

**Amy Buckler**

---

**From:** laikodi@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Friday, March 03, 2017 4:45 PM  
**To:** Downtown Strategy  
**Subject:** Comments on Draft DTS

Dear DTS Team:

My comment relates to incentives for development downtown. While some incentives may be necessary for the kind of development we would like to see downtown, I would like to request that all "height bonuses" be removed from the development code for the area within the DTS planning boundary. I believe there are enough other incentives in place to encourage development, without adding to heights downtown and on the Port Peninsula.

If, at some time in the future, such height bonuses are determined necessary, this could be revisited, but I believe that the combination of remaining incentives, existing and future public investment (including in planning studies), and demand will result in residential and mixed use development without the use of height bonuses. Lower allowable heights will improve the skyline, as well as present less of a liability in terms of overall building mass when sea-level rise becomes a problem and the downtown may be forced to retreat from the shore.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Carole Richmond  
3003 Langridge Loop NW  
Olympia, WA 98502

---

**From Lon - Comments On DTS SLR Plan for Oly Planning Commission**

1 message

**Lon Freeman** <lfreee99@gmail.com>

Wed, Mar 1, 2017 at 1:13 PM

To: cpdinfo@ci.olympia.wa.us, L Man &lt;lfreee99@gmail.com&gt;

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2017 1:05PM

Hello, following are comments I have prepared for the Public Hearing on Monday, Feb. 27, 2017, at City Hall. I was not able to make it to the Hearing, so am forwarding to "cpdinfo@ci.olympia.wa.us" as instructed.

I am forwarding comments as an attachment to this email. The attached file is in "Open Document Text (odt)" because I use a Linux system. It should open in MS Word without problem. But, please do not change to open in other format or the document formatting may be altered. Thank you for your cooperation.

Regards to Amy Buckler, John Owen, et al.

Lon Freeman  
Olympia, WA



**2017 DTS SLR Comments.odt**  
31K

Lon Freeman  
5040 78<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW  
Olympia, WA 98502

Olympia Planning Commission  
C/O Olympia Community Planning and Development Department  
P.O. Box 1967  
Olympia, WA 98507-1967

February 27, 2017

Comments to Olympia Planning Commission on Draft DTS: Some Thoughts on Sea Level Rise Response Planning

Dear Commissioners and Participants:

**1. Introduction**

First and foremost I wish to convey my sincere appreciation to the City of Olympia Community Planning and Development Department staff (Lead: Amy Buckler, CPD), to MAKERS Architecture and Urban Design (Consulting Group, John Owen, Rachel Miller et al), to Andy Haupt (Lead: Public Works [PW]) and all partners and participants for the sheer volume of work involved in undertaking an effort of such great complexity, for an urban design project of a relatively compact downtown core.

Although I had some doubts, even mistrust, at the outset of the (public) planning process, the efforts at engaging the challenges of both physical geography on the one hand, and the desire to incorporate a fully inclusive balance of distinct social and cultural groupings, has been evident and praiseworthy. At the same time there is a recognizable tacit acknowledgment of the overarching imperative to ensure the longevity of a municipality that continues to thrive in it's social, cultural, environmental and economic health and well-being.

It is my hope, without having great knowledge of such matters as urban planning, architectural construction design, provision of infrastructure, and Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS), that my comments in a particularly circumscribed area (Sea Level Rise Response) may be taken in a spirit of intended hopeful contribution.

**2. Clarifying and Synchronizing Disparate Planning Horizons and Scenarios in Time**

**Issue:** Currently, there are two distinct and disparate time-frame horizons evident in the DTS planning documents that do not correspond to each other in their impact outcomes, as relates to Sea Level Rise Response Planning.

**2.A)** The DTS proper; "Summary: Volume 1", along with other "Elements: Volume 2" chapters delineate an implied time horizon of 20 years for the relevant planning and design and (re)development actions of the construction projects under consideration in its text, and by verbal communication through the public planning process. The population growth and modeling projections of 5000 new residents in the DT Core are also based on this planning horizon.

An implied base reference year is 2015 followed by a 6 year implementation of updated design guidance and updated zoning and development standards, with marketing and full realization of the cohort of projects over a 20 year period, from 2015 – 2035.

