

April 29, 2018

Comment on TIA by Heath and Associates
Alex Vo's Wellington Heights Preliminary Plat Application
by Dan Leahy, 1415 6th Avenue SW

The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for Alex Vo's Preliminary Plat Application is procedurally flawed, deficient and mistaken. The City staff should reject this TIA along with the application itself.

A. Procedurally Flawed: The Substantive Implications of the Denial of Due Process.

1. TIA Guidelines for New Developments (Ordinance No. 7110) states the TIA “must follow the City of Olympia guidelines for a Traffic Impact Analysis”.

The staff procedure on this TIA did not follow the guidelines thereby **foreclosing** the right of the parties of record access to a record/analysis upon which they could enter on substantive grounds the mandated Hearing Examiner's public hearing.

On Page 1 of the Guidelines there is a description of “Traffic Impact Analysis Scoping Meeting.” The staff did not hold a scoping meeting for this project. Despite numerous assurances to the parties of record that such a meeting would be held in the future (Paula Smith, March 15, 2018; Dave Smith, March 19, 2018) it was not held. On March 22, 2018, Assistant Planner Paula Smith informed us that, “A meeting was not held.”

In the absence of such a meeting, the parties of record are denied a subsequent written report. We received such a post meeting report on the Storm Water Scoping meeting, but not on the TIA. The absence of this written record on a TIA scoping meeting forecloses the right of the parties of record to comment before the Hearing Examiner at the mandatory public hearing.

2. The TIA Guidelines call for an analysis “on the surrounding transportation system” (p. 2) and that it “shall be a thorough review of the immediate and long range effects of the new development on the transportation system.” (page 3).

The staff directions to the consultant ensured that this “thorough review” would not & could not be accomplished. Thus, both the Hearing Examiner and the Parties of Record are denied a substantive basis upon which to both critique and make judgments about the effects of this application for a preliminary plat by Mr. Vo.

As is well documented by the City's own “West Olympia Access Study,” or the Westside portion of the City's recent mapping for its “Transportation 2030,” the “surrounding transportation system” is much greater than what the staff determined the consultant should review for this TIA. (These studies need to be included in the record for the Hearing Examiner).

The staff limited this TIA to a minor part of West Olympia, the area south of 9th Avenue SW. This is a fragment of even Southwest Olympia, let alone the Westside. The study, therefore, did not include an analysis of the traffic that will flow up and down 10th, 11th and 12th streets back and forth to Plymouth. It did not include any traffic flows down 9th Avenue to Percival or through the rest of the northern cut-through streets such as Decatur, Milroy or Cushing. It did not include the major intersection of Harrison and Division, let alone the traffic up and down 4th avenue.

The absence of such an analysis forecloses the ability of the Hearing Examiner and the parties of record to enter the mandated hearing on a substantive basis or for the Hearing Examiner to make legitimate judgments in the presence of accurate information.

3. The City staff did not email the TIA to the parties of record thus again foreclosing their right to participate in the mandated public hearing on substantive grounds.

The City staff did email the materials from the Storm Water Scoping meeting to the parties of record as required, but it did not email the TIA to the parties of record. The City staff noted that the TIA was available on the City's website via a link that was broken and dysfunctional. Nevertheless, the availability of the City's website is not what is legally required to meet the City's obligation to notify parties of record. This obligation requires direct communication of substantive materials to the parties of record. This did not happen with the TIA.

4. City of Olympia Transportation Engineer David S. Smith indicated to the consultant that he "discuss future connection to Decatur." (March 21, 2018). This promotion by a City staff member of a flagrant violation of the City's Comprehensive Plan calls into question again not only the integrity of the City's procedure, but also the legitimacy and purpose of the TIA itself.

The connection to Decatur that Engineer Smith and City staff are promoting is an automobile connection from the proposed 18th Avenue inside Mr. Vo's preliminary plat design east to Decatur SW. This automobile connection would exit across Mrs. George Johnson's property and into the middle of a 273 foot Bike/Pedestrian Pathway. Not only does the City have no right to cross Mrs. Johnson's property, but this Pathway is permanently closed to automobile traffic, as decided by the City Council and included in the Comprehensive Plan update of 2013.

Such an option can not legitimately come before the Hearing Examiner unless the City Council has changed its Comprehensive Plan. It has not.

