

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT  
CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
July 13, 2011 Page 1 of 16**

**CONVENE:** 5:42 p.m.

**PRESENT:** **Client Oversight Group:** Mayor Pete Kmet; City Administrator John Doan; Community Development Director Michael Matlock; Planning Manager Tim Smith; Senior Planners Veena Tabbutt & Kathy McCormick, Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC); Tom Fitzsimmons, Lorig; Kendra Dahlen, FLT Consulting, Inc.; Neil McClanahan, Councilmember; and Marisa Capella, Communications Coordinator.

**Focus Group:** Eric Carrier, Parks Board; Nancy Stevenson, Planning Commission; Marcus Glasper, Planning Commission; Marnie Slakey, Historic Preservation Commission; Tom Oliva, Councilmember; Joe Gross, Tumwater Chamber of Commerce; Mike Reid, Port of Olympia; and Citizens David Read, Steve Diddy, Gary Wilburn, Rob Kirkwood, Walter Jorgenson, and Eric Kjesbu.

**Other members of Brewery Consultant Team:** Faith Trimble, FLT Consulting.

**Staff:** Recording Secretary Cheri Lindgren.

**Others:** Marcia Kjesbu and Nancy Partlow, Citizens.

**WELCOME:** Mayor Kmet welcomed everyone to the last focus group meeting. He outlined the meeting agenda. At the last public meeting, questions were posed to the public to receive some feedback. This last meeting is an opportunity for members to discuss some of the ideas shared during the public meetings. He thanked members for their participation.

Kendra Dahlen reported the meeting includes a debrief on all that was learned in the process as well as what was heard during the public meetings, which were well attended and dynamic. The last public meeting on June 30 included a summarization of over 700 comments on the project. TRPC staff synthesized the comments into themes and categories to be used as presentation materials for this meeting. Comments are summarized on the agenda. Additionally, members received a copy of the PowerPoint presentation that was presented on June 30 and a summary of the polling results.

**COMMUNITY VALUES:** Ms. Dahlen said that during the first public meeting, citizens were asked about their values for the future of the brewery property as well as a survey question, which asked about the vision for the future of the brewery property. Of all ideas and messages received during the process some values emerged, which may be an area where more work may be necessary.

**SUMMARY OF VALUES:** Ms. Dahlen presented what the team developed from the themes on values:

- Honor the environment, especially the River

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT**  
**CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**July 13, 2011 Page 2 of 16**

- Employment opportunities
- Honor the history
- Connectivity throughout the site from the parks, from the downtown, to the community as well as connectivity to the people as a place to bring people together
- Public access
- Family and youth recreation
- Create a sense of place - community heartbeat

**ROLE OF VALUES:** The values will be important as this project proceeds. The values will be an overarching source of referral to see if in fact, the City is achieving community values in terms of the type of development that may occur on the site.

Ms. Dahlen invited comments.

**WHAT DO YOU THINK?**

Mike Reid said the list represents all good values, but they also represent a challenge because they are so broad and encompassing in some areas that it's difficult to pinpoint exactly what they mean. Many have a broad meaning to many different people that the value may become diluted because they are so broad. While all the values are something that everyone wants, they may be difficult to prioritize. Ms. Dahlen replied that the values were listed in numerical order as to how they were identified. Creating a place in the community was a consistent value identified by many citizens. It may be possible to define what the values mean.

Marnie Slakey said a value that's not listed but very important is something that is economically viable for the community and creates a tax base and provides employment opportunities. Joe Gross agreed and indicated that although parks are an important value, parks do not generate taxes for the City.

Mayor Kmet noted that employment opportunities generated a 72% strongly agree response, which is the strongest response of any of the value statements.

Eric Carrier commented that the public doesn't necessarily consider how the City functions or whether the City requires revenue. They may not be considering that specific value with respect to the City. The value is likely based on their wants and needs in terms of trails and parks and not necessarily how it will function and how it's maintained.

Mayor Kmet asked members how they perceive the value for honoring the environment. Ms. Carrier said there are different benefits associated with the Valley. The Valley may offer more recreation than the Knoll or the Bluff. The Valley has more variety as there could be some employment and some recreation compared to the Bluff or the Knoll.