2

**2.B)** The Sea Level Rise Response Plan (SLR, LU-1), however, although presumably integrated into the DTS at an appropriate and opportune time early in the process, is, in public presentations and discussion (Feb 8, 2017 and earlier presentations to City Council), indicating a preferred planning horizon, based on rational and accepted local sea level rise projections (by accepted authorities) in a 50 year horizon, this being down-selected from an even more severe 100 year impact and planning horizon.

**2.C) Implications for scenario development:**

2.C.1) If planned developments proceed as described in the planning documents (Land Use Element chapter, and Design Element chapter) north of Legion Avenue out to the Port Peninsula (the tidal flooding affected area), with “mixed use”, with 4 story, 5 story, 6 story and 7 story structures; and with mixed public/private mitigation measures being employed in design guidelines for such development (raised grade elevations and flood walls/automatic flood gates for developers; elevated walking pathway berms/levees and automatic tidal flood gates to prevent back-flow for surface and stormwater incursion into outfall pipes at waterfront for public works projects), then pursuing the 50 year **Horizon (to that design criteria)**, the Sea Level Rise Response plan would be advantageous for longevity of the built structures and infrastructure of those “character areas” affected (including “Tech/Artisanal” area in NE section) because Sea Level Rise Response planning would be to design for more stringent requirements – a 50 year flood mitigation design rather than a 20 year design criteria, because in 50 years Sea Level Rise is expected to be more severe than in 20 years time, and so is the corresponding potential for flooding.

2.C.2) If, on the other hand, another urban redevelopment planning effort ensues with an infusion of mixed investment funds and sources in the same area of the downtown core, in 25 – 30 years, at the end of the current 20 year cycle, – a scenario for which I have no idea of efficacy or likelihood, then it may be equivocal to plan currently at the 50 year design Horizon because the presumed knowledge of Sea Level Rise due to climate change, the specificity of its local impacts, the time and spatial resolution of its effects, would be presumed to be of greater reliability and experience. There would also likely be a more extensive configuration of mitigating, adaptive technologies to choose from, and a greater range of “materials” and methods to select in the design and construction of built structures and infrastructure to withstand the onslaught of saline marine incursion and inundation. **In this case a 50 year planning horizon would be obsolete.**

2.C.3) Sea Level Rise related tidal flooding in the affected area north of Legion Avenue will have a range of **variability** – in the frequency of flood events, in the severity or intensity of flood events, and in the duration of flood events. There would be typical expectations based on the scientific knowledge and understandings of the dynamics at work, even in the local case of our own community, and the typical expectations would tend to congregate around a central measure of how often the events occur, how severe or intense is the flood event, and the typical duration of an event. **But, there will be events that diverge from what is typical or expected.** The measure of dispersion or variability of these events remains to be observed, and experienced. Even if the Sea Level Rise Response Plan (SLR, LU-1) is adopted for the 50 year planning horizon, lending more stringent design criteria for flood mitigation, there would still be a chance for a severe departure from the expected (if the distribution is in fact Gaussian, [a Bell Shaped curve]). What if, by some slight chance, there is an event that exceeds the 100 year sea level rise expectation (this is a different metric than what we know as a 100 year flood in storm language). What if there is an event greater than 3 or 4 Standard Deviations from the mean in year 2027? Will the 50 year planning horizon design criteria be sufficient for a normal recovery with only minor inconveniences? I am not sure we have the knowledge and information base apropos to make reliable probability estimations with the corresponding temporal and spatial resolution necessary for design criteria precision (at this time). And if we did, at what probability level would it be appropriate to design for?

2.C.4) In the “Tech/Artisan” character area delineated in the NE of the Port Peninsula, which is without doubt an exciting planning area for its varied function and design characteristics, (which I believe would be inclusive of some level of Light Industrial activity), is it foreseeable that any of the productive activities would necessitate NPDES Permits, or, even if within the SEPA exemption zone, how would

technological/environmental risk be assessed? Would effluent discharge be monitored in the dilution zone of East Bay discharge outfall or in the confluence of East Bay/West Bay discharges, or would effluent discharge be directed to traverse through the LOTT facility (as I am sure would sanitary waste discharge)?

### 3. Residential Building Structures as Technological Systems: (EDDS)

**Issue/Assertion:** Building structures (as well as street-scape structures [and their underlying infrastructure]) are technological systems, with distinct internal and external functions. The subsystems, and the social organization, that constitute these whole systems are subject to the ways and limits of nature's provisioning and the configuration of their fit.

