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Pete Kmet, Mayor  
City of Tumwater  
555 Israel Rd. S.W.  
Tumwater, WA 98501

Re: Final Report for the Community Visioning Project - Former Olympia Brewery

Dear Mayor Kmet:

On behalf of all members of our consultant Team, Lorig Associates is pleased to submit this final report and recommendations on our work related to developing a community vision for the site of the former Olympia Brewery.

In the following pages, you will find a summary of the project approach and a report on the findings and conclusions of our work. We also offer a limited number of recommendations for future activities that, in our view, will help to make the community vision for the former brewery that emerged from this project a reality.

It was a great honor for our Team to work on this Project. As you know several members on our Team live and work in the Tumwater Community, so for them, the Project was even more special. In fact, without their dedication to the Community and willingness to contribute significant time at no cost to the project, this ambitious undertaking would not have been possible. We thank them for this and their great work.

We hope you find our work on this project helpful in defining a strategy to achieve the clear community vision and expectations that emerged from the community engagement process.

Again, we thank you for the opportunity to have worked on this project and we look forward to further discussions with you about our report.

Sincerely,


Tom Fitzsimmons  
Chief Operating Officer

Cc: Mr. Jared Burbidge, Project Manager  
Thurston Regional Planning Council
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. **Project Overview**
   a) Project Background
   b) Project Approach
   c) Project Team

2. **Community Visioning**
   a) Brewery Visioning Focus Group
   b) Citizen Engagement in Brewery Visioning and Development
   c) Values, Visions And Themes For Brewery Development
   d) Community Perspective About Methods To Achieve Desired Outcomes

3. **Building and Site Analysis**
   a) Assessment Methodology
   b) Regulatory Considerations
   c) Site Infrastructure
   d) Building Condition
   e) Adaptive Re-use Assessment

4. **Economic Analysis (Lorig)**
   a) Methodology
   b) Residential Rent Study
   c) Development Proforma

5. **Overall Project Conclusions and Recommendations**

6. **Exhibits**
   1.1 Project Scope of Work
   1.2 Client Oversight Group
   1.3 Site Ownership
   1.4 Site Areal Map with Sub Area Delineations
   1.5 Assessment Screen Tool
   2.1 Brewery Engagement Plan
   2.2 Focus Group Roster
   2.3 Brewery Visioning Project Public Response VALUES
   2.4.1 Brewery Visioning Public Meeting - The Entire Site
   2.4.2 Brewery Visioning Public Meeting - The Knoll
   2.4.3 Brewery Visioning Public Meeting - The River
   2.4.4 Brewery Visioning Public Meeting - The Valley
   2.5 Press Articles
   3.1 Site Areas#1
   3.2 Site Areas#2
   3.3 Land Use Map
   3.4 Zoning Map
   3.5 Flood Plain Map
   3.6 Knoll Building Massing
   3.7 Knoll Buildings
   3.8 Knoll Pictures Exterior
   3.9 Knoll Pictures Interior
   3.10 Valley Buildings #1
   3.11 Valley Buildings#2
   3.12 Bottle House Interior Pictures
   3.13 Bluff Site
   3.14 Knoll Demo Idea #1
   3.15 Knoll Demo Idea #2
   3.16 Knoll Demo Idea #3
   4.1 Office Comparable
   4.2 Apartment Comparables
   5.1 Matrix of Community Action
   5.2 Continuum of Partnerships
Project Background

This document is the final report of a project to develop community vision for the site of the former Olympia brewery in Tumwater, Washington. The project was sponsored by the City of Tumwater in collaboration with the Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC). This site consists of two separate properties, the former brewery complex and the historic brew house. This project focused on the brewery complex, although in the context of the iconic historic brew house.

TRPC secured funding for this project through a federal energy grant. Key aspects for use of the grant funds were to include: reuse of an existing industrial site; rejuvenating a former urban activity center; integrating the site into the surrounding area; and maximizing its potential to contribute to trip reduction by adding opportunities to live, work, shop and play where possible. The former brewery site was targeted as a perfect candidate for this work.

The City of Tumwater Economic Development Plan recognizes the brewery site as a key economic development asset, important to both Tumwater and the broader region. The site has the potential to serve as an economic engine and iconic symbol for Tumwater long into the future, but features specific challenges that community stakeholders need to address collaboratively.

TRPC solicited responses from consultant teams to assist on the project through a competitive process. The Lorig Associates team was selected through the process and contracted for a scope of work that involved project management, community outreach, building and site infrastructure analysis, regulatory considerations, assessing the potential for realistic redevelopment including public/private partnership scenarios and providing “next step” recommendations to TRPC and the City. The full scope of work for the project is included with this report as Exhibit 1.1. The project activities progressed generally through four phases:

**Phase I – Project Start Up (March – April):** This involved a detailed discovery process to understand the political, community, historical and environmental context of the project by the project team as well as confirmation of scope and schedule of work and the outline and framework for Community Engagement Plan.

During this phase, working closely with TRPC and the City of Tumwater a *Client Oversight Committee* comprised of TRPC, Tumwater staff and elected officials was formed and began meeting. This Committee served as a guiding group for the work throughout the project for the public and jurisdictional review processes. The composition and members of this group are detailed in Exhibit 1.2.

Also during this phase the *Brewery Focus Group*, described further in the Citizen Engagement portion of this report was formed; background meetings with current property owners, brokers and agents were held; and review and compilation of previous site planning, historic assessment and economic development documents was conducted.

**Phase II – Assessment (May, June, and July):** This phase included analysis of the buildings and property, current property owner plans, structures and site conditions, economic, political, regulatory and community vision and attitudes to develop a baseline for compatibility or lack of compatibility
with potential development scenarios and plans. The phase identified the extent to which the property can be developed, critical concerns for the adaptive reuse of structures on site, key economic issues, survey the local and regional market demand for viable and likely uses, establish the necessary investment and financial return parameters and identify likely funding and finance mechanisms. In addition, this phase identified the range of potentials and public and private aspirations currently existing through community and Brewery Focus Group meetings and discussion and dialogue with the public at planned public meetings.

**Phase III – Citizen Engagement and Development Scenario (May, June, July):** This phase completed the assessment of the property ownership, buildings and site considerations, zoning, environmental and economic issues and integrated what was learned about the capacity of the buildings and the site, the likely future regulatory environment, the most economically realistic new uses in the current market and political environment with the vision and community aspirations for the area. This correlation of capacity, market demand and community aspiration defined options for the economic development of the site and framed realistic development scenarios used for community conversations and reaction in the context of the citizen visioning results from the previous phase.

**Phase IV – Project Findings Review, Documentation and Reporting (August – September):** This phase developed this report on findings, processes and recommendations. The report is designed to serve as a guide to the best, most effective reuse of the buildings and property, considering and balancing the current and likely future economic, structural, community and programmatic context.

**Project Approach**

The project was approached as a fully integrated Team including Lorig Associates staff, all other members of the Lorig Team as well as staff from the City of Tumwater and TRPC. The work was performed in an interactive and transparent approach designed to encourage collaboration and exploration guided by the City and community visioning in the context of financial and property condition and ownership realities.

The City’s Economic Development Strategies clearly contemplates creating a renewed sense of place for the Brewery site. The central focus of the work was to create development strategies to implement the community vision for an economically vibrant district.

Outside of the scope of work, Lorig sponsored a brainstorming charrette based upon background information and economics for the community and past studies. Many Lorig staff not working on the project directly participated in the charrette as well as several staff from the City and TRPC. The brainstorming charrette allowed orientation, relatively unrestrained exploration of the potentials and defined the possibilities and challenges.

The approach to assessing structures was to essentially let the buildings, the site and its surrounding urban context guide us to the best conclusion. The methodology for assessing the site and buildings was based on a parallel investigation of the three main influences on a successful strategy: Jurisdictional and Community Interests, Economic and Market Factors, Architectural and Engineering Assessment. The Team incorporated the lessons provided by the previous planning for the area, assessments of the structures and the local use and regulatory environment. We held meetings with code officials and planners to understand the potential for site-specific land use and environmental regulations.
The architectural and engineering sub-team did the technical review of building conditions and structural integrity. The methodology of this approach is outlined in the Building and site analysis section of this report.

The citizen involvement and visioning sub-team led the visioning work consistent with the budget for the project and the desires of the city. The economic sub-team, led by Lorig, surveyed of the local and regional market demand for viable and likely uses, established the necessary investment and financial return parameters and identified likely funding and finance mechanisms. This report provides considerable detail on the approaches and outcomes of each of these lines of effort in the following sections.

Finally, what was learned about the capacity of the buildings and the site, the likely future regulatory environment, the most economically realistic new uses in the current market and political environment was merged with the vision and community aspirations for the area. The correlation of capacity, market demand and community aspiration is what resulted in reasonable options for viable economic development of the site.

**Property Subareas:** The former Olympia Brewery property that was the subject of this project is quite large covering some 175 acres in total. It is also under a variety of ownerships as depicted in Exhibit 1.3. To help focus the assessment of the property, the study team divided the site into three distinct areas. These areas are: The Knoll, The Valley and The Bluff and are identified in Exhibit 1.4. Since each of these areas offers unique challenges and opportunities for redevelopment, this approach allowed the community to better understand these potentials and opportunities and better structured the conversations and visioning. This subarea approach was used throughout the project and is one of the central organizing principles of this report.

**Potential Reuse Screening Tool:** The Team developed a screening tool to quickly identify the opportunities and challenges of each idea for potential reuse of the property or property subareas. A copy of this tool is included with this report as Exhibit 1.4. The tool was applied to most of the reuse ideas, and to some degree, was helpful. However, with the exception of flood plain issues, in applying the tool, it became clear that the answer for nearly all reuse proposals was the same: *there are few significant environmental, structural, regulatory or access issues that will prevent nearly any of the reuse ideas*. The factors that work against most of the reuse ideas are economics and market conditions.

**Project Team**

The Team assembled for this project consisted of experienced members of Lorig’s staff who managed the project, coordinate all work, conducted the economic and development potential analysis and strategic plan, assisted in the community visioning, and wrote this final report.

**Lorig Associates** is an award-winning real estate development company with a strong reputation of success in improving communities in the Pacific Northwest through creative and insightful real estate development and property management. Since 1972, the firm has completed over 58 significant projects through personal attention, quality design and construction, and sensitivity to our clients’ goals.
Johnson Architecture & Planning performed the architectural, historical and building condition assessment, regulatory requirements and urban concept design. Johnson has extensive experience leading teams to assist public and private property owners with economic and structural assessments of large urban sites and landmark properties in the Puget Sound region.

KPFF Consulting Engineers is one of the largest civil and structural engineering firms in the Puget Sound area. KPFF has accomplished hundreds of significant site development projects. The firm’s role on this project was to help on the environmental assessment, review of past studies, and assessed civil & structural engineering issues.

FLT Consulting, Inc. is a public affairs consulting firm with offices in Olympia and Seattle, Washington. Since 2000, the firm has helped clients get projects unstuck, develop solutions, and move ideas forward committed to strengthening public programs by grounding decisions in solid performance planning, best management practices and informed decision making. The firm’s role on this project was to design and conduct the community and stakeholder outreach, visioning, and public information.

REDEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS LLC is a local development firm with thirty years experience in development including six approved historic tax credit projects. The firm assisted in reviewing building Conditions and developing potential development approaches. Specific Team members working on the project included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lorig</th>
<th>Johnson Architects</th>
<th>KPFF</th>
<th>FLT</th>
<th>Redevelopment Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Lorig</td>
<td>Stevan Johnson, Susan Upton,</td>
<td>Bryan L. Tokarczyk, PE</td>
<td>Faith Trimble, Kendra Dahlen,</td>
<td>David Brubaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Fitzsimmons</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Mark A. Veldee, PE, Jordan Brown,</td>
<td>Linda Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Orr</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Design Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Frivold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly the project would not have been a success without help from other members of the full “team” including Tim Smith, City of Tumwater Planning Manager and Veena Tabbutt, TRPC Senior Planner, Members of the Oversight Committee and Members of the Brewery Focus Group.

In addition we thank the following for their help as well:

South Sound Bank – Tumwater Lodge donation
Michael Cade, Executive Director, Economic Development Council of Thurston County; Newsletter articles and announcements
George Sharp, Executive Director, Olympia-Lacey-Tumwater Visitors and Convention Bureau; Newsletter articles and announcements
Jacalyn Tobosa and John Freedman, Olympia Tumwater Foundation;
Donation of Brewery historic materials for public meetings
Einmaleins Broadcasting Network, [http://einmaleins.tv.com](http://einmaleins.tv.com); Video of May 31st Public Meeting
The public engagement goals for the Brewery Community Vision Project were to:

1. Ensure broad and specific participation;
2. Develop a community vision that incorporates the realities of market, site and structural analysis; and,
3. Build momentum and excitement for possible future development.

The consultant team, guided by the Oversight Committee, sought to achieve these goals by capturing the community’s imagination of what the site could become informed by the history and prominence of the former Brewery and a comprehensive evaluation of the site’s economic and physical potential for redevelopment. To this end, the project team implemented a strategy that involved multiple opportunities for public comment on specific issues, ideas for subareas and values for development of the entire site.

This strategy was guided by Team’s comprehensive Brewery Visioning Project Engagement Plan and is included in this report as Exhibit 2.1. The Plan proved to be exceptionally effective. Between April and July 2011, an inspired community provided over 700 comments through mail surveys, public comment cards, website response and public meetings. Comments were correlated into themes for subareas of the brewery site and values were defined to guide future development of the entire site.

**Brewery Visioning Focus Group**

As the project began, Mayor Kmet nominated a select group of community citizens to work directly with the consultant Team on a substantive ongoing basis. This group became known as the Brewery Focus Group and anchored the public engagement process. The group was comprised of elected officials, city advisory board members, citizens, business representatives, property owner representatives, and community stakeholders. This dedicated group served as the project sounding board, adding perspective and experience to the research, analysis, findings and observations offered by the consultant team. The Membership Roster for this group is provided in Exhibit 2.2.

The Focus Group met five times. Each meeting was structured to provide an informed and iterative sequence to lead toward a realistic and sustainable vision for the Brewery’s future. The meetings involved intensive review of site analysis, including establishment of distinct site subareas, discussion of the integrity and complexity of structures, property ownership issues, valley flood plain constraints, access, assets and liabilities, and historic, regulatory and market analysis. Focus Group members achieved a thorough understanding of the development challenges balanced with the obvious and unique attributes of the site. They comprehensively addressed marketing and economic realities affecting development. The group de-briefed after public meetings, discussed the public’s values, priorities and themes generated from the robust public meetings, and melded themes into conceptual scenarios.

The final Focus Group meeting resulted in a relatively robust conversation between Group members about their various perspectives on the visioning process and what members believed the City of Tumwater should consider in moving the community vision forward. A sample of member’s comments during this final meeting included:
- Leverage the purchasing interest of LOTT. Move on this opportunity.
- Involve larger regional community to realize long term vision.
- Implementation needs a Champion.
- Achieve success in one area at a time.
- Conduct a worldwide design contest.
- Assemble public/regional entities to agree to do something together.
- Re-engage the tribe in the fish hatchery development. The fish hatchery could “flip the switch” and generate more development opportunities; city, county and tribes join to make it happen.
- The ‘Heart’ is not the buildings; it is the spirit of the people who worked there.
- The people of Tumwater will make a new history for this site.