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT**  
**CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**July 13, 2011 Page 3 of 16**

Walt Jorgensen said input from the Focus Group and the public will be used in several ways. What has been asked is what kind of value should receive attention. It appears that the input can be used by the City in considering what zoning changes or comprehensive plan amendments should be made. Although the results in the documents allude to community uses, what the information is really about is what the community doesn't want in terms of pollution and traffic that 48 units might generate. It's important to consider parameters around proposed development and any proposal that doesn't create major impacts should be acceptable. Another way to use the input in terms of economic viabilities and employment opportunities is ensuring the input on the values of the river and its historic importance are not ignored. Other suggestions include helping to market the property by sharing the values that the developer should consider, which could result in revenue generating development. The area is so big and so varied, it would not entail just one use, but multiple uses.

Rob Kirkwood said citizens weren't asked how much they would be willing to pay. All the questions asked of the public included no associated costs. The issue is how much a citizen is willing to pay on a yearly basis. Just about all the values will cost something. It's easy to ask the public what they want, but attaching the costs would help citizens assess how valuable it is to have access to the river. Faith Tremble replied that the process didn't mention costs, but there is a level of detail from the public on the level of public effort. The exercise began with high level values that included some parameters and guidelines and concluded with questions on the comfort level in terms of public commitment.

Gary Wilburn commented that all the values strike a chord for him personally. The group's job is providing input to the City recognizing that there will be many more steps down the road. However, the group's efforts should be in the context of what members would like the City to do. The City's has a role to play in all the values that he would like saved for a future time when they are less emphasized at the local government level. The riparian areas next to the river cannot be developed and it's important to determine the best way to make use of those areas that contribute to the community as a whole as well as strengthening the economic viability of the City. There should be some effort to preserve the structural fabric of this setting.

Mayor Kmet said that at one of the meetings, there was a comment on the apartment building illustrations that didn't capture the sense of history. That may speak to the need for the City to develop design guidelines that are more specific to this property that will steer new structures in a direction that reflects some of that historical ambience of the region. He expressed interest in hearing specific ideas from members on how to reflect some of the values within the City's code that will govern the brewery properties.

Mike Reid commented on the need for some comparative analysis of the value statements. For example, employment opportunities versus public access and

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT**  
**CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**July 13, 2011 Page 4 of 16**

whether the public would rather have industrial uses that provide substantial taxes but with limited public access. Mr. Reid was asked what he prefers. He said he would personally like to see what the property previously provided in terms of employment of the former brewery. He said he is curious whether the City would rather have employment opportunities and tax revenues with limited public access or increased public access but a decrease on the commercial viability of the property. The question is what is more important to the community. He questioned whether that was addressed during the exercise. Tom Fitzsimmons affirmed that the question was addressed. What is close on the value scale is the strongly agreed versus disagree score that could be interpreted that some things are more important than others are. The Focus Group has the opportunity now to weigh in. Mr. Fitzsimmons said the team will delve into each of the areas and ask similar questions. Currently, the process is focused on values and there has been some input on not just giving the whole value away to the river, public access, and public views, but retaining some for economic purposes while also protecting the river and those values.

Mr. Gross said protecting the river doesn't necessarily mean developing a large parking structure or warehouse buildings, which is what will happen if the area becomes a transit center. Oil and other pollutants will travel to the river. The issue is whether the community is honoring the river if polluting uses are developed. It may be possible to mitigate pollutants, which could lead to the generation of jobs.

David Read commented that during the public meeting, many people selected some of the environmental values and recreation opportunities because of flooding constraints in the Valley. People naturally viewed the Knoll as the economic engine that could entail mixed use of retail and commercial and not just industrial and manufacturing. The river is a very important attribute to the property and it's an important value as it makes the site unique.

Ms. Stevenson agreed that the concept of the river and its history are critical values that argue for the Valley to be a special place that the public would want to invest in and re-create employment opportunities that were offered in the past. The other values reflect what would apply elsewhere. What are pertinent to this area are the river and its history.