5. The Southwest Olympia Neighborhood Association (SWONA) was denied what they believe to be observation rights to scoping meetings thus frustrating and foreclosing its ability to participate in the public hearing process on a substantive basis.

When SWONA was informed by CP&D Director Stahley that scoping meetings were not "public meetings" and therefore SWONA representatives would not be informed in advance or allowed to observe, SWONA asked for the City's legal opinion upon which Mr. Stahley's assertion was based. The City's attorney never provided SWONA with that opinion nor did the City Council direct the City attorney to respond.

In the absence of any written legal opinion justifying the exclusion of parties of record or SWONA from these scoping meetings by Mr. Stahley, the parties of record have unjustly been denied information pertinent to their ability to participate on a substantive basis in the public hearing.

6. The City Staff has now included two streets, Division and Cushing SW, in the scope the TIA. Neither of these streets have had posted, mandatory signage, "Future Street Connector Neighborhood Connector." Only Fern Street SW has this signage. Citizens purchased homes on these two streets with the reasonable expectation that these two streets would remained closed to traffic. Clearly, the City has no right to open these two streets given the absence of public promulgation and notice to home buyers.

B. The TIA by Heath and Associates is deficient and mistaken. It should be rejected by the staff as should be the project itself.

Even with the severe limitations and personal promotions imposed by the City Staff on Heath and Associates, the TIA itself is full of deficiencies, omissions and mistakes. It should be rejected by the City Staff, as should the application itself.

“Developments surrounding the site are primarily residential with commercial land uses in the greater surrounding areas.” (Page Three). This statement is fiction. Of the four sides on this site, two are contiguous to auto mall dealerships, one to a wooden area owned by Mrs. Johnson and only one to residential area.

There are five pages of vicinity maps, beginning on page four, and one page of a site map with the 17 page narrative. None of the maps show a connection to Decatur SW even though it is discussed in the narrative. This is a substantive omission.

There is a description of Fern Street SW and Division Street SW that states “parking is provided in areas.” (page six). The omission of the narrow nature and one-sided only parking on the southern end of these two streets is particularly egregious and misleading.

“Ordinance #7104 shows Fern Street planned for extension” and that this extension “will take place on the south side of the site.” If Fern Street was extended south of the site, it would have to run over the cliff and through the Chrysler Jeep dealership. Plus the Ordinance #7104 only shows a bike extension from 9th Avenue “to end” of Fern.

This Fern extension “will provide a connection to Decatur SW.” It will only if two parallel streets cross each other. No, what I presume they are trying to say is that the proposed west/east 18th Avenue in the site is proposed to connect to the east with Decatur SW.

“Decatur Street SW will also be widened as part of this project.” They cite the City's Transportation 2030 for this assertion. There is a listing of streets in this document that will be widened. Decatur is not one of them. And, although the City staff loves to continue its hope for an automobile connection south to Caton Way, it is prohibited until completion of West Side Access Study Phase II is completed, if ever.

“Non-Motorized Traffic”: (This is the name for people who walk in our neighborhood). “The area has well developed pedestrian facilities in the form of sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike lanes that help alleviate any potential conflict between motorist and non-motorist.” (Page Ten). If the intersection of 9th and Fern SW was not so dangerous, this statement would be hilarious. Instead, it is obscene.

“Well developed?” There is no sidewalk or curb on either side of Fern Street for one block from 9th Avenue south to the Tuscan gated community. There is also no street lighting. There is no sidewalk on the south side of 9th Avenue from Black Lake Blvd to the Fern Street intersection. There is no sidewalk from the bus stop on 9th Avenue and Fern east to Cushing SW, except in front of Village Gardens. There have been numerous pleas over the years to the City Council from residents of Evergreen Vista and SWONA to “develop” this intersection with at least sidewalks.

There are also, of course, no bike lanes inside Wellington West nor any proposed by Alex Vo for

his preliminary plat, only two car garages. This is in line with the City of Olympia's de facto transportation policy which is the continual movement of automobiles to retail sites. The only reference to bike lanes is the elimination of the Decatur Bike/Pedestrian Pathway by driving automobiles on to it.

“Accident History or Pedestrian Conflicts.” The TIA Guidelines require the TIA to “identify safety and access problems, including discussions of accident history... and pedestrian conflicts.” (Page 4). There is no such identification in this TIA, despite the request by parties of record to consider the safety of children in the area, some of whom have been hit by traffic.