All the Focus Group meeting agendas and detailed notes from their meetings are available on the City of Tumwater Homepage: http://www.ci.tumwater.wa.us/ Click Emerging Issues - Tumwater Brewery Visioning Project

Citizen Engagement in Brewery Visioning and Development

**Survey and Comment Cards:** Tumwater residents and businesses received letters from Mayor Pete Kmet informing them of the Brewery Visioning Project. Monthly news releases were issued and public meeting notices included a brief survey. Prominent comment boxes like the one pictured to the right, were located in City Hall and the Library. The following questions comprised the survey and were also printed on comment cards:

- What is your vision for future use of the former Olympia Brewery site?
- What types of improvements to the site would you like to see that could enhance the community’s quality of life?
- Do you think there may be obstacles or challenges to developing the property as you envision?

The abundant and thoughtful responses to these questions were blended with results from public meetings to define Values and Themes for future development of the Brewery properties. Exhibit 2.3 provides a summary of the public’s ideas for the Brewery generated through these comment cards and survey questions.

**Public Meetings:** Over 200 citizens participated in two dynamic public meetings at the Tumwater Valley Lodge. Participants arrived with drawings, photos, proposals and notebooks to illustrate their inspired ideas and visions for the future of the Brewery. During meetings, we displayed historic artifacts and prominent news articles to honor and illustrate the legacy and vitality that once existed and the central role the Brewery served in the community.

The public meetings were structured to capture the public’s ideas and to solicit values and visions for the future of the Brewery. Break-out sessions, small group discussions, and electronic polling were interspersed with interactive information presented by Tom Fitzsimmons and Steve Johnson. The public engaged in lively sharing of concepts and priorities for distinct subareas of the Brewery property: the Knoll, the Valley, the River, and the Floodplain.
Public Meeting #1, May 31st, 2011; Tumwater Valley Lodge: The first public meeting provided participants information about the project from the consultant team and obtained the public’s perspectives. The meeting was planned and facilitated to achieve five goals:

- Orient the public to the project and the site.
- Present analysis of the site, buildings, challenges and assets, and issues for consideration.
- Obtain values for future development of the Brewery.
- Solicit ideas and priorities for development of specific areas.
- Influence project planning and final public meeting.

Meeting participants were oriented to the substantial geographic area encompassed in the visioning process. We introduced the concept and rationale for establishing sub-areas within the site, presented issues for consideration including building configuration and structural conditions, ad-hoc construction methods, economic and marketing challenges, and property ownership implications.

With the assistance of City of Tumwater and Thurston Regional Planning Council, some 14 facilitators led systematic table based discussions with approximately 8 participants per table. These small group discussions addressed the core components of the visioning process: Values to guide the future of the Brewery site; and Preferred uses for the Knoll, the Valley, the River and the Floodplain.

The results from these highly energetic discussions were recorded and combined with public comments derived from survey, website and comment cards. Thurston Regional Planning Council staff sorted and organized the multitude of value statements, development ideas and public priorities. These comments were then distilled and consolidated into predominant values and themes for Brewery development.

Public Meeting #2, June 30th; Tumwater Valley Lodge: The second and final public meeting was structured to:

- Confirm the values and themes that emerged from the 700+ comments received through public outreach, and
- Determine the level of public support for achieving desired priorities for future development.
- Electronic polling was used to measure concurrence with value statements and themes for development of the Knoll, the Valley, the River and Floodplain.
Values, Visions and Themes for Brewery Development

Defining the values was a central discussion point with members of the public. Public meeting participants expressed their desire to assure that future plans for the Brewery are rooted in community values that will guide future development scenarios. In general people agreed with the values; however their comments implied that more time was needed to refine the values and develop clear definitions. Employment opportunities (72%) and public access (68%) received the highest level of support, with family and youth recreation (33%) receiving less enthusiasm. This was due in part to interpretation of ‘family and youth’; “what about teenagers and young adults?” people asked. And, “we don’t want the whole site to be devoted to family and youth recreation”. These comments suggest the need for further work on the values, including defining values statements that pertain to specific areas of the brewery site.

### Community Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment opportunities</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business incubator space, new sustainable light industry, mixed commercial development.</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Access</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide public plazas, recreation opportunities, bicycle paths and trails throughout the site.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create a Place – Community Heartbeat</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A new vibrant center of activity for Tumwater</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honor the environment, especially The River Riparian corridor restoration, access to the river. Learning/interpretive center. Wildlife viewing.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honor the history</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge heritage with museum and evoke history through restoration and design standards.</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connect site with community, Pioneer Park and provide trails and paths to connect the entire site.</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family and youth recreation</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunity for year round family recreation and exercise.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ideas from the public meeting break-out sessions were combined with those submitted through survey, website and public comment cards. All of the public’s ideas and statements were recorded verbatim, sorted and consolidated into themes for the Knoll, the Valley, the River and Floodplain. Hundreds of creative and thoughtful ideas were received, along with sketches, renderings, photos, and research of other old breweries that have been successfully revitalized.

The majority of the ideas for development of the Knoll pertained to mixed use. Comments and ideas for the Knoll referred specifically to “mixed use” or delineated a combination that comprised mixed use. Below are typical examples of comments supporting mixed use?

- Residential, retail, offices, shops, public market
- Apartments, condominiums, retirement community, restaurants, retail
- Live/work/nightlife
- Offices, school, restaurants, residential, retail, parking garages
- Shopping, live performance, lodging, art studios, restaurants, rock wall
- A hub for Tumwater-like a downtown district

Fifty nine percent (59%) of meeting participants strongly agreed with the themes for development of the Knoll, and thirty four percent (34%) agreed. Meeting participants requested to rank the list of nine proposed uses for the Knoll. Electronic polling was conducted to rank the themes. Mixed Use received forty four percent (44%) of the votes with Conference/Convention/ Cultural and Event Center trailing in second place at thirteen percent (13%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes for the Knoll</th>
<th>Preferred Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use: Residential, Commercial and Public Use</strong></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference / Convention / Cultural and Event Center</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Center / Museum</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Campus</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and Retail</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small /Sustainable Business</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation, Public Space</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing, Light Industrial</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concurrence with Overall Themes for the Knoll

Strongly Agree: 59%  Agree: 34%  Disagree: 4%

Public comments and ideas for the Valley were distinctly different from the ideas for the Knoll, utilizing the warehouses, rail lines, flood plain and nearby river to inspire a range of uses. Public use and access comprised the majority of ideas. A wide variety of creative ideas were proposed for recreation activities, light industrial use, education, solar energy and performing arts. Below is a sampling of ideas received for the Valley:

Multi-use indoor sports and recreation center
- Aquatic center
- Athletic complex/ Basketball courts
- Ball fields / Minor league baseball stadium
- Family fun center - indoor putt-putt golf, batting cages, go-carts, bumper cars, etc.
- Skating rink
- Indoor soccer

Manufacturing/Industrial/Warehouse use
- Brewery /Micro breweries
- Light manufacturing - Bikes, kayaks, economical and sustainable.
- Green industries / solar panels
- High tech industry

Cultural and Performing Arts / Links with Community Center
- Music/arts/concert venue
- Natural amphitheater
- Performing arts

Transit and Transportation
Pedestrian/transit and bike friendly-public transit
Preserve rail corridor and/or increase rail activities
Transportation link to downtown Olympia

Thirty three percent (33%) of meeting participants strongly agreed with the themes for the Valley and fifty two percent agreed. The ideas and themes for the Valley were so diverse that meeting participants needed more time to discuss the possibilities for the warehouses and recreation opportunities for the floodplain. Discussion of the rail line, frequency of use and its potential also needed more discussion. Also, further understanding of compatible activities in the Valley would benefit the public’s vision for future uses.

Meeting participants requested to rank the list of proposed uses for the Valley. We conducted electronic polling to rank the themes. Multi-Use Indoor Sports and Community Center / Family and Youth Recreation Opportunities received the highest ranking at thirty seven percent, followed by Manufacturing, Industrial and Warehouse use at twenty seven percent. Transportation hub received the least votes at five percent.
Themes for the Valley

| Multi-Use Indoor Sports and Community Center / Family and Youth Recreation Opportunities | 37% |
| Manufacturing/Industrial/Warehouse Use | 27% |
| Public Events and Performing Arts | 14% |
| Education / Vocational Training | 10% |
| Public Access and Connectivity | 7% |
| Transportation Hub | 5% |

Concurrence with Overall Themes for the Valley
Strongly Agree: 33%  Agree: 52%  Disagree: 8%

Public comments and ideas for The River and Floodplain essentially focused on public access, recreation opportunities and river restoration. Below are some of the main ideas that emerged for the river and floodplain:

- Green space connecting people to the river
- Interpretive center, river-walk, learning center, ecosystem education
- Jogging/walking paths, passive recreation, wildlife viewing
- Kayaking, river activities
- Salmon restoration and fish hatchery
- Passive recreation and open space, picnicking and eating areas
- Paths and trails throughout the flood plain connecting Pioneer Park to Deschutes Parkway
- Baseball fields and sports fields

Sixty five percent (65%) of meeting participants strongly agreed with the themes for the river and floodplain. Participants did not rank the list of themes for the River.

Themes for the River and Floodplain

| 1. Parks, Recreation and Public Access | 2. Bicycle Paths and Trails |
| 3. River Restoration | 4. Connectivity Throughout Entire Area and to Pioneer Park |
| 5. Trails, Pathways, Picnic Areas Along River Corridor | 6. Public Event and Performance Space, Amphitheatre |
| 7. Wildlife and Interpretive Center | 8. Recreation Opportunities in the Floodplain |
Concurrence with Overall Themes for the River

Strongly Agree: 65%  Agree: 35%  Disagree: 0%

A summary of themes for the entire site, the Knoll, the River and Floodplain and the Valley is provided in Exhibits 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.4.3, and 2.4.4.

Community Perspective About Methods To Achieve Desired Outcomes

During the second public meeting, in addition to confirming values, visions and themes for development of the Brewery properties, meeting participants were asked to express what level of public effort they would support to achieve their desired uses. The questions for this exercise emerged from both the Focus Group and The Oversight Group as described in the final section of this report. Four alternative approaches with increasing levels of public initiative were discussed:

1. **Passive**: Let the Market Do It (Little to No action would be taken influence outcomes for the Brewery).
2. **Moderate**: Use Existing Tools (Zoning, expedited permitting, infrastructure improvements).
3. **Assertive**: (Partner with Others; Adapt Additional Tools.....Public/Private partnerships with development agreements and incentives).
4. **Aggressive**: Take Local Responsibility; Create New Tools (Create an entity to take charge of marketing and developing the Brewery).

The ideas behind these approaches were discussed at length during the meeting. Examples were provided and terms were defined generally, but in a manner that was meaningful and understood by the majority of the participants. Using electronic polling devices, participants registered their comfort level with the other alternatives responses for each of the site subareas; The Bluff, The Knoll and The Valley. A summary of the results of the polling during the meeting appears in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Bluff</th>
<th>Moderate Action 66%</th>
<th>Assertive/Aggressive Action</th>
<th>N/A (Consultant’s recommendation: Moderate action is adequate for the Bluff)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Knoll</td>
<td>Moderate Action 87%</td>
<td>Assertive/Aggressive Action</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>Moderate Action 84%</td>
<td>Assertive/Aggressive Action</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table suggests and as was voiced loudly during the discussion about the approaches, participants in the meeting strongly expressed a sense of urgency to take action to achieve their visions for the site and strong support for more assertive/aggressive approaches for action related to the Knoll and the Valley.

**Media Attention**: As a result of both the consultant team and the City staff, the project gained some attention in the local press. City Staff and the Mayor also conducted an Editorial Board interview. Copies of articles are included with the report as Exhibit 2.5.
Assessment Methodology

The assessment of the Olympia Brewery site and buildings was an effort in which the entire team participated. There were several site visits and walk-through(s) of all the Brewery buildings with team members from Lorig, Johnson, KPFF, Redevelopment Consultants and FTL accompanied by City of Tumwater and Thurston Regional Planning Council staff. The team visually inspected and photographed every level of every major structure on the site, walked the entire site area and toured the surrounding community. The Team also developed and overview orientation to the site which is included with the report as Exhibits 3.1 and 3.2

Construction and permit documents were found on-site in some disarray, but were organized by the team and reviewed for structural and building systems information and for their future usefulness as background information for future redevelopment planning and design.

Team members interviewed planning staff and staff from the local utility providers, obtaining information on the condition and capacity of the infrastructure serving the site. Agencies and organizations with specific interests in the site (e.g. FEMA) were also contacted and provided documentation and information regarding the property.

The team also reviewed available documentation provided by the Tumwater Historical Society and by George Heidegerken, the current owner of the historic brewery property and his architectural team. The information available from these sources was exceptionally helpful in our investigation and assessment.

Regulatory Considerations

The redevelopment of the Olympia Brewery property will be controlled by several local regulatory ordinances including:

- The City of Tumwater’s Land Use map
- The Tumwater Zoning Ordinance and Map and
- The Riparian, Floodplain and Shoreline Regulation areas.

Land Use: The Tumwater Land Use Map (Exhibit 3.3) identifies the current uses and regulatory districts affecting the site. The Land Use Map identifies the Knoll property as Light Industrial (LI) for the most part, with the western portion that lies within 200’ of the Deschutes River as Shoreline Environmental (SE). The SE area includes all of the M Cellar Building and the western and southwestern portion of the Brewhouse/Cellar building.

The Zoning Map (Exhibit 3.4) identifies the Valley area as LI, with a portion designated SE extending from the river to the existing railroad tracks and including the southern part of the valley floor coincident with the FEMA 100-year floodplain. The FEMA floodplain map (Exhibit 3.5) is in process of being revised to include essentially the entire Valley with the exception of the major building footprints and the Tumwater Land Use map will likely be revised to conform to these changes. The Bluff area is designated as LI on the Land Use Map.
**Zoning:** The Tumwater Zoning Map and zoning code establishes the permitted uses and development limitations on the site. The Zoning Map designates the site areas as follows:

- The Knoll: LI, with Historic Commercial (HC) designation across Boston St. SE along the Deschutes River
- The Valley: LI, with Open Space (OP) along the Deschutes River
- The Bluff: LI with Single Family Low Density (SFL) across Cleveland Ave SE and to the south

A review of the Tumwater Zoning Code suggests that General Commercial zoning would be appropriate for most of the potential uses of the Knoll and the Valley and that the Multi-Family Mediums Density (MFM) zone might be appropriate for the Bluff parcel.