Marcus Glasper said that although he doesn't disagree with any of the values, it's illogical to plan on maximizing any of those values on any particular part of the property. From a realist point of view, the community should be considering what might be fruitful for particular properties that don't violate any of the values and start offering some proposals as to which pieces honors which values the most and try to maximize it from that perspective. He's heard many messages and there was a lot of discussion about the river, but people also didn't want their views jeopardized. One example is the Bluff and whether that is the area that should be focused on how not to violate the views but perhaps use it for

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT**  
**CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**July 13, 2011 Page 5 of 16**

some other value. Different pieces of the property have an opportunity to honor some of the values and perhaps that is the logical way of considering how to maximize values as opposed to how each piece honors all the values.

Councilmember Tom Oliva commented that there all kinds of taxes that are generated from parks, such as sales that occur in parks as well as properties adjacent to parks increasing in value, resulting in more property tax. In terms of values, it appears the community has made a statement about what kind of industry or property owner will end up with the brewery property. It's unknown if the Olympia Brewing Company could operate again as it had in the past. The heavy industry with sounds, traffic, and the smells likely wouldn't be popular today with the community. Since there is a clean slate so to speak, it will limit the types of industries that can locate within the community that has such stated values and quality of life requirements. The question is whether the community wants quality of life in terms of many well-paying jobs or quality of life in terms of clean water and deer frequenting the river area. There is a trade-off.

Ms. Slakey commented that's a balance of both.

Mayor Kmet referred to the floodway and the immediate area along the river and restoration efforts as well as providing public access to those areas, which doesn't preclude the ability of reusing the warehouses for some type of use. Future uses and the values are not necessarily mutually exclusive but it will involve a balance.

Councilmember Oliva said in terms of the environment, the effort didn't capture issues such as pollution, congestion, and some of the adverse impacts. The statements for environment were not that inclusive or exhaustive.

Nancy Partlow said quality of life is a big issue and parks do generate taxes. The Deschutes River is Tumwater's waterfront. The City of Olympia is doing an incredible job along its waterfront. The Valley is the logical place for environmental protection of the ecosystem. The Knoll and Bluff are where jobs should be created. The Valley could be Tumwater's recreational playground around the river. The Valley protects the river and affords one-third of the area in environmental protection while the remaining two-thirds could focus on economic development and jobs.

Mr. Fitzsimmons asked whether Ms. Partlow's set of values precludes the warehouse from functional use in the future and does that entail the Valley as an environmental area or whether the Valley can include a mix of uses as long as river and shoreline protections are included. Ms. Partlow said the warehouse is currently located in the Valley and likely won't be removed. Although parking for the Knoll property could be located in the Valley, that's not a very good use of the property. The area is a floodplain that could be restored to something special. She compared the area to Olympia's Interpretive Trail around Capitol

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT  
CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
July 13, 2011 Page 6 of 16**

Lake where something similar could be established. The Valley has been impacted by the brewery over the years. Mr. Fitzsimmons asked whether her values around the Valley could be achieved by some complementary use of the warehouse as long as it did not interfere with the achievement of the set of values.

Mr. Read commented that an attractive place that draws people can also generate tourism revenue.

**COMMUNITY VISION  
OF POSSIBLE USES:**

***CONSULTANTS  
ANALYSIS AND  
FINDINGS & PUBLIC  
THEMES AND  
PRIORITIES:***

Ms. Dahlen referred to themes for the Knoll, which were derived through a numerical hierarchy. All public comments were reviewed for the Knoll. The themes were distilled from all those comments. The number of ideas were great and could have been categorized a variety of ways. However, the themes that will be reviewed are the ones that rose to the top:

- Mixed Use: Residential, Commercial, Public
- Historic Center/Museum
- Manufacturing/Light Industrial
- Restaurants and Retail
- Parks & Recreation/Public Space
- Hotel
- Conference/Convention/Cultural and Events Center
- Small – Sustainable Business
- Education

Ms. Stevenson pointed out that since the Knoll is a large area and because of its location, there could be a number of mixed uses constructed on the Knoll. The area could offer a variety of services for people living nearby. There is a potential for all the uses.

Mr. Wilburn said the uses appear reasonable but suggested referring to the values. An important step is an inventory and an appraisal by experts of the Knoll on its historic significance in terms of its site and structures. That information should then be factored within the analysis of the different types of uses. Essentially, the sky is limit in terms of imagination and what the market could support. It's important to conduct an appraisal of the historic significance to help determine whether the buildings should be honored.