**3.A)** With reference specifically to the Sea Level Rise Response Plan (SLR, LU-1); in the event of an exceptional, out-lier occurrence of a failure mode of the planned public/private mitigating measures for sea level rise flooding, in the most vulnerable, prone areas: are there ways to incorporate design guidelines for the materials and configuration of the buildings themselves to remain resilient to inundation and/or incursion?

**3.A.1)** In the site plan of a development project, are there ways to protect electrical power distribution, or on-site electrical power generation, and the provisioning of domestic, potable water, and relevant on-site HVAC pumps, condensers, machinery from the corrosive effects of saline, marine water that comes in contact with these facilities. If there are ways to configure these facilities for protection, in the case of contact, what are the likely marginal costs for such direct protection; would it be feasible? Or is prevention of direct contact really the only way to mitigate flood events in the physical geography of the affected areas?

**3.A.2)** Similarly, in the design guidelines for building construction(s) proper are there ways to design the structure for internal, resilient protection of the fore-mentioned subsystems in the case of marine water incursion, internally in the building? Are there "materials" to use in the subterranean and ground floor segments of the construction which would be resistant and impervious to flood waters at a moderate incursion for a limited time period? Or, if not, is it possible (and feasible) to design pass-through systems where incursion water passes through the structure and exits one of the other sides of the structure in appropriate timing and flows?

**3.A.3)** Is it feasible to locate **all** of the technological subsystems; power distribution and control, domestic water distribution (pumps, etc.) and control, and HVAC systems and control, in an upper story (perhaps a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor story would be sufficient) in a multistory, multi-unit structure, and still maintain sufficient insulation and isolation from the expected noise pollution?

**3.A.4)** If there is any reasonable response in the affirmative to these speculations, is it feasible to have them translated to an updated "Engineering Design and Development Standards" code which is in the City of Olympia purview, as a set of minimum performance codes for the affected area(s), and then to elaborate as an updated "design guidelines" with greater flexibility in accomplishing the implied functional design goals?

**End**

Thank you very much for the opportunity to participate and share my thoughts on the Sea Level Rise issue in this complex endeavor.

With appreciation and homage to Lewis Mumford and Jane Jacobs.

Lon Freeman

*Lon Freeman, March 1, 2017*

## Amy Buckler

**From:** Judy Bardin <judybardin@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 02, 2017 10:52 AM  
**To:** Amy Buckler  
**Cc:** Joyce Phillips  
**Subject:** Comments on the Downtown Strategy

Hi Amy and Joyce,

I am sending my comments again because I am not sure my first attempt worked.

[illegible]

Dear Amy;

Please accept my comments to the OPC and Council on the Downtown Strategy and the draft document. I took part in the Downtown Strategy by attending most of the community meetings and by completing a number of associated surveys.

At present, I am away from Olympia with limited access to email so my comments will be somewhat abbreviated and I will limit them to views and the views survey.

I hold a doctorate in epidemiology and I have worked for a number of years as an epidemiologist. Additionally, I have experience with survey design. I am concerned because I feel there are several serious flaws in the methods and implementation of the views survey as follows:

1. In order for a survey to be valid, it must be a random sample of the population from which it was drawn. In other words, the people who participated in the survey should represent the people of Olympia in terms of characteristics such as age, gender, race, income level, education and neighborhood. No information was presented on the distribution of these characteristics among the views survey participants and we therefore don't know if Olympians were accurately represented. It is highly likely that survey respondents reflect a select demographic in

Olympia. If the Olympians are not accurately represented, then inferences and conclusions drawn from the survey may not be valid.

2. The sample size of the survey was small, about 200 people. No information as to statistical significance, such as a p-value or confidence level was presented. Therefore the certainty or the meaningfulness of the results are not known.
3. The survey questions themselves were flawed. Instead of asking if various views were important and should be preserved, the posed questions pitted preserving various views against housing and the creation of a lively downtown. This type of question is extremely biased and severely limits the validity of a survey.