The shoreline regulatory environment for the Deschutes River and floodplain includes the Riparian Buffer, which extends 200’ from the river or to the west edge of the railroad tracks, and the Shoreline Jurisdiction, which extends to the limits of the FEMA designated 100-year Floodplain (Exhibit 3.5). FEMA regulations allow local jurisdictions to permit development within a 100-year flood plain under certain conditions. However, the Tumwater Municipal Code (TMC) expressly prohibits development within the flood plain for structures or grading. This is located in Section 18.38.055 – One-Hundred Year Floodplain Sub district—Permitted Uses.

Several previous land use studies have been conducted to facilitate improvement of the area. A Land Use Plan for the Deschutes Neighborhood of Tumwater, updated in 2005, has been compiled by the TRPC. This document cites the Deschutes River Special Area Management Plan, which amends the Shoreline Master Program for the Thurston Region. All of these planning documents should be reviewed as part of a redevelopment plan.

**Historic Considerations:** The Olympia Brewery property has played an exceptionally significant role in the history and development of the City of Tumwater and Thurston County. The structures on the site being analyzed in this study are not currently listed on local, state or national registers of historic buildings. However, it is the opinion of the consulting team that, although the structures are relatively recent - largely being constructed between 1934 and 1976 - the importance of the site to the local community, the scale and extent of the development and the architectural quality of several of the buildings support consideration as an historic district, with individual buildings eligible for historic status. This opinion appears to be supported by the historic assessment of the site prepared in 2009 for the City of Tumwater.

While historic or landmark status may restrict or modify certain approaches to redevelopment, the tax-credits available to potential investors could prove a valuable incentive.

**Environmental Considerations:** While a detailed review of environmental issues and considerations was beyond the scope of the project, the Lorig Team did make several observations. The Team’s review of available studies and regulatory references identify some potential limitations to redevelopment, largely due to the site’s proximity to shoreline, function as a flood plain, and the impact of stormwater.

The majority of the site area that is affected by these limitations lies within the Valley and Knoll parcels. The Knoll parcel is within the riparian buffer, but according to available maps, is out of the...
100-yr flood plain. The Valley parcel lies within the 100-yr flood plain of the Deschutes River and within the shoreline buffer areas. Due to periodic flooding and the current Tumwater Municipal Code, grading and construction of new structures will not be allowed. Future uses of the Valley Parcel will need to be tolerant of periodic flooding.

The Tri-City and Olympia railroad track bed and adjacent areas of the Valley Parcel may contain pollution of heavy metals. An environmental site evaluation is needed to identify the need for remediation or isolation of contaminants.

The most recent Phase II Environmental Report on the brewery property was completed for the Miller Brewing Company in 2001 before their subsequent sale of the property in 2004. The current owner in California has declined the opportunity to share that report with the visioning team. Their realtor reports that the report apparently deals primarily with asbestos pollution in the form of pipe wrappings and potentially in ceiling tiles.

Since the brewery shipped much of its production by semi-tractor trailer, the site should be screened for hydrocarbon spillage.

Because the Deschutes River is a salmon-bearing stream we recommend further investigation of the main rail line and the many spur lines in the valley sub area to determine levels of heavy metal pollution along the tracks. Since some of these right-of-ways have been in use for approximately one hundred years, particulates of lead, mercury, and cadmium that are part of older rail car brake shoes may well be present. Since the rail lines have been inundated by flood waters twice in the last ten years it is also possible that heavy metals are getting into the river during these events.

Other forms of pollution from upstream agricultural and non-point sources could leave residues on the brewery property during these flood events. This kind of pollution cannot be addressed from the brewery property without channelizing the river itself. It would take a basin-wide interlocal plan and agreement to prevent this kind of flood related pollution, thereby improving the salmon habitat. With the potential for public ownership of the valley sub area the other major habitat improvement could be accomplished by landscaping the river banks with native shade trees that were lost with re-channelization during the 1940’s. Providing shade over most of the surface water could lower ambient stream temperature and improve the salmon habitat.

The Thurston County Regional Planning Council has developed a river bank restoration plan as part of the June 2009 Final Proposed Shoreline Master Program and area specific Land Use Plan for the Deschutes Neighborhood of Tumwater. This will be a consideration in any redevelopment of the Valley Parcel.

Drainage improvements will be required according to the Thurston County Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual at the time of future permitting and construction. Construction of bio-swales and ponds are needed to provide water quality and flow control mitigation of proposed redevelopment plans.

The Bluff parcel may have a potential sensitive area in that the area lies near the top of a steep slope. Additional geotechnical site investigations are needed to determine the possible impacts and limitations to structural foundations and setbacks to the existing slopes. Drainage improvements
needed for development of the Bluff parcel will be based on geotechnical investigations, grading concepts, and investigation of existing drainage courses.

**Building Codes:** A detailed analysis of the local building codes as they apply to the redevelopment of the Olympia Brewery buildings was largely beyond the scope of this study. However, observations made by the Lorig team during the site and building walk through and document reviews brought out a number of issues that must be considered.

While significant architectural changes will be required to many of the buildings (particularly the Brewhouse/Cellar building) to allow for new uses, conformance with current code requirements will have an equal or greater impact on the redevelopment scope of work. The buildings have been vacant since 2003, therefore any and all new uses must comply with current building codes, including structural, energy and accessibility codes all of which have been greatly changed since the Brewery buildings were constructed. Code requirements will require significant alterations or complete replacement of the structural systems, the exterior walls and roofs, exit stairs and elevators, electrical and mechanical systems among others.

Because building systems and the exterior envelop require substantial renovation, it is the study team’s opinion that the Knoll buildings should be considered as unfinished floor plates, and redevelopment should not rely on the reuse of any of the existing building systems, except as they may contribute to and be preserved as historic preservation efforts.

**Site Infrastructure**

**The Knoll Site:** The parcel defined as the Knoll (See Exhibit 3.2) is 7.2 acres on the bluff above the Deschutes River. The parcel is separated topographically from the valley floor and is bounded by Custer Way SE to the north, Boston St. SE and the Deschutes River to the west, the railroad tracks to the east and the elevated Capitol Boulevard S to the south. Steep slopes confine the Knoll on the west, south and east.

The Knoll appears to be a remaining piece of a glacially formed ridge that has been cut away and isolated by the Deschutes River. The dense soils appear to be competent to support large loads on conventional spread footings. Further geotechnical explorations will provide information needed to determine feasibility of redevelopment.

While the Knoll is surrounded on three sides by public streets, site access is limited due to relatively high volumes of traffic, difficult turning movements and topography. Further evaluation of traffic ingress/egress and emergency access will be needed for potential redevelopment options.

The Knoll is served by public utilities that were used to support the former brewing operations. The assessment of the current capacity and condition of these utilities is beyond the scope of this study; however, the Lorig team has reviewed the available public documents and has made the following general observations:
1. The Knoll is served by public utilities that have been used to serve the former brewing operations. The assessment of the current capacity and condition of these utilities is beyond the scope of this study. There are public utilities in adjacent Custer Way Southeast, as shown on city utility maps, available to serve the site. Further research and analysis will be needed to document the capacity and condition of existing utilities needed to accommodate proposed development options. Utility providers will assess utility availability and/or need for potential upgrades once the scope of development has been resolved in enough detail to quantify service needs and impacts to existing utility capacity.

2. The site is served by a sanitary sewer lift station, located beneath the bridge of Capital Boulevard South, which discharges to a 14” force main to the public main running along the railway to the north of Custer Way Southeast. According to available maps, this is at or near the 100-yr flood stage boundary. Upgrades will likely be necessary for future redevelopment of the sites.

3. Apparently water service has been provided via connection to existing well fields, located south of the parcel, and public water mains in Custer Way Southeast. Due to well water rights being changed to municipal use, we anticipate improvements to the water system to connect to the municipal system and to provide loops for fire fighting use.

4. Power service has been provided via a PSE substation located near the east limit of the Deschutes River, east of, and below, the Capital Boulevard Bridge. The location of the substation is vulnerable to river flooding, so upgrading the power services is expected to be necessary.

5. Existing Site drainage systems consist of buried conveyance piping that discharges to the Deschutes River. There are no documented water quality or flow control facilities on-site.

6. There are three separate structures on the Knoll: The Office & Bottle house A Building, the Main Brew house & Cellar Building and the M Cellar Building. These structures are assessed in the subsequent Section and are shown in Exhibit 3.6.

**The Valley Site:** The Valley site is comprised of the parcels directly surrounding the Brewery warehouses. These parcels, totaling 11.2 acres, are shown on the accompanying Exhibit 3.10. Physically the Valley is defined by the Cleveland Avenue bluff to the east and northeast, and the hill forming the Knoll to the northwest. The south boundary is defined by the properties currently being acquired by LOTT. The west boundary is the Deschutes River. The Valley properties are accessed from the driveway down from the Knoll and by the bridge at E St Southeast. Evaluation of traffic ingress/egress and emergency access will be needed for potential redevelopment options.

The Valley site is divided by the Tri-City & Olympia Railroad Company (TCRY) railroad tracks. We understand cargo train traffic will remain operational well into the future. Coordination with the railroad companies will be necessary to develop access and site improvements.

The Valley site is an industrial site that is essentially flat and largely covered with asphaltic concrete paving. The entire area falls within the FEMA designated 100-year flood plain, as shown in Exhibit 3.5.
Site drainage systems consist of buried conveyance piping discharging to the Deschutes River. There are no documented water quality or flow control facilities on-site.

Since the former brewery operations occupied both the Knoll and Valley parcels, the utility services are understood to be inter-connected. Therefore, infrastructure evaluations for The Knoll Site are applicable to the Valley as well.

The buildings in the Valley fall into two categories: The main warehouse/bottle house structure and several nearby support structures. These structures are assessed in the following section.

**The Bluff Site:** The Bluff is a 2-acre parcel of undeveloped land accessed from Cleveland Avenue S.E. The site is approximately level and is well setback from the steep bluff above the valley floor. The site is served by utilities including power, water, sewer and storm drainage from Cleveland Ave. SE. There is an easement for electrical power along the eastern boundary of the site. Additionally there is an unopened 1939 street right of way easement across the center of the parcel, but it is not known if this easement is in effect at this time.

Existing site drainage appears to sheet flow away from the site to the west, down the slope. Site development will likely involve grading to collect drainage which will then be conveyed to a stabilized downstream conveyance system.

Further research and analysis will be needed to document the capacity and condition of existing utilities needed to accommodate proposed development options. Utility services will provide an assessment of utility availability and/or needed upgrades once the scope of development has been resolved in enough detail to clarify requirements.

**Building Condition Assessment**

**The Knoll Buildings (Exhibit 3.6):** There are three separate structures on the Knoll: The Office & Bottleshouse A Building, the Main Brewhouse & Cellar Building and the M Cellar Building. All of these buildings were built in several phases, as shown in Exhibit 3.7.

The Office and Bottleshouse Building was constructed in several stages from 1935 to 1960. It is the first building constructed by Olympia Brewery on the knoll, and it has housed many functions over its life. Most recent uses include corporate offices and a bottling facility.

The northern and western portions of the Office & Bottleshouse building are part of the earliest phase of construction. These portions of the building are cast-in-place concrete frame, with stucco-finished masonry exterior walls and steel industrial windows. The building has a high-bay central room with bottle washing equipment. The upper floors contain corporate offices, break-rooms and maintenance shops. The structural frame is apparently in sound condition. Structural improvements are likely to be required to the lateral system, particularly with any selective demolition.
The exterior walls are in good condition. However, these exterior walls are un-insulated and will need significant improvements and full window replacement to meet current code requirements.

The southeastern addition to the building was built as corporate offices and is a wood-framed structure. The exterior condition is fair, with un-insulated walls and glazing. There are no provisions for accessible access to the structure. (See Exhibit 3.8 for photographs of the Knoll buildings exteriors)

The interior of the Office & Bottlehouse building is in fair to poor condition. The high-bay bottling areas and the maintenance areas have no interior finishes. The office space interiors have been significantly damaged by water intrusion and mold. There are elements of reasonably high-quality interior finish construction (e.g. the open stairways, railings), but these elements in many instances do not meet current codes. (See Exhibit 3.9 for photographs of the Knoll buildings interiors)

*The Main Brewhouse & Cellar Building:* The Main Brewhouse and Cellar Building housed the brewing operations and an estimated 600 55,000 gallon tanks. This four, five and six story building is an agglomeration of 15 separate but adjacent structures. Built between 1936 and 1968, each individual “block” was separately permitted and supported on its concrete foundation. The “blocks” can be seen in the attached diagram in Exhibit 3.7 with the separate cellar blocks labeled A through L and the brew house blocks labeled A through C. Common utilities, corridors and stairs serve the combined blocks.

The Brewhouse and Cellar Building blocks are typically constructed with concrete foundations, exposed steel structural frames and cast-in-place concrete floors. A few of the roofs are framed in wood. There are two distinctly different exterior wall types in the Main Building. The fermentation and malting room blocks (Brew houses A, B, C) have aluminum and glass curtain walls. The storage blocks (Cellars A through L) are enclosed with cast-in-place concrete walls with metal siding. The concrete walls partially encapsulate and brace the steel structural frame. None of the exterior walls or the roofs is insulated.

The steel-framed structural system and concrete foundations appear to be in good condition, with posted large vertical-load capacities in most areas. The Cellar tanks are supported independently of the floor system, which may need investigation as part of a redevelopment plan. Any existing lateral resistance structures will be compromised with the removal of the exterior facades. The buildings may have been constructed in a way that the individual blocks are not integrally tied together.

The original staged construction of the “blocks” of buildings may have been performed in such a manner that the buildings are not integrally tied to act as a cohesive unit. Further study should be performed to identify existing conditions and possible retrofit scenarios to address this issue.

Existing diaphragm continuity and attachment to the exterior walls requires examination as a gap for insulation between the slab edge and wall is visible in the original construction drawings of the M Cellar building, which may apply to other existing cellar buildings. Façade removal and replacement will likely facilitate making required new connections as part of a future redevelopment)
Anticipated floor loading and existing gravity framing capacity, with primary focus on the Cellar buildings, should be investigated for future re-development. Design floor loads, such as those listed on the existing drawings, could be violated under certain uses in particularly when modifications necessary to address existing sloped floor framing are incorporated. Future redevelopment as residential or light office may not have floor-loading concerns. Retail, hospital, and educational could have vertical capacity concerns depending on how the buildings may be used and specific loading conditions.

The curtain wall systems in the Brewhouse areas are in fair to good condition, but the glazing and the aluminum mullions have minimal thermal performance, and do not meet current code. The concrete/metal siding facades of the Cellar building blocks are also in fair to good condition, but lack insulation, fenestration and interior finishes. While currently providing weather-protection, the exterior facades offer no value for most redevelopment scenarios.

The interior of the Brewery areas are in fair to poor condition, having been damaged by the salvaging of equipment and tanks and by water intrusion. There are large holes in the Brewery building floors, left by tank removal. The existing interior partitions and room functions are highly specialized to the brewery operations and are not appropriate for most redevelopment options. There are three elevators in the Brewery area, which do not meet current passenger elevator codes.

The interiors of the Cellar buildings are entirely taken up by beer ageing tanks. The floor levels vary between individual blocks and are connected by open steel stairs, which are non-code compliant.