Mr. Reid commented that the Knoll is the most visual parcel of the brewery properties. From a future use perspective, the location is off the freeway and someone could determine a viable use located in the area that could be used as a lynchpin to create a public/private partnership that would entail providing the

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT**  
**CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**July 13, 2011 Page 7 of 16**

funding for a waterfront trail and other public amenities associated with the site.

Mayor Kmet offered that there are several approaches for the area. One is mandating a mix of uses or the uses could remain an option. The community has expressed a desire for mix of uses rather than one use. He asked for feedback from the group in terms of their interpretation of the community's desire.

Mr. Jorgensen said he views the brewery property as four elements to include the Old Brewhouse, Knoll, Valley, and the Bluff. The Knoll is the potential economic engine. Mixed uses could be simultaneous uses or a variety that are acceptable rather than limiting.

Steve Diddy referred to the value for honoring the environment. He questioned the difference between honoring the environment and environmental protection. Sometimes, he struggles in terms of what is Tumwater on a larger scale. Tumwater is essentially a freeway that removed much of the City. The Knoll could be the center of Tumwater and he likes the idea of it as an economic engine that anchors the Knoll and allows other mixed uses as the location does lend itself to mixed uses. His personal favorite is a campus of either business or education. It doesn't necessarily need to be a manufacturing facility. Another aspect discussed was placing boundaries. In terms of development, there are boundaries and restrictions on building in some cities. He said he favors mixed uses and working with developers. The entire brewery constitutes the brewery property. The value of honoring the history might be more important if natives were acknowledged. He supports a "soft" economic engine that attracts other types of amenities, such as restaurants and shops that could transform the area.

Mr. Gross questioned whether it's possible to zone different types of uses for the different areas. For example the Knoll could be zoned for mixed use while the Valley could be zoned as a conservation easement or zoning that enables environmental uses along the river. Zoning on the Bluff could be in a particular fashion to enable multi-family residential with the design honoring the historical significance of the area. The main objection to apartments on the Bluff was the appearance rather than the apartments. Mayor Kmet acknowledged that zoning can be accomplished for the different areas. Manager Smith said the City has existing zones or can develop new zones.

Ms. Dahlen asked for additional information on the Knoll prior to moving to the Valley. Ms. Carrier said she prefers the architecture of the old brewery and the consistency of the City buildings with respect to the brewery design. However, the façade on the Knoll should be maintained as viewed from the freeway because of its signatory importance.

Erik Kjesbu shared that he spoke with several former coworkers of the brewery who shared that if they considered purchasing or reusing the property, the

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT**  
**CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**July 13, 2011 Page 8 of 16**

property is essentially made for a brewery and that sooner or later the constraints of the deed needs to be reconsidered because it limits the reuse of the property. If a person considers reuse of the buildings, the only use is likely limited to a brewery.

Mayor Kmet said the City initiated some contact with Miller Brewing Company about the deed restrictions. It wouldn't necessarily be a brewery that competes against Miller but perhaps a smaller brew pub that could utilize the existing buildings. It's still a discussion the City would like to pursue with the company.

Ms. Partlow asked whether mixed use zoning within the City has been utilized. Mayor Kmet said it's important to define mixed use, as the state office building occupied by the Department of Health is located within a mixed use zone. However, only one office complex was built with no mix of uses. That may not be an issue with the brewery property because of its mass.

Mr. Fitzsimmons offered that there needs to be some creativity in the application of zoning as many other communities are experiencing similar situations in terms of what the community wants and is willing to put on the table to achieve those uses. There are some creative zoning ideas that warrant further exploration.

Ms. Stevenson said she prefers the flexibility of not necessarily specifying mixed uses but keeping options open.