I realize that the City has done many comprehensive surveys in the past, such as the Elway survey about parks. Tools such as surveys are often used to better understand public opinion. However, it is important that they are designed correctly so that the information obtained is unbiased and truly reflects the desires of the community.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Judy Bardin

Sent from my iPhone

## Amy Buckler

---

**From:** cpdinfo  
**Sent:** Friday, March 03, 2017 8:09 AM  
**To:** Amy Buckler  
**Subject:** FW: Downtown Strategy

---

**From:** Bill Richardson [<mailto:wfr@nwrain.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 02, 2017 1:51 PM  
**To:** cpdinfo  
**Subject:** Downtown Strategy

The Port of Olympia marine terminal has had its ups and downs in regard to revenue generated but most years it has had to be subsidized by tax payers. I recognized the argument that the port operations provides jobs. I would like to see a study that could show the economic benefit from converting the marine business and terminal property to highest and best use (perhaps you could partner with urban planning students from local colleges). Uses for the property could include housing, retail, office, restaurants, hotel, a public swimming pool, extended Percival Landing etc. Our guess is that there would be many more jobs created and property taxes would generate revenue instead of needing taxpayer subsidies. Has this idea been considered?

We would also like to voice our misgivings about the Parklets downtown. There is no uniform design and they are not consistently maintained by the partnering businesses. Using PBIA money to help fund the parklets is taxing one business to give a subsidy to another business that benefits plus street parking is lost.

We would appreciate a response.

Bill and Richenda Richardson

Owners of Childhood's End Gallery  
<http://www.childhoods-end-gallery.com/Index.html>



## Amy Buckler

---

**From:** Janae Huber <janaehuber@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 02, 2017 9:49 PM  
**To:** Downtown Strategy  
**Subject:** Draft Downtown Strategy Comments

Dear Amy -

I am sending a quick and enthusiastic note of support for the draft Downtown Strategy. I am proud to have been a member of the stakeholders working group and am grateful for the chance to have been a small part of creating this document. It was also great to meet the other stakeholders and work with City staff and Makers.

While the plan doesn't include Jerry Parker's dream of eliminating the one-way couplets, I think there's a lot to appreciate in the draft document. There are a handful of recommendations I'm particularly excited about:

- Explore traffic calming opportunities at intersections along 4th Ave SE.
- Reduce Capitol Way in areas to two traffic lanes with a center turn lane
- Add protected bike lanes to Washington Street north of 5th
- Improve Thurston for more pedestrian and bike activity.
- Develop a Comprehensive Housing Strategy to establish a mixed income residential community in Downtown
- Facilitate construction of new housing by using, promoting, and exploring additional incentives/tools to encourage a range of housing options for a range of incomes and lifestyles (e.g., various size apartments/studios, townhomes, live/work, collective living, etc.)
- Update zoning and development standards
- Update design guidelines for building and site development that organizes the several different design review chapters into a single, easy to use tool to address key design objectives
- Identify buildings and tools appropriate for adaptive reuse, and promote these tools.
- Apply for an EPA Brownfield Assessment Grant and other federal and state funds to assist with assessment or clean-up of site contamination
- Explore how City-owned properties could be redeveloped through public/ private partnerships to meet public goals

Thank you for all of your work on this project! And congratulations for the near-completion of this phase.

Janae Huber

## Amy Buckler

---

**From:** cpdinfo  
**Sent:** Friday, March 03, 2017 1:26 PM  
**To:** Amy Buckler  
**Subject:** FW: Downtown Strategy Recommendation for OPC Consideration  
**Attachments:** Downtown Strategy Recommendation to OPC.docx

---

**From:** Roger Horn [<mailto:rogerolywa@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, March 03, 2017 11:18 AM  
**To:** cpdinfo  
**Subject:** Downtown Strategy Recommendation for OPC Consideration

Hello,

I have attached a recommendation regarding the Downtown Strategy for Planning Commission consideration.

Thanks.

Roger Horn

March 3, 2017

To: Olympia Planning Commission  
Re: Downtown Strategy  
From: Roger Horn

Dear Planning Commissioners,

An idea I recommend you consider regarding the Downtown Strategy is to emphasize in the report the importance of a Downtown welcome/information center. The current Downtown Olympia Welcome Center has been open for a couple years. I am among the volunteers that work at the front desk. Currently the Welcome Center is open each week, Thursday through Sunday.

The Welcome Center provides a variety of services. It is the office out of which the Downtown Ambassadors and Clean Team operate. Both are providing a valuable service to the City, downtown businesses, street dependent people, as well as visitors to downtown Olympia. I've heard many positive comments from downtown businesses and association members about the work they do.