**M Cellar Building:** The M Cellar Building is a 6 story isolated storage tank structure. It is separated from the Main Building by a driveway leading from Boston St. SE to the valley floor and is perched directly above the banks of the Deschutes River and falls. It is constructed very similarly to the storage “blocks” in the Main Building, with concrete foundation, steel structural frame and concrete floors.

The M Cellar building is essentially identical to the Cellar Buildings in the main building with similar concerns regarding the exterior building shell and building systems. There are no interior partitions or finishes. Except for one small lab area, the interior is almost entirely dedicated to ageing tanks.

**The Valley Buildings:** The buildings in the Valley fall into two categories: The main Warehouse & Bottlehouse B structure and the several surrounding support structures. See Exhibit 3.10 and Exhibit 3.11

**The Warehouse & Bottlehouse B Building:** The Warehouse & Bottlehouse B building was constructed in six phases over a period from 1954 to 1968. The building contains a total of approximately 300,000 SF, with a 250,000 square foot footprint.

The earliest building was Bottle House B, constructed in three phases in the north portion of the valley, with either laminated arched structures or open wood trusses and contained office mezzanines and two levels of bottle washing and filling. The Bottle house structure is on an approximate 30’ x 30’ structural grid. The roof of the Bottle House is constructed with saw tooth clerestories and ceiling heights vary up to approximately 20’. Gable end fenestration also provides natural light.
The Warehouse was developed to the south of the original Bottle House structure, in three phases, creating a continuous warehouse floor of 210,000 SF. These later phases are framed with long-span laminated timbers.

The Warehouse buildings are constructed with long-span open bays with 60’ spans. The long spans and ceiling heights of 20+/- make for highly flexible and adaptable spaces. The structure and exterior shell of these buildings is in good to excellent condition. The exterior facades provide numerous access doors, but few windows. Natural light is provided by skylights or clerestories.

There are very few interior partitions, with the exception of the office areas in Bottlehouse B. The interior finishes, where they exist, are in fair to good condition. See Exhibit 3.12 for images of the interiors of the Warehouse & Bottlehouse B building.

**The Support Structures:** There are approximately 10 structures designed for specific brewery utility, maintenance, canning and bottling functions built surrounding the main warehouse/bottle house. Most of these structures are small and are function-specific, containing boilers, or brewery process equipment. They are typically steel framed, single story industrial structures.

Two of the support structures substantially larger than the others: The Empty Bottle Warehouse is a 35,000 SF, single-story, long-span steel-framed industrial building, similarly constructed, the Bottle washing Building is a 25,000 SF high-bay building with a large mezzanine.

The existing systems of the warehouse may lack a complete lateral system or appropriate detailing due to the construction period and staged construction. Adequate seismic detailing of the structures may not be present as required to provide lateral load sharing and reduce the impacts of building pounding. Investigation into potential retrofit schemes and localized strengthening should be an area of focus on further development.

The existing saw tooth clerestories in the original construction of the Bottlehouse B may have created an inherently localized weakened zone within the roof diaphragm against lateral loading that may need to be reinforced.

**Adaptive Re-use Assessment**

**The Knoll Buildings:** (The Office and Bottlehouse A Building, The Brewhouse and Cellars Building and the M Cellar Building) It is the team’s opinion that the several buildings on the Knoll in combination, and the Brewhouse and Cellars Building in particular, are too large and too bulky to accommodate most adaptive reuse functions. The multiple orientations of the structural frame of the Brewhouse and Cellars Building also will make the removal of the ageing tanks difficult.

Therefore, we developed several test scenarios where selective demolition of various building “blocks” resulted in building configurations better able to support a variety of reuse options. These selective demolition options also improved the natural light and air needed for those uses. Several of these potential selective demolition concepts are shown in Exhibits 3.14, 3.15 and 3.16. For example, the selective demolition shown in Exhibit 3.16 creates a cluster of buildings with depths of 60’ to 80’, which are suitable for small office and residential uses and for retail lease spaces. The selective
demolition suggested would eliminate portions of the lateral resisting capacity for these buildings and needs to be assessed structurally.

These concepts are not intended to be specific to identified or preferred uses. They are however, generally envisioned as potentially supporting corporate (Exhibit 3.14), educational (Exhibit 3.15), and “town center” (Exhibit 3.16) uses. The town center concept could include a mix of retail, office and residential uses. This concept seems to be generally accepted by the community in the public meetings. The town center idea has been used in the economic analysis presented in Section 4.

The selective demolition of portions of the Brewhouse and Cellars Building, in conjunction with the necessary removal of the concrete façade panels as needed for the application of a new exterior, will require careful structural assessment. See Appendix X for structural observations.

Any redevelopment scenario for the Knoll buildings has to take into account that new construction within the area designated as Shoreline Environment (SE) will face significant regulatory hurdles. For this reason, our consideration of redevelopment options for the Knoll area does not include new construction in the SE mapped zone.

*The Valley Buildings* (The Warehouse & Bottlehouse B Building, The Empty Bottle Warehouse & Bottle washing Building) The Valley buildings were built as light industrial facilities and warehouses to a high standard of quality and utility for their purpose. They continue to be in good condition and offer highly flexible space. The greatest impediment to their reuse is the likelihood of intermittent flooding of the staging and parking areas surrounding the structures. The floors of the warehouses themselves are set at 4’ above the surrounding area, above the maximum predicted height of flooding.

It should be noted that expansion of the existing building footprints will likely be prohibited by the shorelines and floodplain regulations.

Site access is somewhat limited by the E Street SE bridge capacity. Rail access for freight service should continue to be available in the future.

Utilities appear to be adequate to support most redevelopment options.

These buildings are very suitable for future warehouse and light manufacturing, as long as those functions can tolerate infrequent but unpredictable disruption by flooding. The also may be suitable for other uses such as recreation or business incubators. The column free areas and ceiling heights will not accommodate certain court sports such as tennis and the spaces appear quite adequate for most sport and recreation uses.
Methodology

The key focus of the economic analysis for the project was to consider the potential and challenges of the buildings for development activities from a financial and developer’s perspective. To achieve this responsibility, Lorig undertook the following activities:

1. The site development charrette served as a brainstorm for potential development ideas and approaches for the site including and excluding the buildings. Participants in the charrette were provided background material and past studies on the area for the workshop in advance including historic and community information and case studies of other like areas in the country. This workshop generated a number of ideas, not constrained by economic or engineering data about the site and thus served as a vision of what “could be” without consideration practical market constraints.

2. Lorig visited the community and site on at least six occasions to ensure a good sense of the actual condition of the site and its context and help envision potential future uses.

3. Lorig also considered economic trend data for the area from local reports, the TRPC data base and interviews with local real estate experts.

4. Lorig staff conducted extensive and personal research on current market data in the Tumwater Area including apartment, warehouse, and office rental rates, condominium sale prices, land value assessments and the vitality of the local commercial and retail sectors. Lease absorption rates, local construction costs and a number of past economic studies were also considered and the Lorig Team met with the broker on two occasions about potential tenants in a development on the site. The range of office availability, rental rates and comparable opportunities is depicted in Exhibit 4.1. The range of market rate multifamily availability, rental rates and comparable opportunities is depicted in Exhibit 4.2.

5. Based on our market analysis, our own and the community vision for the site, our best experience in similar developments, construction cost estimates, the building specifications and identified uses for the buildings (commercial/retail, multifamily, market-rate rentals, condominiums, and hospitality), current market comparables, and interviews with local experts, Lorig developed proforma analysis for hypothetical residential, commercial and office developments for the site.

Residential Rent Study

Since mixed use development involving multifamily residential was so strongly preferred through the visioning process and since multifamily residential development on the bluff appeared to make most sense, Lorig conducted a more complete apartment rent study using the services of Dupre & Scott. The focus of the study was new (since 2007) single and two bedroom apartments in the area. The tables below show the results of the data research. There were relatively few new apartments available in the area on the date of the assessment which is in part, a good indication that vacancy
rates are low for the new stock. On the other hand, rent rates compared to other areas are also relatively low.

*The New Apartments (Since 2007) in the Tumwater / Olympia Area Current Vacancies, One Bedroom Average Rental rate = $1.14 / sq. foot and the New Apartments (Since 2007) in the Tumwater / Olympia Area Current Vacancies, Two Bedroom Average Rental = $1.06/ sq. foot.*

Most significant to note is that the data for the same unit types for all of King and Pierce Counties average $180 per square foot.

**New Apartments since 2007 in the Tumwater Area Single Bedroom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparable Number</th>
<th>Current Rent ($)</th>
<th>Current rent ($/nrsf)</th>
<th>NRSF</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>Turnover rent: $965 ($1.27/nrsf)  Heat paid by: T; Water/sewer paid by: T; Garbage paid by: O; Open parking: Unknown; Carports: Unknown; Garages: 95; Decks: Yes; Fireplaces: Yes; Washers/Dryers: Yes; Elevator: No; Security: No; Rent incentives: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>$1.26</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>Turnover rent: $941 ($1.26/nrsf)  Heat paid by: T; Water/sewer paid by: T; Garbage paid by: T; Open parking: Unknown; Carports: Unknown; Garages: Unknown; Decks: Yes; Fireplaces: Yes; Washers/Dryers: Yes; Elevator: No; Security: No; Rent incentives: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>$0.92</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>Turnover rent: $915 ($0.96/nrsf)  Heat paid by: T; Water/sewer paid by: T; Garbage paid by: O; Open parking: Unknown; Carports: Unknown; Garages: 85; Decks: Yes; Fireplaces: No; Washers/Dryers: Yes; Elevator: No; Security: No; Rent incentives: Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New Apartments since 2007 in the Tumwater Area Two Bedroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparable Number</th>
<th>Current Rent ($)</th>
<th>Current rent ($/nrsf)</th>
<th>NRSF</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>Turnover rent: $1,145 ($1.18/nrsf)  Heat paid by: T; Water/sewer paid by: T; Garbage paid by: O; Open parking: Unknown; Carports: Unknown; Garages: 95; Decks: Yes; Fireplaces: Yes; Washers/Dryers: Yes; Elevator: No; Security: No; Rent incentives: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>Turnover rent: $1,134 ($1.15/nrsf)  Heat paid by: T; Water/sewer paid by: T; Garbage paid by: T; Open parking: Unknown; Carports: Unknown; Garages: Unknown; Decks: Yes; Fireplaces: Yes; Washers/Dryers: Yes; Elevator: No; Security: No; Rent incentives: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>$1.13</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>Turnover rent: $1,650 ($1.33/nrsf)  Heat paid by: T; Water/sewer paid by: T; Garbage paid by: T; Open parking: Unknown; Carports: Unknown; Garages: Unknown; Decks: Yes; Fireplaces: Yes; Washers/Dryers: Yes; Elevator: No; Security: No; Rent incentives: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>$0.86</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>Turnover rent: $1,025 ($0.89/nrsf)  Heat paid by: T; Water/sewer paid by: T; Garbage paid by: O; Open parking: Unknown; Carports: Unknown; Garages: 85; Decks: Yes; Fireplaces: No; Washers/Dryers: Yes; Elevator: No; Security: No; Rent incentives: No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Proforma

As a way of assessing the feasibility of redevelopment of the buildings on the knoll site into a mixed use facility, and/or the development of market rate apartments on the bluff, and as a way of educating the community and decision makers, Lorig used detailed proforma to create hypothetical and interactive (terms can be adjusted on a screen in real time and the results are automatically recalculated) “development” budget calculation tool for potential redevelopment projects. This budget tool was derived from assumptions about lending rates and terms, required equity investment, construction costs and rental rates. The budget for a mixed use multi family residential development derived through the tool appears below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Development Budget for Tumwater Area (Proforma)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Loan Terms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Coverage Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Income per NRSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: Monthly Other Income per NRSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Monthly Expenses per NRSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly NOI per NRSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly NOI per NRSF Less: Allowable Monthly Debit Service per NRSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Cash Flow per NRSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Cash Flow per NRSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divided: by Capitalization Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportable Equity per NRSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportable Debt per NRSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportable Development Costs per NRSF</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the terms assumed in the budget case above, which are comparable to the current market conditions in the area, the developer of the project would have some $122.07 per square foot to acquire the land, construct the project and pay a return to the project equity investors. This budget is clearly inadequate for most reuse ideas for the Brewery buildings and site. It may be adequate for a multifamily apartment on the Bluff. Currently, the Bluff property is on the market for a sales price of $5.71 / square foot.

This development budget approach was instrumental in understanding the difficulty of the market in the Tumwater area poses to redevelopment of the site and allowed the focus group to gain an appreciation about the realities of redevelopment.
OVERALL PROJECT CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

It is difficult if not a disservice to attempt to summarize nearly six months of community engagement, visioning and education and site and economic analysis. Nevertheless, the following points are an attempt to provide such a summary of the consultant Team’s observations and conclusions:

1. The Former Olympia Brewery property is viewed by the citizens of Tumwater as a very special property. Many hold very emotional connections to the site and believe that what ever happens to it, future redevelopment must retain the cultural and historical significance that the site has contributed to the community over the years.

2. Tumwater citizens are highly interested in having the former Brewery property develop into an active and special place that serves as an asset and focus for the community both on an economic and cultural level.

3. Citizens have many preferences and views about their vision of the specific elements of what this future special place should include. There is strong agreement that it should involve a mixture of uses including residential and retail as well as public and recreational spaces particularly along the Deschutes River corridor.

4. Citizens expressed a strong desire to have community leaders work hard to achieve their vision to see the property become a special place and believe what does happen to the site must be rooted in community values that serve as an ongoing guide for future development.

5. There is strong support for the City of Tumwater to take urgent and assertive steps to make it happen, including adopting or creating new development tools and roles for the City as it embarks on achieving the vision.

6. In general, most of the buildings and structures included on the property can be physically adapted to many future uses, including most of those embodied in the community vision for the site.

7. The site and buildings have significant assets for future redevelopment including location, property size, adaptability and river connection.

8. Lack of market demand, availability of alternative locations, rent rates, the extensive flood plain involved with the site and construction costs related to rehabilitation and reuse of the buildings pose significant financial impediments to future private development of the site.

9. Many of the challenges to private development of the site should be able to be overcome through the types of private / public partnerships and community advocacy that have achieved similar visions for other large and valued properties in other communities.
Perhaps it is this last point that is most important and deserves further explanation. As the project unfolded, it became clear that the economics of the area and the cost of redevelopment for the site posed a significant impediment to achieving the aspirations of the community.

As a result, the consultant team began to explore the concept of community action to overcome these impediments. The matrix included in the report as Exhibit 5.1 was developed and used to sponsor a conversation about such potential actions.

This conversation in turn led to the discussion and polling about the community’s willingness to take action described in the Community Engagement section of this report. And ultimately, this conversation led to an exploration of public / private partnership models by the Oversight Group during its last meeting. As a way of defining potential partnerships, the consultant Team produced a graphic that provides a continuum of examples. That graphic in included as Exhibit 5.2. The tools that emerged from these discussions are:

- Tax-Credit or Tax-Deferral
- Long-term Entitlements
- Public Development Authorities
- Inclusionary Zoning
- Property Use/Street Use Development
- Agreements / Contract Rezones
- Tax-increment Strategies
- Non-Profit Development Organizations
- Quasi-Governmental Authorities
- Direct Financial Support

While this “community action and partnership” exploration was never anticipated to be a part of the work scope for the project, in fact, in the opinion of the consultant Team, it may have been one of the most critical elements of the project outcomes since it has the potential to serve as an empowerment for action and a foundation for future work.