Ms. Dahlen reviewed uses for the Valley. There were hundreds of ideas generated for the Valley:

- Multi-Use Indoor Sports and Recreation Center (many citizens recommended including an aquatic center)
- Manufacturing/Industrial/Warehouse Use – green businesses
- Family and Youth Recreation Opportunities – indoor batting cages, roller skating and ice skating rinks
- Community Center – relates to connectivity for the community for people of all ages
- Transit and Transportation – taking advantage of rail line and ensuring it is available for a Sound Transit station in the future, using it as a trolley, etc.
- Education and Training – vocational schools
- Business Incubator - warehouses could serve an business incubator space
- Cultural and Performing Arts

It was noted the uses were defined for the existing warehouses and does not include the area of the floodplain or along the river.

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT**  
**CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**July 13, 2011 Page 9 of 16**

Mr. Diddy asked whether there is competition with other sites for warehouse space. Mr. Fitzsimmons said there are many sites along the I-5 corridor that compete directly with the Valley warehouses. There are sites that have better access to the freeway as well as sites that are located within similar warehouse districts enabling supportive services nearby, such as truck stops and fueling stations.

Mr. Reid asked about the disposition of the existing rail line and whether it is protected or can be removed. Mr. Fitzsimmons advised that it's difficult to decommission existing rail lines. The abandonment process is a voluntary process. Mr. Reid suggested that reality lays the groundwork as to future uses in the Valley. It will always have a rail connection regardless of what the community wants for public amenities. Dependent on the uses on either side of the Valley, there could be train traffic through the Valley. That paints the picture for the potential uses of the site. He questioned whether community uses are conducive near a rail line and suggested it's not possible to discuss community uses without acknowledging the constraints of the site, which includes rail.

Ms. Carrier said when the City's Economic Development Advisory Committee discussed the Valley; there was acknowledgement that permission would need to be obtained to use property on the other side of the rail line. There would need to be some conversations with the railroad company. The options listed for the Valley are mostly public-related and there is a good opportunity for the City to pursue that direction. It may be possible to pursue many of the themes. The location of the trail line with respect to community uses are not necessarily in conflict and could benefit those uses.

Ms. Dahlen asked whether it's possible for both light industrial and public uses to be co-located within the Valley. Ms. Carrier affirmed that she believes it is possible to include some limited truck traffic. There's so much warehouse space available in the Valley.

Ms. Partlow asked about the frequency of trains in the Valley. Councilmember McClanahan said he lives in the area and there are approximately five to six trains a week that use the line.

Ms. Slakey said train traffic in the Valley is less problematic than coyotes in the Valley.

Mayor Kmet said when the brewery was in operation and refrigerated train cars were parking along the rail line, he would receive complaints from citizens about the noise. The spur connects to the main Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSE) line from East Olympia. To eliminate the line, it would be necessary to pay BNSF for the lines, which would be too costly. However, if BNSF decided the line is uneconomical to retain and wanted to abandon the line, the City has the

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT  
CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
July 13, 2011 Page 10 of 16**

ability to preserve the corridor and purchase the line. There is no right-of-way across the rail line. That issue would need to be resolved for future uses.

Mr. Reid said the line connects to the Port of Olympia's Marine Terminal. The Port is consistently asked to accommodate rail instead of having trucks deliver cargo to the Port. As the future of transportation is explored, cargo on rail will be considered because it is cheaper, more efficient, and better for the environment. In the near term, there could be an increase in rail activity on that line.

Mayor Kmet cautioned that all the community themes will cost an extraordinary amount of public dollars, which the City doesn't have. It would require a public/private partnership along with many other stakeholders to include the Port, Thurston County, and others.

Mr. Kirkwood suggested all those entities would need to be involved in the project. The entire county would benefit from those uses and the financial aspect should be shared by all the entities.

Ms. Stevenson questioned the possibility of the rail line connecting to downtown Olympia for passenger service. Ms. Dahlen said there were many similar recommendations for connectivity. Mayor Kmet said the Transportation Policy Board is discussing rail. For a viable rail option, there must be a destination as well as density to support the service.

Mr. Diddy suggested the warehouses and the Knoll are linked and it's likely not possible to separate the two. The warehouses are a huge asset to the Knoll. Mr. Fitzsimmons said the comment raises a good question because if the end user viewed a combination of Knoll and warehouse it would leave the river and the area by LOTT as another element. There are some potential situations where offices and mixed use could generate lease space revenue that could be supportive and governs uses in the warehouses. The warehouses are very adaptive as they are solidly built and could support many varied activities besides rail shipping and receiving. He described the existing transportation network to the warehouses.