Welcome desk volunteers provide to visitors maps, brochures, and other information about downtown activities, lodging, local retail businesses, public venues, local events, and transportation. The Center also has provided outreach supplies to street-dependent people, though the Center is now transitioning away from service. Many people from out of town come to the Center to ask questions about downtown and the area and to obtain printed materials.

A Welcome/Information Center can make a significant contribution to downtown. It needs to be located in an accessible location which is visible to many pedestrians, bicyclists, and car and bus riders. It should be supported, as it currently is, in partnership between the City, the Downtown Association, Parking and Business Improvement Area, the Capital Recovery Center, and the Thurston County Visitor and Convention. Two potential improvements would be to collocate the Center with Olympia Historical Society or Estuarium museum, and to select a location that would have restrooms that would be available to visitors.

Last year, I visited Charleston, SC and Savannah, GA. They both had visitor centers that were located near transit hubs and not far from the center of downtown. Both were very busy and included restrooms, a small theater to show videos about the city and its history, souvenirs for purchase, and well-organized informational materials. The Savannah center was collocated with a history museum. I think they both make major contributions to their downtowns. Our Welcome Center has the potential to do the same.

Please consider adding language in the Downtown Strategy to support a downtown welcome/information center.

Thank you.

Roger Horn  
1817 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE  
Olympia, WA 98501

## Amy Buckler

---

**From:** Comcast <kandjgoddard@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 22, 2017 11:04 AM  
**To:** Amy Buckler; John Owen; Keith Stahley  
**Cc:** Cheryl Selby; Julie Hankins; Nathaniel Jones; Jim Cooper; Jessica Bateman; Jeannine Roe; Clark Gilman; Kendra Dahlen  
**Subject:** Re: City of Olympia News Release | Downtown Strategy Public Hearing - Feb 27

Dear John, Amy and Keith.

I am so grateful for the work you and your teams have accomplished during Year One of the DTS, and for the projects slated to continue or begin during 2017. As I have mentioned in the past, you have exceeded my best hopes of laying the groundwork for a high-quality, long-view revitalization plan for Downtown. I am particularly delighted that to date 3500 people from Olympia and surrounding communities have shown up at workshops, etc. and/or completed online surveys. That, I think, is a clear indicator of (1) your keen focus on the value of meaningful public outreach and (2) how deeply people care about our downtown's best future.

I am so sorry that I'll miss the 2/27 OPC public hearing covering the draft Downtown Strategy. Jewel and I are off to Maui that same morning where we will be greeted by rain, which is in the forecast the entire first week. So much for MY planning!

My sincerest thanks to all of you and yours.  
Kris

P.S. Please pass along kudos to your outstanding graphics teams for communicating this story powerfully, artfully and understandably.

On Feb 21, 2017, at 3:05 PM, Nancy Lenzi <[nlenzi@ci.olympia.wa.us](mailto:nlenzi@ci.olympia.wa.us)> wrote:

<image001.jpg>

### **FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

### **DOWNTOWN STRATEGY PUBLIC HEARING – FEB 27**

**Date of Release: February 17, 2017**

#### **Contact:**

- Amy Buckler, Senior Planner
- 360.570.5847
- [abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us](mailto:abuckler@ci.olympia.wa.us)

#### **Public Hearing on the draft Downtown Strategy**

The Olympia Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on the draft Downtown Strategy on Monday, February 27 at 6:30 pm at City Hall, to receive public comments prior to making a

recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposal. Anyone interested is invited to attend and present testimony regarding the draft proposal, which is available online at [www.olympiawa.gov/DTS](http://www.olympiawa.gov/DTS). The draft includes a summary and seven more detailed chapters about each of the strategy elements.

During 2016, the City hosted an extensive public process to form a strategy that will move forward our community's vision for Downtown. Over 3,500 community members from around the region participated at meetings and online. What emerged is a holistic design framework and set of priority actions for enhancing Downtown. The Strategy will guide City actions over the next 6 years to address housing, homelessness, transportation, design, retail/business and land use development. It is also a tool for communicating our vision and commitment to action for Downtown.

