

COMMENTS:

My concern is the road at the cul de sac is suppose to go through to Rich Road and I would request that be looked at and not put through. There is the road on Haig that comes out onto Rich Rd and people speed down that road. We have children who are in the neighborhood playing and I see no purpose of another Road onto Rich Road from Glenmore Village. Also cars speed down Rich Road from Yelm Hwy and we don't want more cars taking a shortcut through the neighborhood.

Thanks,
Laurie Briggs

From: [Cynthia Stonick](#)
To: [Leah Davis](#)
Subject: Incoming Comment on Thurston 2045
Date: Sunday, November 27, 2022 7:16:57 PM

Name: Cynthia Stonick

Email: ckelpforest@gmail.com

Message: I only support the original decision to have a grocery store which is sorely needed!!!

Please explain to me why the City is providing options that require having no community oriented shopping center - which was our former goal...??

Time: November 28, 2022 at 3:16 am

IP Address: 76.135.16.103

Contact Form URL: <https://thurstoncomments.org/comment-on-glenmore-village-rezone/>

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.

From: [Cynthia Stonick](#)
To: [Leah Davis](#)
Subject: Incoming Comment on Olympia Joint Plan
Date: Sunday, November 27, 2022 7:34:02 PM

Name: Cynthia Stonick

Email: ckelpforest@gmail.com

Message: The idea to reduce vehicular parking spaces/traffic is not an option for us until there are more frequent bus times and longer bus hours. The County cannot assume they have addressed congestion issues by providing less parking spaces without realistic community transportation services.

I see no justification for the PO/MD zone. Leave the Zoning as is!!! Stop changing plans that have not been included in the long range planning process!

Time: November 28, 2022 at 3:33 am

IP Address: 76.135.16.103

Contact Form URL: <https://thurstoncomments.org/olympia-joint-plan-comments/>

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.

From: [Cynthia Stonick](#)
To: [Leah Davis](#)
Subject: Incoming Comment on Olympia Joint Plan
Date: Sunday, November 27, 2022 7:52:38 PM

Name: Cynthia Stonick

Email: ckelpforest@gmail.com

Message: Allow the elderly and other immune impaired individuals to avoid COVID and influenza by participating online and by phone for all meetings!!! If you leave us out, it is not really a public process!

Time: November 28, 2022 at 3:52 am

IP Address: 76.135.16.103

Contact Form URL: <https://thurstoncomments.org/olympia-joint-plan-comments/>

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.

From: [Cynthia Stonick](#)
To: [Leah Davis](#)
Subject: Incoming Comment on Olympia Joint Plan
Date: Sunday, November 27, 2022 8:33:29 PM

Name: Cynthia Stonick

Email: ckelpforest@gmail.com

Message: Better stormwater management must be realized. This issue already ground development within the UGA to a halt several years back. Digging deeper ditches on Wiggins Rd. only made the road that more dangerous during icy conditions. This was one of the most pathetic "solutions" for stormwater I have witnessed to date (other than just letting roads flood - which we used to do on Cooper Pt Rd by Blacklack Blvd).

We need more areas for drainage, more detention and retention ponds. Stormwater cannot be an after thought. Developers need to pay upfront for this infrastructure. The aggregate effects must not be ignored. It costs the taxpayers a lot more to fix problems after the fact. Then there is the fact that this water should be treated. Volume and run off rates are likely to be larger than we are currently required to build. Are we really addressing Climate Change if we do not prepare for future runoff volumes???

Kudos to the City for addressing waste water quantity and for their treatment methodologies. Again developers must pay for the infrastructure or we will once again have CSO problems! It appears unlikely they will be able to keep pace with development.

The schools within our area are wholly inadequate to serve the population of children residing here. Again, why aren't the developers being held accountable!!! I am horrified that we keep packing the children in closer and closer together.

I am very disappointed to see that the major builders in Thurston County are located in California and thus bring California building styles to our previously more community oriented neighborhoods. Why do the City and County not consider the ramifications of squished together homes. Where are we really building up - multifamily units have mostly been two stories??? We seem to be looking at our next step instead of ahead of us to really develop long range solutions.