**LEVEL OF PUBLIC  
EFFORT:**

Mr. Fitzsimmons provided an overview of the public effort. When the consultant team proposed working on the project, the concept of public effort evolved from the line of exploration from the standpoint of a largely market and physical building assessment set of conclusions that essentially revealed there is huge passion and a huge gap occurring independently. There are great expectations, but the likelihood of it occurring is limited. Essentially, the level of public effort was developed with support by steering committees. The team considered not delineating between assertive and aggressive but defining them to include organizing a new taxing authority for citizens to consider during the polling exercise to provide some sense of burden in terms of how much the

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT  
CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
July 13, 2011 Page 11 of 16**

community is willing to pursue the values and end uses to make them happen. The scores are reflective of those assumptions.

It was noted that there was some negative public feedback that the level of effort by the public was combined. Mayor Kmet added that it wasn't defined as to the level of assertive or aggressive in terms of how much property tax a citizen might be willing to pay each year. Mr. Fitzsimmons said it comes down to asking citizens if they want parks. When they respond in the affirmative, then they are asked if they are willing to pay more in property taxes. Typically, the response is no, which is the dilemma City leadership has to contend with in terms of realizing its hopes and inspirations. The polling result is very important information, as there is a strong desire by the public to see something happen.

Ms. Slakey asked whether there is any consideration to collect more scientific data from the community on more specificity on possible tax structures to help determine how committed or interested citizens are in terms of tax structures.

City Administrator Doan advised that the City must carefully approach such polling as tax dollars cannot be used to gauge the public's response to specific tax options. It is also premature at this point. However, focus groups and other instruments could be used. The City would need to be further into the process to define what it means in terms of assertive or aggressive taxing options. At this point, there are many options available. Ms. Slakey said it would be helpful to ascertain a measure of public support at this point. Mayor Kmet advised that the City must be careful in polling specific questions about how much citizens might be willing to pay. If the current owner wants to facilitate a public/private partnership, the owner could invest in additional polling of the community.

Councilmember Oliva said financing is a major element that should be of focus in the final report in terms of how the region might work together in packaging or structuring an approach to attract investment and developer participation. The findings will be important for an actionable plan rather than just connected to an exercise. Not all the values have to apply to every part of the property. If the Knoll could be economically viable, perhaps the Valley could be less developed economically. He commented on the viability of constructing condos on the Knoll with structured parking. Those residents would have unique access to the area.

Discussion followed on the improbability of converting the existing buildings on the Knoll to condo units. Mr. Fitzsimmons advised that it is possible based on the structure of the existing buildings and the existing floor plates. It essentially involves redesigning the interior on the existing set of floor plates.

Mr. Gross said the idea of condos with shops and restaurants would make the area the center of Tumwater. That's one of the visions for the area as well as riparian restoration along the river valley, which could be subsidized by the use

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT**  
**CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**July 13, 2011 Page 12 of 16**

of the Knoll.

Mr. Wilburn said the question for the group is whether members support an assertive/aggressive public effort for the Valley. He suggested it would likely be “yes” if “phased” is inserted because of the lack of time to define what an aggressive public effort might entail. He suggested the consultants have experience in other communities about what that public effort could entail in the initial steps. It will take more than just the City of Tumwater and will likely take the entire region as well as the state. A vision is needed prior to pursuing the next phase. He suggested that Mr. Fitzsimmons and the consultant team could provide some examples.

Mr. Gross suggested developing an offer to the representative of the owner that the City of Tumwater is willing to spearhead a public/private participation process for the development as well as including other public entities.

Mr. Jorgensen offered that assertive/aggressive should include something other than financial participation. The City can set the stage and choose to enter into a public/private partnership. It’s important to consider how property tax can be used. He commented on recent interest in the rail line to provide local trolley service between downtown Olympia and Tumwater.

Mr. Fitzsimmons commented that the group now knows about the interest for the site, the visions, sense of public ownership, and aspirations for the future of the site. This is a chance to convey to the City what the City should do. There are lots of ideas of what it could be as well as hope and vision. The issue is how to make it happen.