“Transit Service.” “Intercity Transit system map shows transit services is provided on site.” (Page 11) No. 9th and Fern is not “on site.” Nor does the City staff promote the provision of transit service on site, only the destruction of a Bike/Pedestrian Pathway.

Proposed Action: Reject this TIA and deny the application.

Paula Smith

From: Terrilyn Burke <tburke@linkageservices.com>
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2018 1:08 PM
To: Keith Stahley; Tim Smith; Paula Smith; Jeff Fant; David Smith
Subject: Comment on Alex Vo's TIA for Wellington Heights Preliminary Plat Application

Hello Keith, Tim, Paula, Jeff and David,

The information below has been brought to my attention. It appears the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for Alex Vo's Preliminary Plat Application is procedurally flawed, deficient and mistaken. I hope the City of Olympia starts caring about its residents. Unfortunately, as a resident I feel as though no one at the City of Olympia cares much for its citizens yet unfortunately developers are highly regarded and courted. I'm not sure but perhaps it is for the financial gain the City of Olympia hopes to receive. I wish the City of Olympia was more progressive and operated more like Monterey or Carmel, California.

The City staff should reject this TIA along with the application itself.

Terrilyn Burke
1424 12th Avenue SW
Olympia, WA 98502

A. Procedurally Flawed: The Substantive Implications of the Denial of Due Process.

1. TIA Guidelines for New Developments (Ordinance No. 7110) states the TIA "must follow the City of Olympia guidelines for a Traffic Impact Analysis".

The staff procedure on this TIA did not follow the guidelines thereby **foreclosing** the right of the parties of record access to a record/analysis upon which they could enter on substantive grounds the mandated Hearing Examiner's public hearing.

On Page 1 of the Guidelines there is a description of "Traffic Impact Analysis Scoping Meeting." The staff did not hold a scoping meeting for this project. Despite numerous assurances to the parties of record that such a meeting would be held in the future (Paula Smith, March 15, 2018; Dave Smith, March 19, 2018) it was not held. On March 22, 2018, Assistant Planner Paula Smith informed us that, "A meeting was not held."

In the absence of such a meeting, the parties of record are denied a subsequent written report. We received such a post meeting report on the Storm Water Scoping meeting, but not on the TIA. The absence of this written record on a TIA scoping meeting forecloses the right of the parties of record to comment before the Hearing Examiner at the mandatory public hearing.

2. The TIA Guidelines call for an analysis "on the surrounding transportation system" (p. 2) and that it "shall be a thorough review of the immediate and long range effects of the new development on the transportation system." (page 3).

The staff directions to the consultant ensured that this "thorough review" would not & could not be accomplished. Thus, both the Hearing Examiner and the Parties of Record are denied a substantive basis upon which to both critique and make judgments about the effects of this application for a preliminary plat by Mr. Vo.

As is well documented by the City's own "West Olympia Access Study," or the Westside portion of the City's recent mapping for its "Transportation 2030," the "surrounding transportation system" is much greater than what the staff

determined the consultant should review for this TIA. (These studies need to be included in the record for the Hearing Examiner).

The staff limited this TIA to a minor part of West Olympia, the area south of 9th Avenue SW. This is a fragment of even Southwest Olympia, let alone the Westside. The study, therefore, did not include an analysis of the traffic that will flow up and down 10th, 11th and 12th streets back and forth to Plymouth. It did not include any traffic flows down 9th Avenue to Percival or through the rest of the northern cut-through streets such as Decatur, Milroy or Cushing. It did not include the major intersection of Harrison and Division, let alone the traffic up and down 4th avenue.

The absence of such an analysis forecloses the ability of the Hearing Examiner and the parties of record to enter the mandated hearing on a substantive basis or for the Hearing Examiner to make legitimate judgments in the presence of accurate information.

3. The City staff did not email the TIA to the parties of record thus again foreclosing their right to participate in the mandated public hearing on substantive grounds.

The City staff did email the materials from the Storm Water Scoping meeting to the parties of record as required, but it did not email the TIA to the parties of record. The City staff noted that the TIA was available on the City's website via a link that was broken and dysfunctional. Nevertheless, the availability of the City's website is not what is legally required to meet the City's obligation to notify parties of record. This obligation requires direct communication of substantive materials to the parties of record. This did not happen with the TIA.

