

**CITY OF OLYMPIA
LAND USE AND ENVIRONMENT
COMMITTEE
SUMMARY MINUTES
October 19, 2009**

Members Present: Karen Messmer, Chair, Rhenda Strub 5:15, Joan Machlis

Staff Present: Steve Hall, Keith Stahley, Tom Hill, Mr. Riker Riker, Jan Weydemeyer, Bonnie Harrington, Ms. Stimson Stimson, Andy Haub

Guests: Stewart Elway, Perry Shea, Joe Amoros, Bob Pasquariello, Will Stakelin, Cory Prutzman, Jeff Pantier, Henry Mora, Brad Korner, Michael Barber, Monty Hudson, Elisabeth Wilson, Matt Cover, Tom Parmenter

The June 15, 2009 meeting of the LUE Committee was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

I. Approval of the August 17, 2009 LUE Summary

Councilmember Machlis moved approval of the August 17th minutes, second by Councilmember Strub. The motion was approved.

II. Approval of the September 21, 2009 LUE Summary

Councilmember Strub moved approval of the September 21st minutes, second by Councilmember Machlis. The motion was approved.

III. Review of Subdivision Development Practices for Inactive Subdivisions: (Tom Hill)

Councilmember Messmer asked for introductions.

Tom Hill provided an introduction of the item and overview of the staff report.

Councilmember Messmer asked Mr. Hill to review the options and conditions. Plats that have not yet expired would have the ability to ask for a formal extension beyond the initial five years. Proposed conditions:

- Erosion control features in place.
- Overgrown and nuisance vegetation
- Control of site access

Councilmember Messmer asked for comments from the public:

Perry Shea - provided the committee with the perspective from his involvement in Briggs Village. Two subdivisions have been platted. The west phase has not yet been started though. It has been through most of development review. It will expire in 2010 in February. Mr. Shea supports the extension. They have no problem with the proposed conditions.

Joe Amoros owner of Briggs Village is trying to make things happen by bringing to market townhomes, town center, and 72 units of multiple family housing. He pointed out that he donated the land for the Briggs Village park and that they are about to start the 25,000 square foot grocery store. Next year there should be 200 units of senior housing on the eastside of Henderson. He concluded that they are not abandoning the project and support the extension.

Will Stakelin with the Olympia Master Builders said that he was glad that we're having this discussion. Five years with a two year extension is a reasoned approach. What does the extension involve? Conditions? Fees? Supports the two years extension. Conditions such as erosion control, vegetation management okay. Please don't go beyond that.

Corey Prutzman with Boston Harbor Land Company asked about plats that have been approved on paper and haven't been started. Master Planned subdivisions such as Briarton Village. He said that a master plan with 300 plus units was unlikely to be built-out within five years.

Brad Korner planning elements take a considerable amount of time. Platting can take years. Option 1 seems like a reasonable approach. Don't add on costs and fees.

Jeff Pantier representing First Citizens. Submitted a letter to the committee regarding Whitmore Glen. He supports a two year extension. Be careful with adding on conditions. Erosion control measures are under control. Look at conditions on a case by case basis.

Phase I of Whitmore Glen is ready to be built on. May not need the extension, however, it's a good idea to establish the ability to extend the project. Many projects will need the time to finish their projects.

Monty Hudson noted that the price of land has dropped dramatically.

Elisabeth Wilson with Frontier Bank and current owner of the Evergreen Hills plat stated that they have already applied for an extension. Supports 2 year extension. Other jurisdictions are also addressing the situation. Concern about dealing with noxious weeds.

Matt Cover with Frontier Bank intends to make their investment safe, sound and sanitary. Extension is critical. Should include paper plats. What is the process to get the plat extended.

Tom Parmenter Evergreen Hills . Supports the extension. Mr. P. mentioned delays from the City and that the bank has taken over the property. Concerns about conditions of extension new engineering standards. Lost \$10,000,000.

Councilmember Messmer turning back to the committee asked, Do other members have questions?

Councilmember Strub asked about the status of the extension at Evergreen Hills? Additional requirements? Tom Hill responded that extension is in place.

Councilmember Strub questioned the paper plat process and whether the noxious weeds - will it change our enforcement? Tom Hill replied that it would not. We rely upon the County for noxious weed enforcement and would continue to do so.

Councilmember Strub question to Jeff Pantier about the proposed conditions. Broad understanding of what needs to be looked such as erosion, noxious weeds, access.

Mr. Prutzman responded that he wasn't clear about the effect of the proposal on preliminary plats. Tom Hill clarified that this proposal does address preliminary plats.

Mr. Prutzman advised that you may run into situations where the bank won't be able to extend.