Recommendations

The volume of comments received during this visioning process, coupled with the extraordinary optimism and energy exhibited during our public meetings suggests that the community is deeply committed to influencing the future of the Brewery properties. The community embraced the visioning process, bringing their personal history, the legacy of the site, and well thought out ideas to the public meetings. The second and final public meeting concluded with a sense of urgency to move forward, this was evident from the discussion of assertive to aggressive actions and multiple comments suggesting “let’s get going”.

The high level of interest and enthusiasm for making something happen at the former brewery site, and the deep connection the community has with the site calls for attention and action by community leaders. With regard to continued work on achieving the community aspirations for redevelopment of the site and continued community engagement, the consultant Team offers the following recommendations:
1. The City of Tumwater and the TRPC should work to find a way to clarify and simplify the site ownership structure, including investigating the possibility of public ownership of the site potentially as part of the apparent acquisition of part of the site by LOTT. In fact, we believe that the City, the Port and LOTT should work together to acquire at least the Valley for public ownership and future public development.

2. We also recommend that the City and the TRPC work collaboratively to further investigate the constraints and possibilities of redevelopment conforming to the visioning evoked during this project, and explore ways to express, visualize and discover markets and/or partners to help achieve that vision for the Tumwater community. The site needs a public advocate and this City and TRPC partnership could serve as that advocate.

3. Keep the community informed and involved in the next steps for the project. Build upon and maintain the momentum established during this Brewery Visioning process.

4. Refine the Values for development of the Brewery site. Build upon recommendations from the Focus Group regarding continued work on the value statements.

5. Elevate and integrate Brewery Values, Visions and Priorities into subsequent neighborhood, community, and regional planning processes. Certainly one conclusion about the engagement process learned from this project is that engagement is most successful if approached on multiple levels. The “Dear Neighbor” letter from Mayor Kmet to introduce the project to surrounding community, the Public Meeting Announcements with Survey Questions, Press Releases, Public Meeting Agendas, and Questions for Public Comment Cards used during this project should serve as examples for future work.

6. Link the visions for development of the Brewery site with the City’s Strategic and Economic Development Plan.

7. Retain and continue to update the Brewery Visioning project website. Consider establishing an independent link on the City’s home page.

8. Celebrate your success. Acknowledge the dedication of the community and the quality of their contribution to the Brewery Visioning process.

And finally and perhaps most importantly, the consultant Team recommends that the City embark on defining and implementing an action plan to achieve the vision of the community for the future of the Brewery. This plan should engage the regional community in the effort, perhaps through some intergovernmental structure and should be pursued with a sense of urgency to protect and develop this community treasure.
Exhibit 1.1 Scope of Work
Community Visioning Project – Former Olympia Brewery

This Scope of Work document outlines the details of our services including professional project management, community outreach, building and site infrastructure analysis, regulatory considerations, assessing the potential for realistic redevelopment including public/private partnership scenarios and providing “next step” recommendations to TRPC and the City.

All work performed by LORIG will take into account that the City of Tumwater Economic Development Plan recognizes the brewery site as a key economic development asset, important to both Tumwater and the broader region. The site has the potential to serve as an economic engine and iconic symbol for Tumwater long into the future, but features specific challenges that community stakeholders need to address collaboratively.

Lorig anticipates (4) phases to complete the project:

Phase I – Project Start Up (March – April)

The work begins with a detailed discovery process to understand the political, community, historical and environmental context of the project by the project team. We will work closely with TRPC and the City of Tumwater to develop a TRPC/Client Oversight Committee comprised of TRPC, Tumwater staff and elected officials, as appropriate (see item 8 below). The TRPC/Client committee will serve as a group to work with us throughout the project for the public and jurisdictional review processes. This phase will include project start up activities including:

1. Project planning with TRPC and City of Tumwater staff
   o Gain a thorough understanding of current Brewery vision language, how it evolved, and the breadth of public involvement to date. Establish goals and objectives with the TRPC, City and public engagement activities.

2. Confirmation of scope and schedule of work
   o Confirm outline and framework for Community Engagement Plan
   o Confirm preliminary scope, schedule, and critical milestone meeting dates for TRPC/Client and public engagement, in detail for Phase 1 and 2.

3. Organization of budgets, sub consultant engagement agreements; draft and endorse final contract with TRPC.

4. Review and collation of available historic and as-built documentation.

5. Hold background meetings with current property owners, brokers and agents.

6. Review and compilation of previous site planning, historic assessment and economic development documents.
   o Review the City’s Strategic, Economic Development Plans, and other relevant plans and ensure that the engagement plan builds upon existing work.

7. Communication about the project and approach with a newly formed Brewery Focus Group and previously engaged citizens
   o Conduct “stakeholder analysis” with TRPC to determine extent of involvement, stakeholder perspectives, priorities, issues and interests as they relate to the site. Determine the interest, and level of communication and participation needs. Identify new stakeholders that need to be contacted and include in stakeholder analysis
   o Establish Brewery Focus Group. Develop role, structure and meeting schedule for Brewery Focus Group. Convene initial meeting to introduce project team, brief them on project approach, milestones and timeframe. Discuss role of the Focus Group as it relates to the scope of work.
o Introduce project in letter or email to community members who have previously been involved in public processes regarding the Brewery.

8. Combine TRPC and City staff briefing with the Client Oversight Committee at key stages throughout the project in advance of sharing information, findings and recommendations with the Brewery Stakeholders and the public.

9. Development of a citizen engagement / communications plan for approval by TRPC and the City staff
   o Present range of communication methods and engagement tools.
   o Select preferred communication methods and engagement tools to be integrated with the phases of the project.
   o Establish preliminary Engagement Plan, with Phase I and II presentation materials schedule, and milestones for Brewery Focus Group and Brewery Focus Group and public engagement.
   o Update Engagement Plan at each Phase interval, as required.

10. Linking and Enhancing Public Information Infrastructure
   o Establish website page, links and Facebook account and links
   o Schedule TRPC/Client briefings, as appropriate, based on TRPC and the City staff communication preferences
   o Develop database of contacts
   o Identify neighborhood groups and secure meeting schedules; newsletter timelines
   o Develop media contacts and protocols

Phase II – Assessment
(May, June, July)

This phase includes analysis of the buildings and property: current property owner plans, structures and site conditions, economic, political, regulatory and community vision and attitudes to develop a baseline for compatibility or lack of compatibility with potential development scenarios and plans. This phase will identify the extent to which the property can be developed, critical concerns for the adaptive reuse of structures on site, key economic issues, survey the local and regional market demand for viable and likely uses, establish the necessary investment and financial return parameters and identify likely funding and finance mechanisms. In addition, this phase will identify the range of potentials and public and private aspirations currently existing. Lead project staff will participate in community and Brewery Focus Group meetings, present result of analysis and engage in discussion and dialogue with the public at planned public meetings. These meetings will be structured to encourage informal dialogue, present critical issues, develop realistic expectations and priorities. Establish a baseline for developing an integrated and realistic expectation for development of the Brewery properties.

Included in this phase will be:

1. Further documentation of background documents for the site
2. Architectural and structural field survey of structures in general and review of existing appropriate surveys
3. Conceptual level test-for-fit of a likely adaptive reuse scenario
4. Conceptual level cost estimates, if required, for a likely reuse scenario
5. Economic analysis of potential uses based on current local conditions and on overall economic development concept

6. Recommendations for demolition of structures based on economic, life-safety or incompatibility with viable uses

7. Brief TRPC/Client and elected officials on site analysis findings

8. Historic evaluation of the structures and site including opportunities for preservation of historic or iconic features as part of the site or as contribution as a cultural resource based on past studies

9. Economic and site development concept charrette

10. Brewery Focus Group Meetings x 1 (also Phases II and III x 3)
   - Results of surveys, preliminary re-use scenario findings, economic analysis, and environmental issues
   - Discussion of critical issues, impacts and next steps.
   - Historic evaluation and opportunities for preservation of historic or iconic features.
   - Recommendations on viability for re-use of individual buildings and on groupings of buildings.
   - Results from public meetings: themes, priorities and issues.

11. Public Meetings
    Hold two public meetings (Phase I and Phase II). Public meetings will be structured to inform the public and solicit dialogue on findings from team analysis, critical issues and opportunities for re-use, conceptual alternatives and identify additional considerations and outstanding issues. Comments will be recorded and synthesized to identify objectives and themes for future development of the brewery properties.

    Meetings will include:
    - Current vision statement for Brewery properties
    - Critical findings and concerns for disposition of property and adaptive reuse of structures
    - Economic issues and market demand for viable uses
    - Informal and conceptual site plan alternatives
    - Visioning exercise to capture range of perspectives and attitudes

    Professional opinion regarding critical re-use issues, and recommendations on viability for reuse of individual buildings and/or groupings of buildings.

    Implementation of appropriate public information and engagement activities such as:

    - Mailings (insert calendar of meetings and events in utility bill)
    - Brief the City Council on site analysis findings
    - Interviews with local television and radio personalities??
    - Meet with Olympian Editorial Board (if timing is right)
    - Press release announcing findings, meetings and purpose
    - Updates to Facebook and website(s) content
    - Presentations to civic groups and others
    - Site tours (one day of scheduled tours)
12. Presentation of findings and considerations in conceptual and informal form to TRPC/Client as desired.
   - Update Engagement Plan for Phase 3 and 4

Track the interactions with the Brewery Focus Group and involved citizens to inform the final design for the remainder of the citizen involvement activities.

**Phase III – Citizen Engagement and Development Scenario (May, June, July)**

This phase will complete the assessment of the property ownership, buildings and site considerations, zoning, environmental and economic issues. We will integrate what we have learned about the capacity of the buildings and the site, the likely future regulatory environment, the most economically realistic new uses in the current market and political environment with the vision and community aspirations for the area. The correlation of capacity, market demand and community aspiration will result in a compilation of preliminary options for the economic development of the site and begin framing a realistic development scenario. The scenario will then be used for community conversations and reaction in the context of the citizen visioning results from the previous phase.

**Phase IV – Project Findings Review, Documentation and Reporting (August – September)**

This phase will provide TRPC and the City a stand-alone report on findings, processes and recommendations and include first in draft and then after review in final form. The function of the report is to serve as a guide to the best, most effective reuse of the buildings and property, considering and balancing the current and likely future economic, structural, community and programmatic context.

The draft report will be prepared for circulation among TRPC, the City of Tumwater staff and elected officials, based on TRPC’s and the City’s preferred review and acceptance process.

The final report will be a written narrative of our findings supported by graphic, statistical and supplementary attachments which may include conceptual site plans, diagrammatic “test-for-fit” plans, a summary of critical building and structural code and site environmental issues, conceptual cost estimates, property owner desires and other team findings and simple proforma analysis describing economic feasibility. The report will encompass the context and background of the site (historic, physical, political); building and site infrastructure analysis and conclusions; regulatory and permitting considerations and conclusions (i.e. SEPA; tribal, historic, etc.); identify realistic redevelopment opportunities and constraints; analysis of the community vision and empowerment considerations.

**Other**

- In addition to the Lorig team of consultants there may be need (or desire by TRPC and the City) for a transportation/traffic consultant which can be determined at the onset of the project, but is not currently included in the Scope of Work.

- Quarterly Reports to be complete by Lorig and submitted to TRPC on the form template provided by TRPC (Attachment A)
CLIENT OVERSIGHT GROUP
BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT

Membership:
1. Pete Kmet, Mayor
2. Neil McClanahan, Councilmember
3. John Doan, City Administrator
4. Mike Matlock, Community Dev. Director
5. Tim Smith, Planning Manager
6. Marisa Capella, Communications Coordinator
7. Veena Tabbutt, TRPC
8. Kathy McCormick, TRPC
9. Kim Orr, Lorig (Project Manager)
10. Tom Fitzsimmons, Lorig (CEO)
12. Stevan Johnson, Johnson Architecture & Planning

Purpose and Charge:
• Get new information first
• Strategize on messaging
• Engage in process before each focus group and public meeting
• Identify who needs to be involved at each point

Client Oversight Group Meeting Dates:

March 31: Focus Group & Client Oversight Group Project Kick–Off Meeting, 5:30 – 7:00 PM, Fire Station Headquarters Training Room

April 5: Client Oversight Group, 7 – 8:00 A.M, City Hall Training Room

May 3: Client Oversight Group, 7 – 8:00 A.M, City Hall Training Room

June 7: Client Oversight Group, 7 – 8:00 A.M., City Hall Downstairs Training Room

July 13: Focus Group & Client Oversight Group Final Meeting, 5:30 – 7:00 PM, City Hall Training Room
Brewery Visioning Project

*Engagement Plan*

Working Draft

Last revised: April 20, 2011
Brewery Engagement Plan

This document is a comprehensive overview of the process, players, schedule, tasks and roles for engaging stakeholders and the general public in the development of a Brewery Vision Plan for the City of Tumwater.

This is a dynamic, working document that will be used by the consultant team and client staff to manage the implementation of the engagement process. As new information is identified, the Engagement plan will adapt and be updated accordingly.

The primary goals and objectives of the engagement for the Brewery Vision Project are:

- Ensure broad and specific participation
- Develop a community vision that incorporates the realities of market, site and structural analysis
- Build momentum and excitement for future development

1. Stakeholder Analysis

The Brewery Vision Project is of broad public interest in the South Puget Sound region and involves a large number of stakeholders. The general communities of interest are as follows is illustrated in the chart.

A preliminary stakeholder analysis was conducted based on consultant and client knowledge and assumptions.

The stakeholder analysis will be used to determine the key players we need to work with and keep in the communication loop.
2. Committee Formation

Two committees have been formed to provide guidance and advice to the consultant team: The Client/Staff Oversight Committee and The Brewery Focus Group. \textit{Appendix C} contains a summary of all the proposed meetings, including the public meetings.

