addition to it.</p>
11/4/2021	E-mail	Unspecified	Against	<p>This is just another opportunity to destroy Olympia. You know, as well as I know, it is an invitation for the homeless to move in. Please, don't let Olympia develop another ghetto area and claim a beautiful piece of land - especially by the water. I vote no to the proposal.</p>

11/4/2021	E-mail	Unspecified	Against	Thank you for including my comments at the meeting. I don't know how the Port could get them off their property when their time limit expires. The city has a 24 hour limit (or a limit) to park on the streets. Apparently, the homeless overrides that policy and the city accepts their behavior. I just want Olympia to be a beautiful place again. We are the Capitol of the state in a gorgeous location. The city could get rid of them if it took more pride in the city. Thanks for getting them off of squatting on the sidewalks. Most of them could work - like I did and as a single mother. Thank you. Have a good day.
-----------	--------	-------------	---------	---