Time: November 28, 2022 at 4:33 am

IP Address: 76.135.16.103

Contact Form URL: <https://thurstoncomments.org/olympia-joint-plan-comments/>

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.

Sent: Sunday, November 27, 2022 8:33 PM
To: Leah Davis <leah.davis@co.thurston.wa.us>
Subject: Incoming Comment on Olympia Joint Plan

Name: Cynthia Stonick

Email: ckelpforest@gmail.com

Message: Better stormwater management must be realized. This issue already ground development within the UGA to a halt several years back. Digging deeper ditches on Wiggins Rd. only made the road that more dangerous during icy conditions. This was one of the most pathetic "solutions" for stormwater I have witnessed to date (other than just letting roads flood - which we used to do on Cooper Pt Rd by Blacklack Blvd).

We need more areas for drainage, more detention and retention ponds. Stormwater cannot be an after thought. Developers need to pay upfront for this infrastructure. The aggregate effects must not be ignored. It costs the taxpayers a lot more to fix problems after the fact. Then there is the fact that this water should be treated. Volume and run off rates are likely to be larger than we are currently required to build. Are we really addressing Climate Change if we do not prepare for future runoff volumes???

Kudos to the City for addressing waste water quantity and for their treatment methodologies. Again developers must pay for the infrastructure or we will once again have CSO problems! It appears unlikely they will be able to keep pace with development.

The schools within our area are wholly inadequate to serve the population of children residing here. Again, why aren't the developers being held accountable!!! I am horrified that we keep packing the children in closer and closer together.

I am very disappointed to see that the major builders in Thurston County are located in California and thus bring California building styles to our previously more community oriented neighborhoods. Why do the City and County not consider the ramifications of squished together homes. Where are we really building up - multifamily units have mostly been two stories???. We seem to be looking at our next step instead of ahead of us to really develop long range solutions.

Time: November 28, 2022 at 4:33 am

IP Address: 76.135.16.103

Contact Form URL: <https://thurstoncomments.org/olympia-joint-plan-comments/>

Sent by an unverified visitor to your site.

From: ckelpforest@gmail.com
To: [Leah Davis](#)
Subject: RE: Incoming Comment on Olympia Joint Plan
Date: Monday, November 28, 2022 10:38:11 AM

Leah,

Thank you for all of the information/clarifications you provided!!

Fyi- I am not alone in feeling dissatisfied with the amount that developers are paying for infrastructure. And I can assure you that the school crowding situation was getting to be a problem when my son was younger eighteen years ago!! Are there some new high schools in the Glenmore Village area that I don't know about??

Thanks again for your thorough and respectful responses to my comments and queries. It is nice to communicate with somebody who takes the time to respond and on top of this, explain what I missed!!!

Sincerely,
-C

From: Leah Davis <leah.davis@co.thurston.wa.us>
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2022 9:01 AM
To: Cynthia Stonick <ckelpforest@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Incoming Comment on Olympia Joint Plan

Ms. Stonick:

Thank you for sharing your comments regarding these issues. This particular process is to update the Olympia Joint Plan, it is the comprehensive plan of the Olympia Urban Growth Areas. It does not contain any regulatory language for the issues you have brought forward.

However, there are already many regulations in place that attempt to control runoff; as is their duty, I believe the school district is always working toward dealing with the growing school population; and developers do pay for infrastructure (fire, police, parks and schools) through the building permit process and always provide the streets, sidewalks and lighting when a new development is approved.

Thank you for your comments.

Leah Davis

From: Cynthia Stonick <donotreply@wordpress.com>

Andrew Deffobis

From: Sandler & Seppanen <Laurel.Lodge@Comcast.Net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2022 2:57 PM
To: Leah Davis
Subject: Comments on the Olympia Thurston County Joint Plan

Olympia and Thurston County Planning Commission Members,

I strongly urge the Planning Commissions of the County and City to continue to seek new information and a redrafted Joint Plan before approving the Joint Plan. My key issue relates to housing.