Mr. Diddy suggested the City should fund AutoCAD drawings of the existing structures for the Knoll and the Valley and that the City sponsor a worldwide contest for the best multi-use designs following the values that have been conveyed by the community. Invitations could be sent it out to all universities and design firms. The award would be more prestigious than a cash value. It’s more difficult to sell something that doesn’t exist, for example it’s more difficult to sell a concept. If the City was able to attract several world class designs, those designs could be marketed. Mr. Gross agreed with the suggestion.

The group was encouraged to offer final comments.

Mr. Gross said he views assertive/aggressive as how much the City and citizens will support moving forward. It appears the City has been granted permission to partner with others as well as investing time and effort. Waiting for the market to take over has not been successful. It’s important for the City to pull resources and entities together.

Ms. Stevenson said the idea of a contest in the design world is fascinating to

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT**  
**CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**July 13, 2011 Page 13 of 16**

develop some sort of the concept that people can view to understand the vision. That vision could be shared with the larger community to begin building stepping stones for partnerships that could lead to financing opportunities.

Ms. Carrier said she's supportive of the idea as well. At the last meeting, there was some discussion about acquiring some land in the Valley for the City. If LOTT is going to be involved in purchasing land, the City should be proactive in obtaining some public land from that transaction.

Mr. Wilburn said he likes all the ideas. It's important that as the visioning project is wrapped up, that the City takes some official positions through a phased approach to clearly convey to the public the status of the process as well as formalizing the City's commitment prior to taking any future actions.

Councilmember McClanahan commented on the partnership between the City of Tumwater, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Squaxin Island Tribe, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for a fish hatchery next to the river in Pioneer Park. The cost would be approximately \$35 million. Currently, Issaquah celebrates "Salmon Days" that attracts tens of thousands of people and \$4.5 million in tourism. The proposed hatchery would be state-of-the-art and would be a major tourism attraction for the entire region. The hatchery could be the infrastructure that connects the trail, river, parks, and the Valley. Ms. Carrier commented that the project was ready to proceed when the funding disappeared. The accompanying building would have been a wonderful addition of community space for the region.

Mayor Kmet commented on the possibility of combining the proposal with some of the existing warehouse buildings.

Councilmember McClanahan commented on the annual canoe trips by local tribes and how the Squaxin Island Tribe would like this area to be a future destination for canoe trips.

Mr. Kirkwood commented that everyone needs to become involved now and that the City shouldn't have to take on the project without support. The City should be aggressive in pursuing other support by surrounding entities. His major concern is the warehouses will sit vacant because of the lack of demand. It's important to properly convey the vision otherwise the property could sit vacant for the next 25 to 30 years.

Ms. Slakey recommended that after the City receives the report, it should pursue some aggressive engagement with other local jurisdictions, Thurston County, and the state to stimulate some action. She suggested developing a consortium with the agencies and present a specific request to engage them.

Mr. Glasper said he supports many of the ideas shared. When the owner

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT**  
**CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**July 13, 2011 Page 14 of 16**

representative attended a prior meeting, he conveyed that potential buyers were overwhelmed when they viewed the property. He suggested determining a way of sectioning the property, such as designating parcels with the greatest promise now because the entire brewery property is too overwhelming to tackle at one time. There may be different partners for the Valley property. He suggested making progress on one area and then moving to the next area because of the enormity of the property, financing challenges, and the current economy.

Mr. Reid supported Mr. Diddy's suggestion. He added that the owner's voice is unfortunately absent. However, the property is privately owned and the owner can pursue development under the current zoning. He cited the analogy of his neighbors advocating that he should paint his house white. The suggestion for soliciting designs might be viewed positively rather than discussions on possible zoning changes or other possible actions that might restrict the owner. He suggested gaining more attention from a broader perspective through the development of design visions.

Councilmember Oliva supported the idea of a charrette with the next step building on this process. He commented on the need for funds to pursue additional organizational capacity. City staff capacity is limited. This project has a life of its own. He supports establishing a public development authority or other instrumentality that provides the City and the project the support necessary to move forward. Without that, it will entail too much work. There should be some operational and organizational capacity to pursue a sustainable process.