Councilmember Messmer asked about two different approaches: blanket renewal or having somebody come in and request the extension.

Councilmember Messmer stated concerns about noxious weed proliferation and storm water erosion control as well as security at the site.

Tom Hill staff is looking for flexibility. Used College Station as an example and Robin Hill Landing. Will need the ability to address paper plats and finished plats differently.

Mr. Prutzman asked why include conditions if they are merely code.

Matt Cover asked how a bank can stay in the loop if they are not the owner.

Councilmember Machlis asked if this would affect any plat approved after January 2004? Would this extend into the future? How long would it be in effect?

Councilmember Messmer stated that if it affects preliminary plats, could it change the requirements under which they develop? It takes a great deal of time (five years or more) for new regulations to go into effect. Let's try and put some bounds on this in regards to its duration. Two year extension makes sense to me. Staff should have some flexibility regarding storm water, noxious weeds and security. Renewals are a check point. Administrative fee.—staff determine the fee.

Councilmember Messmer to the committee do you want to see the details in the future?

Councilmember Strub add language plats approved after January first 2004 and before October 19, 2009.

Councilmember Strub what is a reasonable fee?

Councilmember Messmer fixed fee for the simple ones.

Tom Hill would a public hearing be required to extend? We need to answer that question.

Return to November LUE? Councilmember Strub/Councilmember Machlis no need.

Councilmember Messmer include noxious weeds. Staff go out and look at the property and inspect prior to issuance of the extension. No renewal until the standards are met.

Councilmember Messmer need to take into consideration both the property owner interests as wells as the neighbors. Neighbors have concerns.

Councilmember Strub concerns about having to jump through the hoops? Provide some relief.

Councilmember Machlis said it was a good time to verify.

Councilmember Strub extensions will be automatic?

Councilmember Messmer catch it before any plats expire. It will come back to City Council before the end of the year.

IV. Prioritize Performance Measures for Transportation Mobility Strategy (David Riker)

Councilmember Messmer introduced the item and asked Ms. Stimson and Mr. Riker for overview. Mr. Riker said that the focus would be on trying to determine what are key measures or outcomes should be. What are the 3 to 5 items that will help us determine if we are moving towards our transportation vision.

Mr. Riker reported that pavement management is much more than just automobile traffic. He asked the committee to think of the Union Avenue and Black Lake work.

He said that we have a vision of safe and accessible transportation choices. Accident trends should be measure. He mentioned the measurement of mobility index. Are more people making different transportation choices at different locations. Why is one location doing better than others? He said that he wants to make sure that they are reporting on what council wants to hear and thinks are the important measures?

Councilmember Messmer responded that safety should be one of the measures. How should it be reported? Incidents, accidents, injuries, police reports?

Councilmember Messmer likes mobility index - transit, bikes, motor vehicles, pedestrians?

Councilmember Messmer not sure what the right spots are?

Councilmember Messmer catching points like Eastside at the end of the Woodland trail. Capital Way bridge. She asked that staff take a look and make sure we've picked the right locations.

Councilmember Messmer would like to know: How complete are our streets? What portion of our streets are complete? Measures of connectivity?

Mr. Riker connectivity is something we want to progress on. Complete streets today? Do we have the features?

Councilmember Messmer said that measures the connectivity are also important. She referred to work by Andy Mortenson, a transportation consultant, who is developing a tool to measure connectivity.

Councilmember Machlis asked about change of mode? Ms. Stimson responded that bus counts are provided by IT. Changes in ridership. Full set of data for bike counts. We have the methodology.

Councilmember Machlis was interested in an indicator of the link between density and transportation how many 15 minute headway routes do we have should be an indicator? Ms. Stimson responded that we do have the miles of bus routes where at 15 minute frequency?

Councilmember Messmer asked what are you looking for from the committee? Mr. Riker trying to determine what council wants to hear and what's most important. Councilmember Messmer can report out at City Council. Ms. Stimson said she would put information about the program on the web.

V. Consider Alternatives for Sidewalk Construction and Stormwater Solutions in Developed Neighborhoods: (Tom Hill)

Tom Hill provided an overview of the agenda item. This item primarily relates to infill development. Tom highlighted that the requirements have changed back and forth over the years.

Mr. Hill touched on what the options are. Make no changes, create fee in lieu program, LID, don't require sidewalks. Issues could be addressed through the update of the EDDS.

Andy Haub provided an overview of the City's drywell requirement. Mr. Haub reviewed a fact sheet on infill storm water management requirements including costs and volumes. Mr. Haub reviewed the advantages and disadvantages of regional first local on site facilities.

Mr. Haub provided an overview of the fee in lieu of program and our difficulty in administering such a program.