Housing (page 78-80): Thanks to staff for the updated numbers. Unfortunately, the numbers shown are for the combined City of Olympia plus the UGAs. This study must provide the TRCP data for the UGAs specifically. And, unfortunately looking to the TRCP data out to 2045 population demand for housing in the UGAs will slightly exceed the remaining buildable land units estimated by TRCP. This raises some challenges:

- How will the city overcome the sewer challenges to allow the growth expected in the UGAs. Based on the Attachment B Map and Narrative, the area with the most vacant space is the Northeast area. The other areas, except the upper west side area, can each take some of the units needed but not much.
- How will the Northeast UGA take on about 1,000 more units by 2045? There are no plans for a neighborhood center somewhere along South Bay Road. Why not? Does the fact that this is UGA land mean there is no intention to provide 10-minute walking to services in that area as it grows? The plan has no change to South Bay Road to accommodate the additional travel of many additional people.
- How will the county and the city achieve preservation of farmland in the UGA (some 123 acres currently in the UGAs based on a recent analysis) when that land is needed for housing? The city already made the mistake of reducing farmland by turning the UGA based Spooner Farm site along Yelm Highway in a park with no plan for mitigation of that farmland loss. Not planning for mitigation in the face of these inevitable changes means continued loss of farmland.
- About half the farmland in the UGAs is in the Northeast UGA, much of it along Woodard Creek. Is the thinking that this farmland that provides open space and water filtration should be turned into housing with no mitigation strategy for the loss? This is an issue the county and city must address.

Here are the numbers that lead me to warn that there will in 25 years be less room for housing in the UGA than demand for housing in the UGA. TRPC forecasts 1,990 more people in the Olympia UGAs by 2040 and another 1,000 people 5 years later (2045) based on the TRCP forecast.

Jurisdiction	Calibrated		TRPC		TRPC Forecast Most Recent Jurisdiction Boundaries					
	2010	2020	2021	2022	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	
Olympia	City	46,478	55,605	55,960	56,370	58,840	62,980	66,960	69,760	72,040
	UGA	11,840	12,480	12,510	12,620	13,270	13,390	13,730	14,610	15,610
	Total	58,320	68,085	68,470	68,990	72,110	76,370	80,690	84,370	87,650

TRCP says that the UGA has 5,100 housing units now and will need to add 1,200 units to 2040. Extrapolating out to 2045 there may be a need an additional 500 to 600 units in the UGA above the 1,200 already in the Buildable Lands Report – 1,700 to 1,800 units needed. The Buildable Lands Report – (Appendix II – Residential Capacity by Planning Area) reports a capacity of 1,680 units. That capacity will not grow unless the zoned density increases. This plan does not mention the

need to increase UGA density which is 68% low density single family homes. That means the amount of space needed for the planned population growth is tight or may even be inadequate to the need. That's where planning is needed but absent in the draft version of the plan.

Other Items in the report that need attention:

Page 12 – the population data are out of date. They should reflect the latest TRCP population estimates, not those made a decade ago. The population in the City and UGA today is 68,990 (68,058 in 2020) and in 2040 will be 87,650; in 2045 it is forecasted to be 87,650. What is important, however, is to know the population growth in the UGA which is not provided in the draft joint plan. The numbers are 2022 – 12,620 (12,480 in 2020) and in 2040 will be 14,610; in 2045 it is forecasted to be 15,610.

Jurisdiction		Calibrated		TRPC		TRPC Forecast Most Recent Jurisdiction Boundaries				
		2010	2020	2021	2022	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045
Olympia	City	46,478	55,605	55,960	56,370	58,840	62,980	66,960	69,760	72,040
	UGA	11,840	12,480	12,510	12,620	13,270	13,390	13,730	14,610	15,610
	Total	58,320	68,085	68,470	68,990	72,110	76,370	80,690	84,370	87,650

Attachment B needs to be part of the draft plan. The maps in Attachment B are more helpful than any of the maps in the draft report.

Page 80 – housing units is a count of the housing units in the City plus UGA. The last section of that discussion says 12,350 more units are needed in the Urban Growth area. That is the number for the urban area (City and UGA). At minimum, the term Urban Growth area should be revised. Better yet change the numbers to reference the housing units needed in the UGAs as that is the point of this report – not the housing the combined area.

Loretta Seppanen, Olympia Resident