\textbf{Client Oversight / Staff Committee}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Purpose and Charge}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item Get new information first
      \item Strategize on messaging and media relations
      \item Engage in process before each focus group and public meeting
      \item Identify who needs to be involved at each point
      \item Provide overall guidance to the Consultant Team
      \item Ensure that Tumwater and TRPC interests are addressed through the project
    \end{itemize}
  
  \item \textbf{Membership}
  Roster is provided Appendix A
  
  \item \textbf{Roles – Tumwater, TRPC, Consultants}
  \begin{table}[h]
    \centering
    \begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
      \hline
      Role & TRPC & Tumwater & Consultants \\
      \hline
      Notification of membership & - & Lead & - \\
      Meeting scheduling and notifying & - & Lead & Support \\
      Preparing agendas & - & Support & Lead \\
      Meeting Facilitation & - & - & Lead \\
      Material development & Support & Support & Lead \\
      Meeting notes & - & Lead & - \\
      \hline
    \end{tabular}
  \end{table}

  \item \textbf{Meeting Information – Staff/Client Oversight Committee Meetings}
  \begin{table}[h]
    \centering
    \begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
      \hline
      Date & Time & Place & Tentative Purpose \\
      \hline
      March 31, 2011 & 5:30 – 7:00 PM & Fire Station Headquarters Training & Joint Kick-Off Meeting w/Client Oversight
      \begin{itemize}
        \item Introductions and roles
        \item Understanding of scope and process
      \end{itemize}
      \hline
    \end{tabular}
  \end{table}
Brewery Engagement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Site orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| City Hall Training Room | Discussion of critical issues, impacts and next steps  
| | Feedback on public process and engagement strategy  
| | Approval of public and focus group materials |

April 5, 2011  
7-8:00 AM  
City Hall Training Room  
- Discussion of critical issues, impacts and next steps  
- Feedback on public process and engagement strategy  
- Approval of public and focus group materials

May 3, 2011  
7-8:00 AM  
City Hall Training Room  
- Results of surveys, preliminary re-use scenario findings, economic analysis, and environmental issues  
- Historic evaluation and opportunities for preservation of historic or iconic features  
- Preparation for public meeting #1  
- Approval of public and focus group materials

June 7, 2011  
7-8:00 AM  
City Hall Downstairs  
- Results from public meeting #1: themes, priorities and issues. Prep for 2nd public meeting.  
- Approval of public and focus group materials

July 13, 2011  
5:30 – 7:00 PM  
Fire Station Headquarters Training Room  
- Joint Final Meeting w/Focus Group  
- Results from public meeting #2: themes, priorities  
- Presentation of final Draft Brewery Vision Plan and recommendations  
- Discuss Next Steps

Brewery Focus Group

i. Purpose and Charge
- Provide advice to the city of Tumwater and consultant team  
- Receive, discuss, and respond to information and analysis prepared by the consultant team  
- Bring community perspective to the discussion of viable alternatives and scenarios  
- Provide observations and comments on the project recommendations  
- Help engage others in the process

ii. Membership
Roster is provided in Appendix B

iii. Roles – Tumwater, TRPC, Consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>TRPC</th>
<th>Tumwater</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notification of membership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting scheduling and notifying</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iv. Meeting Information – Brewery Focus Group Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Tentative Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| March 31, 2011    | 5:30 – 7:00 PM | Fire Station Headquarters Training Room | Joint Kick-Off Meeting w/Client Oversight  
• Introductions and roles  
• Understanding of scope and process  
• Site orientation |
| April 14, 2011    | 5:30 – 7:00 PM | City Hall Downstairs Training Room | Discussion of critical issues, impacts and next steps.  
• Feedback on public process and engagement strategy |
| May 19, 2011      | 5:30 – 7:00 PM | City Hall Downstairs Training Room | Results of surveys, preliminary re-use scenario findings, economic analysis, and environmental issues  
• Historic evaluation and opportunities for preservation of historic or iconic features.  
• Review Public Meeting #1 process and materials |
| June 16, 2011     | 5:30 – 7:00 PM | City Hall Downstairs Training Room | Recommendations on viability for re-use of individual buildings and on groupings of buildings.  
• Results from Public Meeting #1: themes, priorities and issues.  
• Review Public Meeting #2 process and materials. |
| July 13, 2011     | 5:30 – 7:00 PM | Fire Station Headquarters Training Room | Joint Final Meeting w/Focus Group  
• Results from public meeting #2: themes, priorities  
• Presentation of final Brewery Vision Plan and recommendations  
• Next Steps |

3. Public Process

The consultant team will coordinate two public meetings during the project period: in May and June. The City of Tumwater may hold a final public meeting and public celebration in August/September.

Public meetings will be structured to inform the public and solicit dialogue on findings from team analysis, critical issues and opportunities for re-use, conceptual alternatives and identify additional
considerations and outstanding issues. Professional opinion regarding viability for reuse of individual buildings and/or groupings of buildings will inform the public visioning exercises.

Comments will be recorded and synthesized to identify objectives and themes for future development of the brewery properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Tentative Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| May 31, 2011  | TBD  | TBD   | • Current vision statement of Brewery Properties  
• Visioning Exercise to capture range of perspectives and attitudes  
• Economic Issues and Market Demand for Viable Uses  
• Critical Findings for disposition of property and adaptive reuse of structures |
| June 30, 2011 | TBD  | TBD   | • Informal and conceptual site plan alternatives  
• Revised visioning statement based on information |
| Aug/Sept, 2011| TBD  | TBD   | • City Sponsored (Tentative)  
• Presentation of Final Vision Plan and Next Steps |

In addition to public meetings, the general public will be able to participate in the dialogue in multiple forms. The primary mechanisms for distributing and collecting information will be:

- Direct mailing – Calendar of events
- Flyers
- Web page on City of Tumwater website (links on other primary stakeholder sites)
- Social media (Facebook, Youtube and others)
- Poster boards placed at neighboring businesses
- Monthly press releases to local media (The Olympian, Business Examiner, Olympia Power and Light, Thurston County Progressive Network)  
- Articles for newsletters  
- City of Tumwater Council briefings  
- Presentations at chambers, civic groups and neighborhood associations  
- Tumwater TCTV/Roundtable  
- Public tours of Brewery Site  
- Radio (KGY)  
- Editorial board
4. Engagement Roles and Responsibilities

Roles and responsibilities for engagement are divided between the client group and the consultant team. The following matrix identifies the roles for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>TRPC</th>
<th>Tumwater</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Analysis</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee meeting notices, schedules, rosters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail and email lists</td>
<td>Tumwater citizens and businesses</td>
<td>Committees, strategic and economic plan participants, other stakeholders on list</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media contacts and protocols</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mayor/Marisa</td>
<td>Tom F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly press releases</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Marisa (final and distribute)</td>
<td>Kendra (draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter articles (e.g. VCB and TRPC briefings)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Marisa (final and distribute)</td>
<td>Kendra (draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Boards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>John (arranging)</td>
<td>Kendra (timing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Plan</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear Neighbor letter</td>
<td>Veena (distribute to all Tumwater businesses, residents within 1 mile diameter, SS neighbourhood assn)</td>
<td>Marisa (final and distribute to TRPC, Strategic and Economic Plan committees, participants, survey recipients)</td>
<td>Kendra (Content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Notice flyers with calendar of events</td>
<td>Veena (distribute to all Tumwater businesses, residents within 1 mile diameter, SS neighbourhood assn)</td>
<td>Marisa (final and distribute to TRPC, Strategic and Economic Plan committees, participants, survey recipients)</td>
<td>Kendra (Content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable</td>
<td>TRPC</td>
<td>Tumwater</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPC information briefings and articles</td>
<td>Veena (1st Fridays)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kendra (Content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Oversight/Staff Meetings</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Notices, Logistics, Notes</td>
<td>Agenda &amp; Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewery Focus Group Meetings</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Notices, Logistics, Notes</td>
<td>Agenda &amp; Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web page: Design, content and management*</td>
<td>Veena (posting)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kendra (content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media: Design, content and management</td>
<td>Veena/Erin (postings)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kendra (content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at Tumwater &amp; Thurston County chambers, Rotary (south sound, Downtown Olympia, Tumwater, Lacey) South Capitol neighborhood assn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tim (arrange and presentation)</td>
<td>Faith (schedule rotary presentations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public comments</td>
<td>Print and distribute (record/analysis?)</td>
<td>Marisa (distribute to city hall and libraries)</td>
<td>Content for web, card, box (intern for record/analysis?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumwater TV/Roundtable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Marisa (schedule)</td>
<td>Kendra (arrange for panel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Board Displays</td>
<td>Print and distribute</td>
<td>Distribute</td>
<td>Kendra (content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Materials for public meetings and tours</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings for Tumwater city council and city advisory boards including parks, historical and planning commissions</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Tim (arrange and present)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Tours</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings (first two)</td>
<td>Support and A/V</td>
<td>Notices, Logistics, Notes</td>
<td>Agenda and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Public Meeting and Public Celebration</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Tim (determine when and if)</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The website will be hosted by TRPC with link to Tumwater. Tumwater will provide site on home page. Consultant will submit information for website updates to TRPC.
Each stakeholder group will need a different level of communication. The matrix below outlines the information needed, frequency, type and person responsible for communication by stakeholder group. See APPENDIX A for the current list of stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Groups</th>
<th>Information Needs</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Oversight Group</td>
<td>Agendas, meeting notices, materials and notes</td>
<td>5 meetings; materials 1 week prior and notes one week after.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Kim, Lorig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewery Focus Group</td>
<td>Agendas, meeting notices, materials and notes</td>
<td>5 meetings; materials 1 week prior and notes one week after</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Kendra, FLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Stakeholders</td>
<td>Briefings for Tumwater stakeholders</td>
<td>Prior to major events</td>
<td>Existing meetings</td>
<td>Tim Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtesy letter to other govt stakeholders</td>
<td>Beginning of project</td>
<td>Email or direct mail</td>
<td>Tim Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owners</td>
<td>Individual meetings</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td>Tom F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project updates</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Press releases and VCB newsletter articles</td>
<td>Kendra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Process for participation; project updates</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Flyers, Poster Boards, VCB newsletter article, press releases</td>
<td>Veena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Project updates</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Press releases</td>
<td>Marisa/Kendra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (neighborhoods, civic groups, general public)</td>
<td>Process for participation; project updates</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Comment cards; flyers; direct mail; public tours; 2 public meetings; presentations</td>
<td>Tim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at existing events; press releases; social media; website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Client Oversight Group Roster

Membership:

1. Pete Kmet, Mayor
2. Neil McClanahan, Councilmember
3. John Doan, City Administrator
4. Mike Matlock, Director, Department of Community Development
5. Tim Smith, Planning Manager
6. Marisa Capella, Communications Coordinator
7. Veena Tabbutt, Senior Planner, Thurston Regional Planning Council
8. Kathy McCormick, Senior Planner, Thurston Regional Planning Council
9. Tom Fitzsimmons, Chief Operating Officer, Lorig Associates
10. Kendra Dahlen, Principal, FLT Consulting Inc.
11. Stevan Johnson, Johnson Architecture & Planning

Purpose and Charge:

• Get new information first
• Strategize on messaging
• Engage in process before each focus group and public meeting
• Identify who needs to be involved at each point
Appendix B

Focus Group Roster

Members

1. Erin Carrier, Parks Board
2. Nancy Stevenson, Planning Commission
3. Marcus Glasper, Planning Commission
4. Marnie Slakey, Historic Preservation Commission
5. Neil McClanahan, Councilmember
6. Tom Oliva, Councilmember
7. Michael Cade, Thurston EDC
8. Mike Reid, Port of Olympia
9. Joe Gross, Tumwater Chamber of Commerce
10. David Read, Citizen
11. Mike Crowe, Citizen
12. Steve Diddy, Citizen
13. Troy Dana, Brewery Representative
14. Dan Yerrington, South Sound Bank
15. Gary Wilburn, Citizen
16. Rob Kirkwood, Citizen
17. Walter R. Jorgensen, Citizen
18. Eric Kjesbu, Citizen

Purpose and Charge:

- Discuss and respond to information and analysis prepared by the consultant team;
- Bring community perspective to the discussion of viable alternatives and scenarios;
- Help engage others in the process
Appendix C

Schedule of All Meetings

March 31:  Focus Group & Client Oversight Group: Project Kick–Off Meeting, 5:30 – 7:00 PM, Fire Station Headquarters Training Room

April 5:  Client Oversight Group, 7 – 8:00 AM, City Hall Training Room

April 14:  Focus Group, 5:30 – 7:00 PM, City Hall Downstairs Training Room

May 3:  Client Oversight Group, 7 – 8:00 AM, City Hall Training Room

May 19:  Focus Group, 5:30 – 7:00 PM, Fire Station Headquarters Training Room

May 31:  Public Meeting #1, 7:00 – 9:15 PM, Tumwater Valley Lodge

June 7:  Client Oversight Group, 7 – 8:00 AM, City Hall Downstairs Training Room

June 16:  Focus Group, 5:30 – 7:30 PM, Fire Station Headquarters Training Room

June 30:  Public Meeting #2, 7:00 – 9:15 PM, Tumwater Valley Lodge

July 13:  Focus Group Final Meeting, 5:30 – 7:30 PM, Tumwater Valley

Aug. 1:  Client Oversight Group Final Meeting, 5:30 – 7:30PM, City Hall Training Room
## Appendix C – Deliverables

### Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT DELIVERABLES</th>
<th>Mar-11</th>
<th>Apr-11</th>
<th>May-11</th>
<th>Jun-11</th>
<th>Jul-11</th>
<th>Aug-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veena/Tim</td>
<td>Signed contract sub-agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Stakeholder Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim/Kendra</td>
<td>Roster (Client Oversight/Focus Group/Consultant Team)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim/Kendra</td>
<td>Meeting schedules for Brewery Focus Group, Client Oversight, Public Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Member Notices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim/Veena</td>
<td>Database/email list identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim/Veena</td>
<td>Press/media roles identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim/Kendra</td>
<td>Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim/Tim</td>
<td>Client/Oversight meeting #1 agenda, materials and logistics, notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim/Tim</td>
<td>Client/Oversight meeting #2 agenda, materials and logistics, notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra/Tim</td>
<td>Brewery Focus Group #1 meeting agenda, materials and logistics, notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra/Tim</td>
<td>Brewery Focus Group #2 meeting agenda, materials and logistics, notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra/Tim</td>
<td>Brewery Focus Group #3 meeting agenda, materials and logistics, notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra/Tim</td>
<td>One Pager/Posterboards/Comment Cards to surrounding businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Briefings for Tumwater City Council and Commissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim/Kendra</td>
<td>Public comment cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim/Tim</td>
<td>Client/Oversight meeting #4 agenda, materials and logistics, notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra/Tim</td>
<td>Brewery Focus Group #4 meeting agenda, materials and logistics, notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Tumwater TV/Roundtable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Olympia Editorial Board (tentative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra/Faith</td>
<td>Public Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim/Kendra</td>
<td>One Pager/Posterboards/Comment Cards to surrounding businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Briefings for Tumwater City Council and Commissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra/Faith</td>
<td>Public #2 agenda, materials and logistics, notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra/Kim/Tim</td>
<td>Joint Final meeting #5 agenda, materials and logistics, notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Draft chapter on public process and findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>Final chapter on public process and findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Public Celebration (tentative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOCUS GROUP
BREWERY VISIONING PROJECT

Members
1. Erin Carrier, Parks Board
2. Nancy Stevenson, Planning Commission
3. Marcus Glasper, Planning Commission
4. Marnie Slakey, Historic Preservation Commission
5. Neil McClanahan, Councilmember
6. Tom Oliva, Councilmember
7. Michael Cade, Thurston EDC
8. Mike Reid, Port of Olympia
9. Joe Gross, Tumwater Chamber of Commerce
10. David Read, Citizen
11. Mike Crowe, Citizen
12. Steve Diddy, Citizen
13. Troy Dana, Brewery Representative
14. Dan Yerrington, South Sound Bank
15. Gary Wilburn, Citizen
16. Rob Kirkwood, Citizen
17. Walter R. Jorgensen, Citizen
18. Eric Kjesbu, Citizen

Purpose and Charge:
Discuss and respond to information and analysis prepared by the consultant team;
Bring community perspective to the discussion of viable alternatives and scenarios;
Help engage others in the process
Published June 08, 2011

Good planning will result in proper role for brewery property

THE OLYMPIAN

It’s encouraging to see so many Tumwater residents actively engaged in the planning process to determine the future use of the former Olympia Brewing Co. property.