Public testimony may be presented orally or in writing. Written statements may be submitted to the Commission in care of the Olympia Community Planning and Development Department, PO Box 1967, Olympia, WA 98507-1967; to [cpdinfo@ci.olympia.wa.us](mailto:cpdinfo@ci.olympia.wa.us) or by fax to 360.753.8087. Written comments must be received prior to 5 p.m. on Friday, March 3 and may be presented at the hearing. If you need special accommodations to participate in this meeting, please call (360) 753-8314, at least 48 hours in advance and ask for the ADA Coordinator.

Following the hearing, the Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council. The Commission may recommend that the strategy be adopted or not adopted, or may recommend an alternative or a variation.

###

## Connect With Us!

<image002.jpg> <image003.jpg> <image005.jpg>

2/21/2017 3:05 PM

## Amy Buckler

---

**From:** JacobsOly@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2017 9:37 PM  
**To:** Amy Buckler  
**Subject:** FOW Testimony on DTS Draft  
**Attachments:** DTS Underline Version, Feb 2017.docx

Amy -- attached is the written FOW testimony in electronic form. I handed out hard copies this evening, but thought you might want it in electronic form too.

BobJ

Written Testimony of Friends of the Waterfront for the Olympia Planning  
Commission's Public Hearing on February 27, 2017 Regarding the  
Draft Downtown Strategy

Friends of the Waterfront was founded seventeen years ago and is registered with the Secretary of State's Corporations Division.

*"Friends of the Waterfront is a group of Olympia area residents and businesspeople who see the waterfront as a treasure -- a central feature that is vital to the health of the whole community. We advocate managing the shoreline and adjacent lands wisely and developing them for the community's greatest net benefit over the long term, as determined through an inclusive visioning process."*

We have closely followed the development of the Downtown Strategy draft. Our comments will focus on three areas: (1) the waterfront in general, (2) the Isthmus, and (3) views.

Waterfront

We are pleased to see that the waterfront receives appropriate recognition in this report as a wonderful community asset. This includes:

- Improving pedestrian connections between the waterfront and downtown attractions and the capitol campus.
- Maintaining the waterfront as a public gathering place.
- Promoting waterfront recreation activities.
- Completing the Olympia Waterfront Route (Big W Trail) around the peninsula.

However, we are disappointed there was no attention given to the need for appropriate regulations to assure quality public access. When the Shoreline Master Program was passed recently, councilmembers chose to adopt the minimum 30-foot setback required by Ecology (in order to preserve regulatory flexibility). At the time they said that additional setback space (and stepbacks) could/would be added via local zoning changes. We urge the commission/council to make this part of the downtown strategy and give it high priority in work plans.

(1) Setbacks. Thirty-foot setbacks provide only about twenty feet of flat ground for public use, the other ten or so feet being the slope to the water. Twenty feet of flat ground is not quite enough for a standard walking path cross-section for this kind of area (21 feet). It



provides no space at all for waterfront-related outdoor facilities such as outside restaurant seating, nor for potential sea level rise barriers. We strongly urge an additional 25 feet of setback (55 feet total) to provide space for these uses. Many localities have even wider spaces along their waterfronts. Olympia has relatively narrow strips of flat waterfront land in some areas and little undeveloped waterfront land in others, so this proposal would be appropriate for our local conditions.

(2) Stepbacks. Substantial stepbacks above the second story are needed to provide an open, airy, bright space for waterfront users. It is important to avoid a sense of confinement between tall walls and water.

We strongly urge that appropriate setbacks and stepbacks be included in the DTS, be added to the 2017 Planning work plan, and also be included in the city's sea level rise planning that is now beginning.

### Isthmus

We regard the isthmus as part of the waterfront area and support the efforts of the Olympia Capitol Park Foundation.

1. Capitol Center Building. We saw a reference to possible redevelopment of the Capitol Center Building in the draft, but no mention of its removal. Removal of that out-of-place building has been a community priority for many years. This was reconfirmed recently by a professional public survey during development of the Parks Plan. Removal of this building has appeared in parks plans for a number of years. Action is overdue.

We strongly urge the commission/council to include in the DTS the removal of the Capitol Center Building and use of this space for parks and for future transportation contingencies.

2. Fountain Block and West Parcels. We strongly urge the city to develop the Fountain Block and West Parcels in as open a way as possible, thus adding/preserving important views of the capitol from this area. Views should be important considerations as this area is redeveloped. Any structures that are added should be low and small, serve public uses and preserve views.