4. City of Olympia Transportation Engineer David S. Smith indicated to the consultant that he "discuss future connection to Decatur." (March 21, 2018). This promotion by a City staff member of a flagrant violation of the City's Comprehensive Plan calls into question again not only the integrity of the City's procedure, but also the legitimacy and purpose of the TIA itself.

The connection to Decatur that Engineer Smith and City staff are promoting is an automobile connection from the proposed 18th Avenue inside Mr. Vo's preliminary plat design east to Decatur SW. This automobile connection would exit across Mrs. George Johnson's property and into the middle of a 273 foot Bike/Pedestrian Pathway. Not only does the City have no right to cross Mrs. Johnson's property, but this Pathway is permanently closed to automobile traffic, as decided by the City Council and included in the Comprehensive Plan update of 2013.

Such an option can not legitimately come before the Hearing Examiner unless the City Council has changed its Comprehensive Plan. It has not.

5. The Southwest Olympia Neighborhood Association (SWONA) was denied what they believe to be observation rights to scoping meetings thus frustrating and foreclosing its ability to participate in the public hearing process on a substantive basis.

When SWONA was informed by CP&D Director Stahley that scoping meetings were not "public meetings" and therefore SWONA representatives would not be informed in advance or allowed to observe, SWONA asked for the City's legal opinion upon which Mr. Stahley's assertion was based. The City's attorney never provided SWONA with that opinion nor did the City Council direct the City attorney to respond.

In the absence of any written legal opinion justifying the exclusion of parties of record or SWONA from these scoping meetings by Mr. Stahley, the parties of record have unjustly been denied information pertinent to their ability to participate on a substantive basis in the public hearing.

6. The City Staff has now included two streets, Division and Cushing SW, in the scope the TIA. Neither of these streets have had posted, mandatory signage, "Future Street Connector Neighborhood Connector." Only Fern Street SW has this signage. Citizens purchased homes on these two streets with the reasonable expectation that these two streets would remained closed to traffic. Clearly, the City has no right to open these two streets given the absence of public promulgation and notice to home buyers.

B. The TIA by Heath and Associates is deficient and mistaken. It should be rejected by the staff as should be the project itself.

Even with the severe limitations and personal promotions imposed by the City Staff on Heath and Associates, the TIA itself is full of deficiencies, omissions and mistakes. It should be rejected by the City Staff, as should the application itself.

1. "Developments surrounding the site are primarily residential with commercial land uses in the greater surrounding areas." (Page Three). This statement is fiction. Of the four sides on this site, two are contiguous to auto mall dealerships, one to a wooden area owned by Mrs. Johnson and only one to residential area.
2. There are five pages of vicinity maps, beginning on page four, and one page of a site map with the 17 page narrative. None of the maps show a connection to Decatur SW even though it is discussed in the narrative. This is a substantive omission.
3. There is a description of Fern Street SW and Division Street SW that states "parking is provided in areas." (page six). The omission of the narrow nature and one-sided only parking on the southern end of these two streets is particularly egregious and misleading.
4. "Ordinance #7104 shows Fern Street planned for extension" and that this extension "will take place on the south side of the site." If Fern Street was extended south of the site, it would have to run over the cliff and through the Chrysler Jeep dealership. Plus the Ordinance #7104 only shows a bike extension from 9th Avenue "to end" of Fern.
5. This Fern extension "will provide a connection to Decatur SW." It will only if two parallel streets cross each other. No, what I presume they are trying to say is that the proposed west/east 18th Avenue in the site is proposed to connect to the east with Decatur SW.
6. "Decatur Street SW will also be widened as part of this project." They cite the City's Transportation 2030 for this assertion. There is a listing of streets in this document that will be widened. Decatur is not one of them. And, although the City staff loves to continue its hope for an automobile connection south to Caton Way, it is prohibited until completion of West Side Access Study Phase II is completed, if ever.
7. "Non-Motorized Traffic": (This is the name for people who walk in our neighborhood). "The area has well developed pedestrian facilities in the form of sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike lanes that help alleviate any potential conflict between motorist and non-motorist." (Page Ten). If the intersection of 9th and Fern SW was not so dangerous, this statement would be hilarious. Instead, it is obscene.
8. "Well developed?" There is no sidewalk or curb on either side of Fern Street for one block from 9th Avenue south to the Tuscany gated community. There is also no street lighting. There is no sidewalk on the south side of 9th Avenue from Black Lake Blvd to the Fern Street intersection. There is no sidewalk from the bus stop on 9th Avenue and Fern east to Cushing SW, except in front of Village Gardens. There have been numerous pleas over the years to the City Council from residents of Evergreen Vista and SWONA to "develop" this intersection with at least sidewalks.
9. There are also, of course, no bike lanes inside Wellington West nor any proposed by Alex Vo for his preliminary plat, only two car garages. This is in line with the City of Olympia's de facto transportation policy which is the continual movement of automobiles to retail sites. The only reference to bike lanes is the elimination of the Decatur Bike/Pedestrian Pathway by driving automobiles on to it.