Using a $90,000 grant, city officials are midway through a “visioning” process to outline potential uses of the 175 acres.

This is not something that’s going to happen overnight. In fact, given today’s economic climate, it may be 25 years before the vision Tumwater residents mold today becomes a reality on the ground.

What’s important is that Mayor Pete Kmet and the Tumwater City Council are taking the time and spending the money to do it right. And we applaud the Tumwater residents who are participating – by emailing city officials, filling out comment cards at City Hall or the city library, attending public hearings or joining a focus group. It’s imperative that the final outcome match the desires of Tumwater residents. After all, it’s their city.

While the city of Tumwater does not own the property, city officials play a pivotal role because they can shape the future of the site through zoning and land-use regulations. Right now, the property is zoned for heavy industrial use, but that zoning is unrealistic and undoubtedly will be changed.

The question is “to what?”

We suspect that the end result will be a division of the property into much smaller parcels. No one seems prepared to purchase the entire 175-acre site and dedicate it to a single use. We also suspect that the final plan will be a healthy mix of uses – perhaps some public uses, such as a transportation hub, maybe some residential units and a healthy dose of commercial use.

The process the City of Tumwater is going through is a huge gift to current and future property owners. Thanks to the time and money invested by the city, those property owners will inherit a road map of potential uses, making it easier to focus on and attract clients. And the proper zoning will be in place so that investors can make decisions based on certainty, not on speculation.
After decades of Schmidt family ownership, the brewery fell on hard times recently. The brewery went through a series of owners.

Miller Brewing Co. closed the plant in 2003, putting 400 workers out of work. The community was heartsick. South Sound was left with a series of vacant and deteriorating buildings, a blight in the heart of the City of Tumwater.

Community expectations soared when an out-of-state developer purchased the property and pledged to open a water-bottling facility. He ended up going bankrupt, and the property was tied up in the courts for years.

The old brewery property now is in the hands of a bank and investment company that have been largely unsuccessful selling off the property.

Tumwater officials, at the suggestion of this editorial board, took charge and said, in effect, “We’re going to shape the future of the property and not have the property owners shape the future of our city.”

Lorig Associates, a Seattle-based consulting firm, was paid to do community outreach and come up with a redevelopment concept. At last week’s public hearing, a crowd of 125 offered ideas ranging from an antique car or brewery museum, to a state-of-the-art aquatic center, a chocolate factory, cultural center, a site for green manufacturing and a whole slew of other ideas.

The consultants will mold those suggestions into a realistic redevelopment plan that will be up for a second public hearing later this month. After additional community input, the City Council will adopt a recommendation or series of recommendations, then start down the path to rezone the property so that the vision matches the land-use regulations. The zoning should be in place by early next year.

City Administrator John Doan is absolutely right when he says the eventual development plan is going to require a huge investment of private capital. And that’s not very realistic at this point in the midst of a national economic recession.

So what Tumwater officials are doing is setting the stage for the future – 20, 25, 30 years down the road. It’s important that they get the process right, which they are doing by involving as many residents as possible in shaping the future of the City of Tumwater.

Read more: http://www.theolympian.com/2011/06/08/v-print/1679504/good-planning-will-result-in-proper.html#ixzz1XJn5oXX3

Published June 01, 2011

What should be next for brewery site? Public packs meeting to share ideas

NATE HULINGS

Those were just some of the ideas kicked around Tuesday night during a packed public meeting as part of the community visioning project for the former Olympia Brewery site.

The City of Tumwater, the Thurston Regional Planning Council and Lorig Associates – the Seattle-based consulting firm paid $90,000 to run the project – held the meeting at Tumwater Valley Lodge to gather input as they work to develop a game plan for three sections of the 170-acre site that houses more than 10 buildings.

After receiving an overview of the project and site, people in the standing-room-only crowd wrote down what they want to see at the site before breaking into small groups for more discussion.

All the ideas, visions and questions received Tuesday provide a foundation for what the community envisions and how that lines up with the realities of the site, said Tom Fitzsimmons, visioning project manager and chief operating officer of Lorig.

“Our job is to try and see if some of those aspirations have potential, reality to be achieved,” Fitzsimmons said. “Help us create a future for this incredible legacy.”

Andrea Jackson of Tumwater said she’d like to see the brewery building turned into condos with street-level small businesses.

“I think Tumwater is up and coming,” she said. “I want to see things happen.”

Her other recommendation? No big box stores.

Kevin Deleon was upset to see the brewery go and would like to see something that mixes business and public access.

“I don’t mind if it’s commercial … just keep it from being derelict,” he said.

Others came with ideas about improving transportation.

Bob Bregent, principal for Rail Associates, said he’d like to see the current warehouse location used as an end point for a future Sound Transit station. He said his firm has spoken with the state and Sound Transit about the location, which he calls “ideal.”

“It may be down the track a ways, but it’s something to start thinking about,” Bregent said.

And while vision is important, Fitzsimmons said, implementation is closely tied to the firms’ findings, including the condition of the buildings/site, infrastructure, cost of remodels and demolitions, and market factors.

“The ultimate outcome of this will be a report to the community on what we think viable alternative uses might be and a set of recommendations on how they might be achieved,” he said.
A final report that will go before the Tumwater City Council in September focuses on three sections of property: n The knoll: Steve Johnson of Johnson Architecture and Planning calls this section, the hill above the Deschutes River near Custer Way where brewery buildings and offices are, the “biggest puzzle,” saying the brewery building is large enough for an 80-unit apartment complex but that much of its façade would need to be removed for certain reconstruction because it’s not insulated. The buildings are structurally sound, he added. n The valley: Johnson said this series of industrial/technical buildings and a 320,000-square-foot warehouse are in “very good” condition. n The bluff: The 2-acre plot of land is accessible by Cleveland Avenue Southeast and is zoned light industrial. Although the city does not own any of the properties in the study, it can dictate land use through comprehensive-plan amendments and zoning regulations, Mayor Pete Kmet said. 

TUMWATER BREWING UP ENERGY EFFICIENCY
DOE grant generates community visioning project for Olympia Brewery and other sites
May 2, 2011
Holly Smith Peterson
Business Examiner
With $90,000 in hand as a “go-green” incentive from the U.S. Department of Energy, the City of Tumwater went right to work figuring out how to save gas and cut greenhouse emissions.

And atop the list of their efforts is the former Olympia Brewery site, north of Cleveland Ave along Capitol Lake.

It’s the first in a much larger, three-property area that is now the focus of a major re-visioning project by Thurston County. The other sites involved are the RST Cellars building, north of Custer Way, and the warehouse complex east of Capitol Boulevard. The goal of the project is to merge the community’s vision for the sites with marketable uses and a framework for zoning, redevelopment and revitalization.

"The scope of this initial stage of the process is to create an outline of our community’s vision for what these places could look like in the future, to get a sense of potential for what the brewery properties could be,” said Jared Burbridge, assistant director of the Thurston Regional Planning Council, which is a combined entity of the Thurston County Metropolitan Planning Organization and Regional Transportation Planning Organization.

TRPC was responsible for securing the DOE grant and will coordinate with the City of Tumwater on all procedures and events related to the study, which is scheduled to be completed by Sept. 30.

The council is seeking input from adjacent property owners, residents and local government leaders to develop a master plan for the sites. Once that happens, Burbridge said, Thurston County leaders will be able to develop policies to support the collective vision.

"It’s the first step in a many-step process,” he said.

Heartfelt history
For Tumwater, the Olympia Brewery has long been an area landmark. And the site is expected to be a future economic engine as well.

Built along the Deschutes River by German immigrant Leopold Schmidt in the mid-1890s, the original Capital Brewing Co. complex included a four-story wooden brewhouse, a five-story cellar building, a one-story ice factory and a bottling and keg plant.

Olympia Beer was first brewed and sold in 1896 and the company changed its name to Olympia Brewing Co. in 1902.

After Prohibition, a new brewery building was constructed upstream and beer sales restarted in 1934. In 1983, the company was sold to Pabst, which took over brewing well-known Northwest brands such as Henry Weinhard’s and Rainier until closing in 2003.

Because of the site’s ties to the community the re-visioning project will proceed carefully, Burbridge said. And there will be plenty of input sought from major stakeholders throughout Thurston County.

The TRPC, Tumwater City Council and project consultants Lorig Associates of Seattle and FLT Consulting of Olympia have had several meetings with an 18-member mayoral task force and are scheduled to meet again May 19.

"Right now the consulting team is really hunking down and getting the information about everything they need — the building condition, the market, the permits, the costs,” said Tim Smith, planning manager for the City of Tumwater. “It’s idea gathering at this stage.

The goal is be prepared for a public meeting May 31, which will provide an opportunity for residents to review ideas for the
brewery property.

Because the site is 170 acres, Smith said, the re-visioning process has already identified several big issues. The long vacancy has resulted in significant structural damage which will be difficult to upgrade — or to tear down and rebuild. The building's superior original structural quality also will make renovation or razing expensive.

Lorig and FLT will analyze the brewery site's unique specifications and possibilities, as well as research urban design options, city infrastructure, razing and renovation, and user markets.

And the planners likely will need to break up the parcel, depending in its possible uses — the scope of which still must be determined.

"It's important to come in with a realistic vision that's something the market can support, something that matches the community vision," Smith said. "Basically anything is on the plate to consider."

Another sticking point is that the re-visioning portion of the grant includes only the property that's bordered by Custer Way South. Everything north of that was purchased last year by Old Brewhouse LLC.

"But certainly we will include it in what's going on with the visioning for the rest of it," Smith said. "We're following their progress to make sure it's a collaborative effort."

For everyone involved in the redevelopment groundwork, the key to simultaneously appeasing all property stakeholders are Tumwater residents is to conduct a thorough process. With the grant's six-month timeline for consulting, the team is looking to wrap up the community input phase in July and have a report ready for City Council in August. The consulting contract ends Sept. 30.

"We're most excited that it's elevated to this point," Smith said. "This is an issue that has been on the books for years. Having a proven agenda for meetings and available funds in place are the next steps in progressing. It's exciting to get the ball rolling."

The larger picture

This initial stage of the community visioning process is one task of many actions included within the umbrella of the Department of Energy grant for reducing greenhouse emissions.

Additional topics to be addressed include adding transportation corridors for bus lines; the use of tele-working centers to reduce car travel in the cities of Tumwater, Rainier, Tenino and Yelm; and working with local educational facilities to encourage walking, biking or taking school buses instead of personal cars.

"It's a cross between land use and transportation," Burbridge said. "We're coming at it as if that community vision includes all facets of cutting back energy use in Thurston County."

A website to provide information about the grant and the study also is in the works, and the Thurston Regional Planning Council is gathering community input via a promotional campaign that includes speaking at local clubs and joining social media outlets.

Brewery focus

Veena Tabbutt, a senior planner for the Thurston Regional Development Council who oversees the project's funding, said that, although the brewery is just one subcomponent of the grant to reduce energy costs in the county, it has fascinating possibilities for redesign.

"The idea is that if we could redevelop that area and create a new and improved center between Tumwater central and Olympia downtown, we could get some activity over there," she said. "It's all about getting people interested in the area."

Tabbutt said initial meetings at the site focused on the layout of the Olympia Brewery and included a walk-through to identify possibilities for future use, as well as challenges for construction and renovation.

"There was lots of discussion about the fabric of the building," she said. "When we walked through it, I couldn't believe how huge it was, and all of its complexities. There's a lot of potential. But this process will be slow because we have to think about so many things."

Burbridge agreed, but said stakeholders shouldn't expect much more than engaging discussion until the study is completed.

"It's nothing very sexy at this time," he said. "No date, nothing is going to be on the ground. But it's very practical way to approach this opportunity so that we make sure everyone who wants to has the chance to be involved."

Upcoming task force meetings are scheduled for May 31 and June 30, by which time the group will have recommendations for re-use of the Olympia Brewery site ready to release to the public.
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BREWHOUSE & CELLARS
FOOTPRINT: 75,900+/- SF
G.S.F.: 265,600+/- SF

OFFICE, BOTTLE HOUSE "A", MAINTENANCE
FOOTPRINT: 30,000+/- SF
G.S.F.: 73,000+/- SF

"M" CELLAR
FOOTPRINT: 6,000+/- SF
G.S.F.: 33,500+/- SF
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3.8 THE KNOLL BUILDINGS: Exteriors
3.9 THE KNOLL BUILDINGS: Interiors
3.10 VALLEY BUILDINGS

EMPTY BOTTLE WAREHOUSE
FOOTPRINT: 35,000 +/- SF
G.S.F.: 35,000 +/- SF

BOTTLE WASH BUILDING
FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
G.S.F.: 25,000 +/- SF

BOTTLEHOUSE “B” & WAREHOUSE
FOOTPRINT: 250,000 +/- SF
G.S.F.: 300,000 +/- SF
3.11 : VALLEY BUILDINGS

KEG BUILDING
- FOOTPRINT: 7,000 +/- SF
- 70' X 120'

PAINT/CARPENTER SHOP
- FOOTPRINT: 4,550 +/- SF
- PAINT SHOP
  - 12' X 15'
- PAINT BOOTH
  - 15' X 25'
- CARPENTER SHOP
  - 30' X 60'

BOTTLE WASH BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 60' X 320'

BOTTLEHOUSE "B" & WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250,000 +/- SF
- G.S.F.: 300,000 +/- SF
- BOTTLEHOUSE ADDITION
  - 40' X 300'

EMPTY BOTTLE WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 35,000 +/- SF
- 160' X 220'

WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250' X 405'
- 80' X 295'

1 WAREHOUSE
- 180' X 480'

2 WAREHOUSE
- 275' X 135'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

PAINT BOOTH
- 15' X 25'

BALER BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 80' X 295'

CARPENTER SHOP
- 30' X 60'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

BOTTLE WASH BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 60' X 320'

BOTTLEHOUSE "B" & WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250,000 +/- SF
- G.S.F.: 300,000 +/- SF
- BOTTLEHOUSE ADDITION
  - 40' X 300'

EMPTY BOTTLE WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 35,000 +/- SF
- 160' X 220'

WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250' X 405'
- 80' X 295'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

PAINT BOOTH
- 15' X 25'

BALER BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 80' X 295'

CARPENTER SHOP
- 30' X 60'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

BOTTLE WASH BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 60' X 320'