### Views

#### Background

The importance of view protection cannot be overstated. Whether public or private, important views are treasured, and give significant value to communities. Thus, we support GL8, "Community views are protected, preserved, and enhanced". FOW has advocated this for a number of years, and we are pleased that views are finally being addressed.

We note too the gravity of view protection actions. Any views not protected now can well be lost forever.

Throughout the public process regarding view protection, we observed a clear bias of development over view protection, expressed as stern warnings to the effect that view protections could reduce the chance of achieving the city's goals for housing development downtown. We found these warnings without merit because (1) most of the new housing is planned for the Southeast Neighborhood, which has little to no impact on important views, and (2) the remainder of downtown appears to have far more space than would be needed for the projected additional population.

In addition, mention of potential legal problems and "unfair economic impacts" from view-protecting zoning changes seem to be of questionable merit.

We therefore urge the commission and council to significantly discount reported development-over-views opinion survey results. This is in addition to the fact that these surveys are not statistically valid.

#### Specifics

1. We are chagrined that this report recommends that views of the capitol protect only views of the dome, rather than the dome and drum. The dome alone appears small and unimpressive from a distance. The dome and drum together make a real visual statement and need protection to maintain the dominance of the capitol on our skyline. Including the structure beneath the drum would be even better, though the dome/drum make a strong impression.
2. View 1, State Capitol Campus Promontory to Budd Inlet. This item is defined too narrowly. It should also include northward views from the north basin of Capitol Lake. This is easily the biggest view issue facing Olympia. The Capitol Center Building is a huge blot on our city and on the state capitol. It is completely out of scale with its surroundings, blocks important views, and violates the historic design of the state capitol campus, which was planned around the northward view from the land that Olympia founder Edmund Sylvester donated for our "capitol place". Removal of this structure is a very popular idea and would immeasurably improve our downtown. It was also important in passage of the Municipal Parks District measure. We strongly recommend that this structure be removed and be replaced with public open space, and urge that this project be included in the DTS.
3. View 5, West Bay Park to Mt. Rainier. We support this recommendation.
4. View 7, Percival Landing to Capitol Dome. Under this item, the view from just a single point was analyzed. We believe this approach is too narrow. Percival Landing is an important and

heavily used public park. Important views from public parks are vital to the public interest and should be protected. Thus, we recommend that the entirety of Percival Landing be analyzed for view protection. We also urge that the remainder of the Olympia Waterfront Route be similarly analyzed. Language should be inserted to provide view protections as the Big W Trail is completed in the future.

5. View 8, East Bay Lookout to Capitol Dome, and View 9, East Bay overlook to Capitol Dome. These two views from East Bay to the Capitol Dome illustrate what we and others believe to be an inappropriate constraint that was placed on the view analysis exercise. In some cases important views are enjoyed as much from vehicles as from walking. Therefore a stretch of a street rather than a point along the street should be the view analyzed. In this specific case, we believe the stretch to be protected should be from the southernmost residence along East Bay Drive to the East Bay Overlook. Because of the view over the water to the capitol, this is a very pleasant stretch. It could become part of a "scenic drive" in the future.

6. View 10, Deschutes Parkway to Mt. Rainier. We support preservation of this view.

7. Freeway views of the capitol. We believe I-5 was designed to showcase views of the capitol. Thus, we recommend analysis of I-5 to capitol views for possible additional view protection.

8. We do not know the original reason for the Capitol Height District, but it appears to have had something to do with views of the capitol. This ordinance has not been reviewed in many years. It is time to do so as we have recommended in the past.

## Amy Buckler

---

**From:** JacobsOly@aol.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 28, 2017 8:25 PM  
**To:** Amy Buckler  
**Subject:** Additional Comment on Draft DTS

Planning Commission Members:

I would like to respond to a comment made by a representative of the Olympia Master Builders at yesterday's hearing.

The OMB representative said that view protection could reduce the amount of buildable land so much that the city would be unable to reach its goal of housing 5,000 new residents in the downtown area in the next twenty years.

The FOW written testimony addresses this idea in a general way, but I want to offer some actual numbers.

Judging by the density achieved in the 123 Fourth Avenue building (136 units plus inside parking and ground floor commercial space, all on one-half block), it should be very easy to get 250 units on a full city block.

Taking the high estimate of 3,500 new housing units needed, that means 14.5 blocks.

Much if not most of those new units are expected to go into the southeast neighborhood, in the general vicinity of the library. Housing in that area will have little or no impact on views.