10. "Accident History or Pedestrian Conflicts." The TIA Guidelines require the TIA to "identify safety and access problems, including discussions of accident history... and pedestrian conflicts." (Page 4). There is no such identification in this TIA, despite the request by parties of record to consider the safety of children in the area, some of whom have been hit by traffic.

11. "Transit Service." "Intercity Transit system map shows transit services is provided on site." (Page 11) No. 9th and Fern is not "on site." Nor does the City staff promote the provision of transit service on site, only the destruction of a Bike/Pedestrian Pathway.

Recommended Action for Staff: Reject this TIA and deny the application.

Paula Smith

From: Steven Kant <StevenK@workingsystems.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2018 5:02 PM
To: Cheryl Selby; Nathaniel Jones; Clark Gilman; Jessica Bateman; Renata Rollins; Lisa Parshley; Jim Cooper
Cc: Paula Smith
Subject: Proposed Wellington Heights Project

Dear Council Members:

Like many of my neighbors, I have written to you and received no response, not even an acknowledgement of my comments.

Many of you have made specific promises of opposition to this project and you have expressed support for controlling noise, traffic, storm water, and development in our neighborhood. As you well know, the application process allows for staff review and a hearing, but the wishes of our neighborhood have no official weight.

We have no confidence that the city staff will give this project a real review.

The staff and examiner invariably agree with paid consultants who present studies showing that each project will not have a significant impact. In fact, we already have enough traffic, noise, and storm water problems. This project does not benefit anyone except for the developers. It will result in more traffic and possibly more developer bankruptcies and unpaid creditors.

The review process is created by the City Council and performed by staff; we have no control over it, but you do. You have a voice; do you intend to use it? Are you intending to keep up the silence?

Steven Kant
103 Thomas Street NW
Olympia WA 98502

Paula Smith

From: Richard Stamey <inolyarea@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2018 2:44 PM
To: Paula Smith
Subject: Re: Wellington Heights

Paula, there are several ways to get out of the development to Fern and Decatur besides a spur that goes thru our nice trail. It's BS that the city bends to the developers and us who live here get stepped on like this.

You would think there would be someone down there at city hall that would advocate for the taxpaying, voting citizens of the city as apposed to out of town developers taking advantage of the little guy reducing our quality of life and then moving on.

Some one there needs to care about what the comp plan does, not just what it says. I don't even know why you bother with public comment period and meeting. Has the city ever, oh let's say in the last 1000 years, denied a application. Do we even stand a chance? That was a rhetorical question.

Thanks for your time.

D

On Wed, May 2, 2018 at 2:06 PM, Paula Smith <psmith@ci.olympia.wa.us> wrote:

Dick- the Comprehensive Plan shows how 18th Avenue would connect to Decatur Street. Illustrated as a green dashed line as a Future Neighborhood Collector on the Transportation Map within the Comprehensive Plan (map below).

Hope that helps. Paula

Paula, I just don't get the 18th Ave. dead end on the east side of the proposed project. It's clear it it going to connect somewhere and yet it cannot connect to Decatur and it would be onerous at best to try to connect to Canton.

Which means I guess you are some how planning to connect to Decatur, which you can't.

So, I would like to see the proposed 18th dead end turned into a cul de sac. That would solve any future connection issues.