Mr. Haub said that staff preference would be to maintain the dry well approach.

Monty Hudson provided the committee with series of slides that demonstrated the impact of installing a sidewalk on his infill lot at 16th and Edison. He said that staff should be given discretion to address situations similar to this.

Michael Barber provide further insight into the affected lot. The new standards have a disproportionate impact on Mr. Hudson's property. He state it would cost \$14,000 for fee in lieu at \$200 per foot. 18 foot dedication. Standards changed.

Mr. Parker favors the fee in lieu program. Might allow missing links to addressed on more highly used pedestrian routes. Routes to Garfield Elementary school for example.

Will Stakelin does not recommend continuing the sidewalk to nowhere. \$200 for fee in lieu of seems high. Taking option 3 and 4 and create a hybrid. Creation of local improvement district with a dedication of right of way. Create a hybrid.

Councilmember Messmer what does the comp plan say - Land Use Chapter sidewalks on both sides of the street.

Councilmember Messmer referenced her door-belling experience - people want sidewalks. West Bay Drive as an example of a connected system that developed from disparate parts. Sidewalk to nowhere is a slow process. Councilmember Messmer has seen the failure as a result of the LID process - Blvd. Road. Councilmember Messmer prefers the fee in lieu to the LID or have sidewalks installed - funds can be directed to the place where they belong. Mr. Hudson's situation is somewhat unique and may be best addressed by a variance process.

Tom Hill pointed on the impacts of requiring sidewalks on large lots can be cost prohibitive.

Councilmember Machlis stated that the fee in lieu is prohibitive because of the city's cost is so high. Seattle's ribbon sidewalk and rain garden approach. Is there a better way? How could a neighborhood incentivize the LID. Street types are different - Giles verse Rogers.

Mr. Haub explained that the Seattle program was an extraordinary circumstance and was expensive.

Councilmember Machlis asked if there is there something more that could get the issue addressed more quickly. Mr. Haub dry wells are effective for dealing with roofs. Is there a way to deal with it on a bigger neighborhood-wide solution. Mr. Haub we have a very minimal retrofit program.

Councilmember Strub identified two different problems. First person in. Last person in. In favor of modifying where a neighborhood has no sidewalks so that the City has the responsibility.

Councilmember Messmer houses will be razed and new sidewalks will be installed.

Councilmember Messmer fee in lieu is a way to address.

Councilmember Strub fee in lieu seems cost prohibitive. Could support it if fee was lower.

Tom Hill explained that it costs the city a lot to construct a sidewalk in right of way, storm water, contracting, managing are all included in the fee in lieu. Fees must be used within 6 years. Must go

in the same neighborhood. Staff can take another look at the fee in lieu program? Lots of unique situations.

Councilmember Messmer how do you fairly allocate what needs to be done? People want sidewalks. We need to move forward not backwards on this issue. Collective good is that people want sidewalks.

Councilmember Machlis stated that we need to look for a middle ground. Set aside right of way and put cost into fund. Not City's cost.

Councilmember Messmer must look at the nexus issue.

Councilmember Strub people don't want a disconnected ribbon of sidewalk in their front yards and they don't want to pay \$15,000. Third option voluntary contribution program. Submit cost estimate, contribute to neighborhood system.

Councilmember Messmer can you pre-designate projects that the funds can be directed?

Tom Hill said he could discuss legal options of fee in lieu with City attorney.

Councilmember Machlis make it part of our overall sidewalk priority plan.

Councilmember Messmer what's the range of cost for our projects?

Will Stakelin asked what are your impact fees covering? Are sidewalks included in impact fees? Are infill projects paying twice.

Councilmember Messmer could you have an infill impact fee?

Robin Black many people don't want to see more sidewalks that create runoff.

Councilmember Messmer they are not mutually exclusive.

Councilmember Machlis said that the impacts of costs have a substantial impact and create barriers to infill. Fees are permits for an infill single family home are over \$24,000.

Councilmember Strub balance. Don't want to create a race to the bottom.

Staff will review with Legal and return to the Committee with options for amending the fee in lieu program.

VI. Update of Comprehensive Plan Process: (Keith Stahley)

Mr. Stahley provided a brief status report on the Comp Plan update process. Ms. Weydemeyer provided an overview of the kickoff event and Mr. Elway provided an overview of the upcoming telephone survey.

Ms. Harrington presented the Imagine Olympia web page to the committee for their review and comment. The committee recommended changing the comment form to include a name and address.

Mr. Stahley asked the committee about forming a content advisory group. The committee preferred to keep it informal and that the City Manager or staff ask specific individuals for their input into educational information.

The meeting adjourned at 8:47.