Mr. Read agreed with several of the ideas offered. The property needs a champion, such as a development authority or a public input commission to move forward. The suggestion on a phasing effort is an important element. The Valley has been somewhat of a hindrance on the property especially in terms of flooding. If LOTT builds its facility and the river valley can be converted to a conservation easement, it will help development proceed. The Knoll will be take time to redevelop. Anything the City can do to move efforts forward is important. He expressed interest in continuing to participate.

Mr. Kjesbu expressed appreciation for the efforts by the City on the community's behalf. It has been a good beginning. There are not many places where this opportunity exists. The property is too large for the City to administer solely and the idea of a partnership between local cities and the state is worthwhile. Previous comments by the property owner have indicated intent to sell the property. There hasn't been much information shared on who has considered the property and what types of development opportunities have been considered. It's important to consider the potential buyers and why they haven't purchased the property. Any combined effort by the jurisdictions must include the owners. If they are not included, the success rate might be questionable. LOTT is a number one candidate and would be a great neighbor to the surrounding residential community. The fish hatchery idea is exciting. He

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT**  
**CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**July 13, 2011 Page 15 of 16**

suggested that more efforts need to be pursued on the legality of removing restrictions on the deed. Mr. Kjesbu said based on his personal history of working at the brewery, the heart of the brewery are not the buildings on the Knoll but rather what occurred there and the people and river that flows through it. It was the first community in the state. He said he has many good years of memories and the historical aspect revolves around the people. The people of Tumwater and its residents will make a new history with respect to the old history. He thanked City staff for their efforts.

Mr. Jorgensen said the public development authority is a good idea. However, in the recent past, the public facilities district pitted cities against one another. Fostering relationships will be needed as well as providing some visionary designs for the next steps. While not opposed to breaking up the parcels, he suggested the design professionals should consider the values, the river, and the old brewery and develop a design for the Valley, Knoll, and the buildings to carry forward commercial opportunities while utilizing the remaining areas for restoration of the natural environment.

City Administrator Doan thanked members for their diligence, attention, patience, and creativity. He said that although he can't speak officially for the property owner, he has spoken with the owner several times and can share his perception. The owner is dealing with some personal matters that are taking some of his time. The owner also represents investors who never intended to pursue any development but want to sell the property. The owner realizes that the City and the consultants provided a gift. Any developer would love to have the work completed by the focus group in terms of the community's desires. Most developers want the community's support. The focus group has completed much work in helping the owner. It is also a difficult time to be presenting a complex, difficult, and expensive project to investors. The City has some time in terms of the current economy.

Mr. Fitzsimmons said the process began with a joint focus group and the client oversight group. The purpose of this meeting was to afford time for feedback from the focus group. The Client Oversight Group will meet again with the results of the meeting provided. The next step is drafting a report for presentation to the Tumwater City Council. The goal is for the Council to accept the report and then begin the next steps in moving forward. Mr. Fitzsimmons said he will present the report to the City Council and provide recommendations on next steps. One of the recommendations will include the community obtaining control of the property or better control of the destiny of the property. There are tool kits that communities have that don't involve purchasing the property.

Ms. Partlow noted that it would be helpful to know what the purchase price is for the property. Mayor Kmet said the City has some prior purchase amounts. Mr. Fitzsimmons said a majority of the property sits in a floodplain. Mr. Read

**BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT  
CLIENT OVERSIGHT/FOCUS GROUP MEETING #5  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
July 13, 2011 Page 16 of 16**

commented on the possibility of an owner donating and writing off the property.

**THANK YOU:**

Mayor Kmet distributed Olympia brewery napkins, Tumwater pencils, and lapel pins to Focus Group members.

The property is the heart of Tumwater and it's important not to let the property sit. It will take a concentrated effort to move forward. The City will continue a presence through the update of the comprehensive plan and zoning, design standards, and investments in the area, such as extending "E" Street across the Valley and restoration efforts along the river. There are a number of places that the City can continue to pursue efforts. The brewery property is a community priority both to the community and to the City Council. The City will work within available resources to move forward and some people will likely become impatient. However, it will take time to happen. The efforts by the Focus Group were not wasted as the City plans to continue moving forward.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**With there being no further business, Mayor Kmet adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.**

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President  
Puget Sound Meeting Services