Dick Stamey

519 Foote St. SE

<)))<

--
<)))<

Paula Smith

From: Dan Leahy <danleahy43@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2018 10:33 PM
To: Cheryl Selby; Clark Gilman; Nathaniel Jones; Jessica Bateman; Renata Rollins; Lisa Parshley
Cc: Paula Smith; Jeff Fant; Cari Hornbein; Tim Smith
Subject: Comments on Storm Water Plan: Mr. Vo's Wellington Heights
Attachments: Wellington. Storm Water Critique Final.doc

Bruce Titus

BLT Inc

PO Box 1657

Tacoma, Washington 98401

Dear Mr. Titus:

These are my comments critiquing the Storm Water Plan submitted to the City of Olympia by Olympic Engineering, March 29, 2018, for Mr. Vo's Wellington Heights project. I argue that this plan and Mr. Vo's application should both be rejected. If it is not rejected, I believe your dealership, along with others located on the southern end of this proposed site, will incur serious damage from storm water.

I am also sending a copy of my comments to Paula Smith, Assistant Planner, and also to Mayor Selby and City Council members. You might want to contact them directly. We have been trying to reach the Council since September, 2017, but to no avail. Perhaps you will have better luck.

Sincerely

Dan Leahy

1415 6th Avenue SW

Olympia, Washington 98502

My Comments:

The preliminary application and proposed storm water plan have serious liabilities for the City of Olympia and the Southwest Olympia neighborhood. The plan and the application should be rejected by City staff.

Stormwater Quantity

The City of Olympia benefits from the project site in its current fallow state. Development north of the proposed project site generates considerable stormwater. Currently, in a fallow state, the project parcels act as a 'stormwater dispersion mechanism' absorbing runoff and preventing most southward stormwater flow.

The proposed plan would end this benefit to the City and to the Southwest neighborhood: the developer intends to route all upstream stormwater directly across their project site, onto the Auto Mall properties to the south.

No analysis of stormwater run-on, nor offsite stormwater facility receiving capacities has been performed. This is a serious liability in the current design. The applicant has provided only off-hand, speculative and anecdotal reports of off-site stormwater flows, rather than scientific flow measurements and calculated volumes. No run-on nor run-off gage data, and no quantification of actual run-on and run-off volumes were provided; they have merely repeated twenty-year-old design estimations.

The report acknowledges the presence of an informal ditch caused by runoff from upstream property - but proposes to both formalize this ditch and then straighten it in the southern portion of the site. At the southern boundary of the site, they intend to use a new set of riprap over a 14-foot steep slope that will direct storm water into an already existing and inadequate (east/west) ditch at the northeast corner of the Chrysler/Jeep dealership. This new riprap, among other features of their plan, will lead to increased flooding of commercial property. Unless the intent of this design is to flood the Auto Mall dealerships on the southern border, this report and its attendant application should be rejected.

Rather than subject the Auto Mall parcels to huge new volumes of runoff (and sediment), a thorough study of stormwater facility capacities should have been performed. It was not. The developer should have provided actual measured data on stormwater volumes across all parcels upgradient and downgradient that provide stormwater: both calculations and modeling should have been used to calculate the actual stormwater volumes involved, and these calculations should have included all run-on to the property, and runoff to all receiving properties. This was not done. The report should be rejected.

The neighborhood cannot be reassured by speculation when the site's value to absorb stormwater today will be completely eliminated by the proposed project. Certainly, the City will be challenged by those receiving huge new volumes of stormwater and sediment newly routed onto their properties with zero analysis of capacity.

Stormwater Quality Omissions

No information has been provided regarding run-on stormwater quality. Similar to the above comments, without characterization, I assume that the stormwater routed through the project will be too warm, with likely increases of nitrogen, phosphorous, oil & grease, pesticides, herbicides and consumer products – typical of urban runoff.

These substances will now bypass the project site's capacity to absorb contamination and will immediately flow into Percival Creek. Since Percival is a listed 303(d) water, its TMDL compliance will be threatened.

Thus, the proposed plan increases the eventuality of "flooding" commercial property, impairs "water quality" by the production of undesirable, warm storm water and damages "aquatic habitat" by sending warm storm water into Percival Creek and the Deschutes, thus impairing the City's responsibility for the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). All of these eventualities contradict the primary responsibilities of the City's recently updated Surface Water Management (Chapter Three).