The rest of the housing (perhaps 7 or 8 blocks worth) would go in the flat areas of downtown and Plum Street. That area has many, many blocks that could be redeveloped, so giving up some potential density would not significantly affect the potential for housing.

I hope these comments will prove useful.

Bob Jacobs  
352-1346

### Public Testimony – Feb 27, 2017

\*\*\*\*\*

Ms. Buckler presented a short briefing and noted written public comment will be accepted until Friday, March 3, 2017 at 5:00 p.m.

Chair Mark opened the public hearing.

Public testimony was received from:

**Stewart Drebeck**, a local developer, stated he felt the document was a good one which can help to create the vision, and he commended staff for their work during this process. His concerns were:

- Housing Chapter, Page 1, second sentence- *The City's Comprehensive Plan includes a target of directing ¼ of the city's forecasted population growth into downtown. This translates into about 5,000 new downtown residents living in approximately 2,500 to 3,500 new residences over next 20 years.* Concerned about the word “directing” and feels it should not become a mandate by the City. He feels the expectation of building 150 housing units per year over the next 20 years is overly optimistic and the market will not bear it. Multifamily is a cyclical industry that overbuilds then stops because the banks won't lend. There is too much available land elsewhere that is far less expensive than Downtown.
- Housing Chapter, Page 3 - *Avoid displacement of lower income groups from the downtown.* Concerned about the City mandating owners of existing lower income rentals from remodeling these units and raising the rent.
- Housing Chapter, Page 4 - He feels the example of a potential quarter block development is not realistic. It's too big for anyone to take on.
- Housing Chapter, Page 11 - Concerned that the costs associated with rehabilitation or demolition of existing buildings make this not a realistic option.
- Concerned about how Olympia might implement its goal of maintaining affordable units. He does not want to see the City implement rent control. That would be bad for the community and bad for people that own real estate.

**Bonnie Jacobs**, a long-time Olympia resident, referenced written testimony from the Friends of the Waterfront organization. She praised the Planning Commission for their service, and stressed the importance of the waterfront as a treasured community asset. Their concerns are:

- View protection from the waterfront. When planning for more visitors and for 5,000 more residents, think about views and setbacks from the waterfront.
- The Shoreline Master Program minimum 30-foot setback is insufficient for a pathway and the setback distance should be increased.

**Aaron Sauerhoff**, a student at Evergreen State College, thanked everyone who put the thoughtful and thorough plan together. He is concerned about collaboration with experts who have the most current data regarding sea level rise and urged the

importance of not missing any available data when implementing the Downtown Strategy.

**Joel Baxter**, a representative from the Olympia Master Builders, feels the plan is mostly easy to read and understand and will be a good tool for citizen involvement. While OMB members do not often build in downtown, they wanted to weigh in on the DTS because they care of the vitality of downtown and believe it is important to the region. His concerns are:

- The DTS outlines a priority of walkability and the desire to add 5,000 residents to Downtown. He feels the current restrictions on building height may create a challenge of obtaining the goal of increasing housing units. OMB does not want to eliminate views, but housing goals as well as walkability can only be supported by increasing density.
- When considering affordable housing incentives an actual affordable housing dollar amount needs to be established in order to determine if a developer can meet this goal of supplying affordable units.

**Bob Jacobs**, a long time Olympia resident, referenced written testimony from the Friends of the Waterfront (FOW) organization. Two themes he sees are holistic and long-term. Different interests have to be balanced in order to have a healthy community, and we need to prepare for growth, for example by setting aside park land and putting view protections in place. He reiterated the following concerns of FOW:

- The Shoreline Master Program minimum 30-foot setback is insufficient for a pathway and the setback distance should be increased. Only 20' of that is flat land. 55' would be better for trail users and private businesses (e.g. for outdoor seating.)
- Appreciate the recommendations to get people to the waterfront – think about the experience people have when they get there
- View protection - the draft recommends the Capitol Dome view be defined as only the Capitol Dome, not including the Drum. FOW thinks both the Dome and Drum are important to the view. (the draft also includes a typo that states the recommended view is the Capitol “Drum” – intended to be Capitol “Dome”)
- Isthmus – urges that the DTS should include a recommendation to remove the Capitol Center Building from the isthmus and replace it with a grand public open space.

Chair Mark closed the public hearing.