Design Errors

The Stormtech catenary arch system proposed in the drainage report depends on the fast-infiltrating capacity of the sand underlying the Vashon-age glacial Till layer (maximum 10"/hour). This sand layer is very deep, and was only encountered in one location very close to the south property line next to the Chrysler-Jeep Dealership.

The entire project design depends on this small Stormtech system's feasibility and operation. This is problematic for a variety of reasons:

1. As the geotechnical report states, a lower rate than the 10"/hour maximum rate should be used for design – and the report sealed by a Professional Engineer recommended a lower rate but the designers chose not to do so;
2. No analysis of groundwater seepage along the steep bank facing the Auto mall was performed. This is a serious omission, since the Stormtech system will be subjected to a maximum capacity loading and a groundwater mound is likely to form, creating seepage along this steep slope;

3. No analysis of slope stability was performed, especially with regard to the additional groundwater seepage noted above;
4. The system's function, sizing and drainage capacity depends on sand being permeable and shallow. The operations and maintenance of the system depends on a competent HOA capable of performing frequent maintenance on a complex filtration system, an unlikely scenario.
5. No run-on stormwater volumes were added – an error.
6. No gage data were collected for any flows upstream – an omission.
7. No field data nor capacity calculations were performed on downstream facilities – an omission.
8. The report incorrectly attests to the absence of storm water on site (“puddles”- p.7)) and does not recognize the existing damage of storm water at the Chrysler/Jeep dealership. Both observations were seen this winter, and the past year was not exceptionally wet.

The lack of direct data and calculations make the report unsupportable. In short, the drainage report should be rejected along with the application.

Operations and Maintenance by an HOA

Bayfilters and StormTech Chambers.

This plan replaces storm water retention ponds with an underground StormTech Chambers located in the southwest section of the site just above the Chrysler/Jeep dealership. This system of filters and chambers is supposed to deal with more than 5,000 sf of new total pollution-generating hard surface. Unlike storm water retention ponds, however, this system requires significant maintenance because the filters tend to clog thus leading to the spread of storm water and contamination off of the site. Maintenance of this relatively sophisticated and buried system is assigned to the site's presumed Home Owners Association with neither the expertise nor financial capacity for such a task. In this eventuality, the City of Olympia will be unjustly burdened with maintenance and repair. This report and its application should be rejected.

Groundwater Seepage

The bottom of the stormtech chambers are open. The presumption is that the storm water will be absorbed on site by the sand found 10 to 25 feet below the Till. There is, however, a real possibility of a “seepage face” in which water seeps from the Stormtech system, making the southern hillside wet, leading to slope failure and landslide. Given the Stormtech's southwestern location, this would lead to direct damage of the Chrysler Jeep dealership. If the dealership moves, the City loses \$1.1 million in revenue.

Warm Storm Water Run-Off into Percival Creek

The drainage report states that “no stormwater will be discharged into a fresh water body.” This statement is demonstrably untrue. Routing stormwater across the site significantly increases flow into Percival Creek at an intensified rate thus impairing the Creek's water quality and the City's responsibility for Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), thereby risking compliance under its NPDES permit.

Pre-development land cover or historic pre-logged vegetation

This report uses the current pre-development scrub-shrub land cover to model the difference between pre-development and post-development, for stormwater modeling. This assumption is inappropriate, allowing the developer to use already-damaged habitat with reduced stormwater absorption, and thereby reduce their need to match pre-development runoff in WWHM. This is also a design error. For a more accurate WWHM model, the report should have used the difference between native forest vegetation and post-development. The calculation the report used leads to under-sizing the needed storm water system.

Permeable pavement

The report proposes that driveways will be constructed of “permeable pavement.” However, permeable pavement decays and requires maintenance. Slow failure of the permeable pavement, once forgotten by successive homeowners, will progressively overload the Stromtech system that the HOA is already unprepared to manage. This means, again, the stormwater management system is undersized and should be rejected.

Proposed Action by City Staff: Reject Report and Reject Application.

Dan Leahy

1415 6th Avenue SW

Olympia, WA 98502

5/4/2018

cc: 146 Parties of Record.

SWONA Officers

Decatur Raiders

Paula Smith

From: Phil Cornell <phil_cornell@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2018 8:46 PM
To: Paula Smith
Cc: Tim Smith; Keith Stahley; Cheryl Selby; Jessica Bateman; Nathaniel Jones; Clark Gilman; Lisa Parshley; Renata Rollins; Jim Cooper
Subject: Wellington Heights project

Paula,

As a party of record on the Wellington Heights project, I wish to voice my opposition to this project, this application and this process. I care about this neighborhood and this project alarms me in many ways. The applicant's filings to date are a whitewash of the required process. I have been emailed several documents relating to this project and after a thorough reading they present a very troubling picture of a developer who will do anything to make a profit and a municipal government shirking their responsibility to the community to appease the developer. This makes me wonder what is going on behind closed doors, what kinds of deals are being made in secret, is there any money being exchanged for favors? The lack of transparency, the fact that we must demand information and only then have access to pertinent documents, frames these questions.

As past President of SWONA I am appalled that there is not just an unwillingness to meet in our neighborhood concerning this project but an almost open hostility towards this idea. Our neighborhood includes the Auto Mall and I am hearing some very disturbing chatter about moving to Tumwater if this project is approved. I am supportive of development that enhances the neighborhood and considers all environmental, traffic, and storm water effects of the project on the neighborhood, this project does none of that in any serious manner. What I have seen is a sloppy, inadequate whitewashed effort by the applicant to satisfy the city's requirements and a city government willing to accept this effort at face value. Mr. Dan Leahy, a long-time SWONA member, has researched this project and has debunked almost every claim in the applicant's filings. This project must be denied, approval brings up the question of collusion.

**A Resolution of the Members of the
South Westside Olympia Neighborhood Association**

11/16/17

Whereas; the members of the South Westside Olympia Neighborhood Association, SWONA, care deeply about the quality of our neighborhood, and,

Whereas; SWONA is an organization dedicated to the preservation of our neighborhood, "Our purpose is to preserve and protect the character and infrastructure of the neighborhood, the rights of its residents, and the quality of the natural environment. We will do this through involving all neighborhood residents and businesses in full and democratic discussion of issues that affect the neighborhood's quality of life, informing the city of our views and advocating on proposals that affect us, and providing an opportunity for social activity and interaction among neighbors.", and,

Whereas; the SWONA neighborhood is defined as “the part of the City of Olympia east of Black Lake Blvd and Division Street, south of Harrison Avenue, west of Capitol Lake and north of Percival Cove, Percival Creek and Cooper Point Rd/Auto Mall Way” which includes the area involved in the proposed development, Wellington Heights, 2000 18th Ave SW, 17-4004, File# 17-0974 Version: 1, Nick Leung (the applicant) and Alex Vo (contact), and,

Whereas; the members of SWONA are not opposed to carefully planned development that is consistent with the existing neighborhood, and,

Whereas; in the past the members of SWONA have successfully opposed incompatible development in our neighborhood, and,

Whereas; the current proposed development is not consistent with the neighborhood, and,

Whereas; the proposed development will create unacceptable levels of traffic in our neighborhood and would create an unsafe traffic situation on Fern St SW and Decatur St SW, and,

Whereas; this development could encourage the City of Olympia to open the intersection of 16th and Fern St and the southern end of Decatur St to traffic, and,

Whereas; SWONA has successfully prevented the opening of these streets to vehicle traffic.

Whereas, 78 SWONA neighborhood households have signed and sent a letter to Nick Leung and Alex Vo stating their opposition to the "Wellington Heights" proposal, and

Whereas, in the November 7th election, three City Council members were elected who oppose this "Wellington Heights" proposal.

Now, therefore, Be it Resolved, that SWONA officers send a copy of this resolution to the City Council, the City's Planning Staff, Mr. Leung and Mr. Vo, Landowner Dean Willie and all local commercial banks who finance housing construction, and,

Be it further resolved that we, the members of SWONA and residents of the South Westside Olympia Neighborhood, are opposed to the development known as Wellington Heights, in its current form, planned by Nick Leung (the applicant), and,

Be it further resolved that SWONA's officers indicate to the City planning staff that its officers be kept informed of all actions with regard to this proposal, and finally,

Be it further resolved that SWONA officers stand willing to review with Nick Leung (applicant) and Alex Vo (contact) any future proposal **other than the current one.**

Phil Cornell – Past President SWONA

1502 15th Ave SW

360-515-1263