BOTTLEHOUSE "B" & WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250,000 +/- SF
- G.S.F.: 300,000 +/- SF
- BOTTLEHOUSE ADDITION
  - 40' X 300'

EMPTY BOTTLE WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 35,000 +/- SF
- 160' X 220'

WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250' X 405'
- 80' X 295'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

PAINT BOOTH
- 15' X 25'

BALER BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 80' X 295'

CARPENTER SHOP
- 30' X 60'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

BOTTLE WASH BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 60' X 320'

BOTTLEHOUSE "B" & WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250,000 +/- SF
- G.S.F.: 300,000 +/- SF
- BOTTLEHOUSE ADDITION
  - 40' X 300'

EMPTY BOTTLE WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 35,000 +/- SF
- 160' X 220'

WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250' X 405'
- 80' X 295'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

PAINT BOOTH
- 15' X 25'

BALER BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 80' X 295'

CARPENTER SHOP
- 30' X 60'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

BOTTLE WASH BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 60' X 320'

BOTTLEHOUSE "B" & WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250,000 +/- SF
- G.S.F.: 300,000 +/- SF
- BOTTLEHOUSE ADDITION
  - 40' X 300'

EMPTY BOTTLE WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 35,000 +/- SF
- 160' X 220'

WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250' X 405'
- 80' X 295'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

PAINT BOOTH
- 15' X 25'

BALER BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 80' X 295'

CARPENTER SHOP
- 30' X 60'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

BOTTLE WASH BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 60' X 320'

BOTTLEHOUSE "B" & WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250,000 +/- SF
- G.S.F.: 300,000 +/- SF
- BOTTLEHOUSE ADDITION
  - 40' X 300'

EMPTY BOTTLE WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 35,000 +/- SF
- 160' X 220'

WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250' X 405'
- 80' X 295'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

PAINT BOOTH
- 15' X 25'

BALER BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 80' X 295'

CARPENTER SHOP
- 30' X 60'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

BOTTLE WASH BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 60' X 320'

BOTTLEHOUSE "B" & WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250,000 +/- SF
- G.S.F.: 300,000 +/- SF
- BOTTLEHOUSE ADDITION
  - 40' X 300'

EMPTY BOTTLE WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 35,000 +/- SF
- 160' X 220'

WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250' X 405'
- 80' X 295'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

PAINT BOOTH
- 15' X 25'

BALER BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 80' X 295'

CARPENTER SHOP
- 30' X 60'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

BOTTLE WASH BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 60' X 320'

BOTTLEHOUSE "B" & WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250,000 +/- SF
- G.S.F.: 300,000 +/- SF
- BOTTLEHOUSE ADDITION
  - 40' X 300'

EMPTY BOTTLE WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 35,000 +/- SF
- 160' X 220'

WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250' X 405'
- 80' X 295'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

PAINT BOOTH
- 15' X 25'

BALER BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 80' X 295'

CARPENTER SHOP
- 30' X 60'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

BOTTLE WASH BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 60' X 320'

BOTTLEHOUSE "B" & WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250,000 +/- SF
- G.S.F.: 300,000 +/- SF
- BOTTLEHOUSE ADDITION
  - 40' X 300'

EMPTY BOTTLE WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 35,000 +/- SF
- 160' X 220'

WAREHOUSE
- FOOTPRINT: 250' X 405'
- 80' X 295'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

PAINT BOOTH
- 15' X 25'

BALER BLDG.
- FOOTPRINT: 19,000 +/- SF
- 80' X 295'

CARPENTER SHOP
- 30' X 60'

PAINT SHOP
- 12' X 15'

BOTTLE WASH BLDG.
3.12 BOTTLEHOUSE "B" & WAREHOUSE: Interiors
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3.13 BLUFF SITE

FOOTPRINT: 87,500+/- SF
(140’+/-) x (625’+/-)

CLEVELAND AVE. S.E.
3.14 KNOLL DEMOLITION IDEA #1: Educational Campus
3.15 : KNOLL DEMOLITION IDEA #2: Corporate Campus

REDEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS, LLC

OLYMPIA BREWERY VISIONING 25 AUGUST 2011
3.16 : KNOLL DEMOLITION IDEA #3: Town Center
525 Columbia Street NW
Olympia, WA
$15.00 - $18.00 PSF
351 - 5,954 SF
Office
Divide or Combine for Multiple Sq.Ft. Options

2101 Harrison Avenue NW
Suite #B1, Olympia, WA
$13.79 PSF
$525.17/Mo. + NNN
457 SF
Office/Retail
(can combine w/B2 for 857 sf)

1801 West Bay Drive NW
Olympia, WA
$25.50 PSF
589 - 5,922 SF
Office
Combine Suites for Multiple Sq. Ft. Options

2114 Caton Way SW
Olympia, WA
$21.50 PSF
$1,085.75/Mo.
606 SF
Office

402 Black Hills Lane SW, #C
Olympia, WA
$16.95 PSF
$890.00/Mo.
630 SF
Medical/Office

2604 12th Court NW, #A-2
Olympia, WA
$14.00 PSF
$764.17/Mo.
655 SF
Office
(Can combine w/ suite B for 4,255 SF)

101 N. Capitol Way, #203
Olympia, WA
$17.75 PSF
$1,143.40/Mo.
773 SF
Office
2958 Limited Lane NW
Suite #B
Olympia, WA
$1,590.00/Mo.

2116 Caton Way SW
Olympia, WA
$1,648.33/Mo.

7226 Martin Way E.
Olympia, WA
$2,500.00/Mo.

505 E. Union Avenue SE
Olympia, WA
First Floor
$17.00 PSF

4315 6th Avenue SE, #C
Lacey, WA
$12.00 PSF
$1,000.00/Mo.

4324 Martin Way E.
Olympia, WA
$17.00 PSF
$1416.67/Mo.

1601 E. Front Street
Building A
Port Angeles, WA
$10.00 PSF
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Price Per SF</th>
<th>Monthly Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700 Marine Drive NE</td>
<td>1,004-6,180</td>
<td>Retail/Office</td>
<td>$15.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308 Fones Road SE</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$.60</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Cullens Street SW</td>
<td>1,105-9,452</td>
<td>Medical/Office</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelm, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601 E. Front Street</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Angeles, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Market Street NE</td>
<td>1,156-6,947</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4313 6th Avenue SE</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$1,191.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6101 Capitol Boulevard SE</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Office/Retail</td>
<td>$15.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumwater, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 Lilly Road NE</td>
<td>1,296 - 12,672</td>
<td>Medical/Office</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Divisible to 1,296 sf with a variety of floor plan options
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4310 6th Avenue SE</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>$17.25</td>
<td>$17,250</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8729 Commerce Place Dr NE</td>
<td>1,338-2,772</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10,000-27,720</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey, WA 98516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724 Columbia Street NW</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$2,800.00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite #330, Olympia, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2101 Harrison Avenue NW</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$1,570.33</td>
<td>Office/Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite #A, Olympia, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Combine w/ B2 for 1,746 sf or w/ B1 &amp; B2 for 2,203 sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2625 Parkmont Lane SW</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$1,380.00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building B, Suite A, Olympia, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 Lilly Road NE</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>$19.50</td>
<td>$2,279.88</td>
<td>Medical/Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building A, Suite B, Olympia, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined w/#A (4,099sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4317 6th Avenue SE, #201</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>$15.50</td>
<td>$1,828.00</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can combine w/#202 for a total of 3,587 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801 West Bay Drive NW</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>$25.50</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite 202, Olympia, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tumwater Area Office Market Analysis

209 Lilly Road NE
Olympia, WA
$27.00 PSF
1,500-32,000 SF
Medical/Office

80 Marion Road
Elma, WA
$.50 PSF
$2,500.00/ Mo.
1,500 SF Office
3,500 SF Warehouse
Office/Warehouse

2940-A Limited Lane NW
Olympia, WA
$11.00 PSF
$1,394.25/ Mo.
1,521 SF
Office
Can combined w/lower level space for 4,418 sf

402 Black Hills Lane SW,
#B
Olympia, WA
$19.75 PSF
$2,603.70/ Mo.
1,582 SF
Medical/Office

6336 Littlerock Road SW
Tumwater, WA
$17.95 PSF
$2,368.00/ Mo.
1,583 SF
Medical/Office

2625 Parkmont Ln SW,
Bldg C
Olympia, WA
$8.00 PSF
1,600 - 3,224 SF
Office

1217 Cooper Point Rd SW
Olympia, WA
$12.00 PSF
1,659 or 1,781 SF
(Can combine for 3,440 SF)
Office

404 Black Hills Lane SW,
#D
Olympia, WA
$19.75 PSF
$2,753.00/ Mo.
1,673 SF
Medical/Office
724 Columbia Street NW
Suite #410
Olympia, WA
$25.00 PSF
$3,570.83/Mo.

649 Woodland Sq. Lp SE
Lacey, WA
$15.00 PSF
$2,436.00/Mo.

1601 E. Front Street
Building B
Port Angeles, WA
$10.00 PSF

300 Lilly Road NE
Olympia, WA
$18.00 PSF

4317 6th Avenue SE, #202
Lacey, WA
$15.50 PSF
Can combine w/#201 for a total of 3,587 sf

4219 6th Avenue SE
Lacey, WA
$18.50 PSF

2625 Parkmont Ln SW,
Bldg A
Olympia, WA
$6.00 PSF

7219 Cleanwater Lane SW
Building #10
Tumwater, WA
$10.00 PSF

1,714 SF
Office

1,949 SF
Office

1,965 SF
Office

1,970 SF
Medical/Office

2,172 SF
Office

2,240-7,060 SF
Office & Retail

2,500 SF
Office

2,513 - 6,000 SF
Office
Tumwater Area Office Market Analysis

2940-A Limited Lane NW
Olympia, WA
$15.80 PSF
$3,419.38/ Mo.

2,597 SF
Office
Can combined w/upper level space for 4,418 sf

205 Lilly Road NE
Building A, Suite A
Olympia, WA
$19.50 PSF
$4,381.00/ Mo.

2,696 SF
Medical/Office
Combined w/#B (4,099sf)

1217 Cooper Point Road SW
Olympia, WA
$12.00 PSF fully serviced

3,440 SF
Divisible to: 1,659 or 1,782SF Office

4317 6th Avenue SE
Suites 201 & 202
Lacey, WA
$14.95 PSF
$4,468.80/ Mo.

3,587 SF
Office
Divisible to 1,415 sf and 2,172 sf

2604 12th Court NW #B
Olympia, WA
$12.00 PSF

3,600 SF
(Can combine w/ suite A-2 for 4,255 SF) Office

3621 Ensign Road NE
Olympia, WA
$17.00 PSF

4,114 SF
Medical/Office

3622 Ensign Road NE
Olympia, WA
$16.00 PSF
$5,853.00/ Mo.

4,390 SF
Medical/ Office
Divisible
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110 West K Street</td>
<td>Shelton, WA</td>
<td>4,400 SF</td>
<td>$11.00 PSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2940-A Limited Lane NW</td>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td>4,418 SF</td>
<td>$14.25 PSF, $5,246.00/ Mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2404 Harrison Avenue NW</td>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td>5,000 SF</td>
<td>$9.50 PSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7219 Cleanwater Lane SW</td>
<td>Tumwater, WA</td>
<td>6,000 SF Each Building</td>
<td>$10.00 PSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505 E. Union Avenue SE</td>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td>6,121 SF</td>
<td>$17.00 PSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5109 Capitol Blvd.</td>
<td>Tumwater, WA</td>
<td>6,745 SF</td>
<td>$11.00-$15.00 PSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Office
- Divisible to 1521 sf and 2,597 sf
Exhibit 4.2
Tumwater Area Apartment Rent Analysis / Comparables
6-20-11

$699 - $1009
1 - 3 Bedrooms
1 - 2 Bath
Black Lake - Olympia, WA 98512
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Small Dogs Allowed, Cats Allowed,

$899 - $1440
1 - 3 Bedrooms
1 - 2 Bath
Tribeca Apartment Homes - Olympia, WA 98501
Tribeca Apartment Homes is a BRAND NEW apartment community offering one,
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Small Dogs Allowed, Cats Allowed,

$733 - $993
1 - 3 Bedrooms
1 - 2 Bath
Crowne Pointe Apartments - Olympia, WA 98502
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Small Dogs Allowed, Cats Allowed,
$770 - $1005
1 - 3 Bedrooms
1 - 2 Bath
Talisman Apartments  ·  Olympia, WA 98506
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Cats Allowed, Parking, Garage

$695 - $895
1 - 2 Bedrooms
1 - 1.5 Bath
Wilderness West  ·  Olympia, WA 98501
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Cats Allowed, Parking, High Speed

$760 - $1090
1 - 3 Bedrooms
1 - 2 Bath
Breckenridge Apartment Homes  ·  Olympia, WA 98512
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Cats Allowed, Parking, Garage ... More >
$670 - $1375  
1 - 3 Bedrooms  
1 - 2 Bath

**Montair at Somerset Hill**  - Olympia, WA 98512  
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Small Dogs Allowed, Cats Allowed,

$895 - $1245  
1 - 3 Bedrooms  
1 - 2 Bath

$710 - $810  
1 - 2 Bedrooms  
1 Bath

**Yauger Park Villas**  - Olympia, WA 98502  
BRAND NEW SPACIOUS LUXURY HOMES!!!1,200 sq ft with attached garages.  
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Small Dogs Allowed, Cats Allowed,

$725 - $1055  
1 - 3 Bedrooms  
$850
2 Bedrooms
1.5 Bath
Townhouse  - Olympia, WA 98501
Dishwasher, Cats Allowed, Some Paid Utilities, Balcony, Deck or Patio,

$780 - $1100
1 - 3 Bedrooms
1 - 2 Bath

Emerald Pointe Apartments  - Lacey, WA 98503
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Small Dogs Allowed, Cats Allowed

$625 - $785
1 - 2 Bedrooms
1 Bath
The Timbers  - Lacey, WA 98503
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Small Dogs Allowed, Cats Allowed
$835 - $1205
1 - 3 Bedrooms
1 - 2.5 Bath
Hearthstone Apartment Homes  - Tumwater, WA 98501
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Small Dogs Allowed, Cats Allowed

$625 - $850
Studio, 1 - 2 Bedrooms
1 Bath
Lacey Park Apartments  - Lacey, WA 98503
Washer/Dryer in Unit, Dishwasher, Small Dogs Allowed, Cats Allowed
### Exhibit 5.1 Brewery End Use Ideas
**Range Of Possibilities for Achievement Methods and Strategies (How)**

**DRAFT: Not a Final Document or Final Conclusions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Ideas / End Use (Development)</th>
<th>Market Driven</th>
<th>Possible City Facilitation Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public - Private Partnership Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public Initiative(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bluff Parcel Asset Considerations:</strong> An easy site to develop. A fairly level reasonable located building site sized appropriately for a typical multifamily residential development although not extraordinary in any manner</td>
<td>Market should support a private development on this parcel dependent on land cost, construction cost and expected returns to private developer</td>
<td>Zoning changes regulation / permit issues, street improvements and access and infrastructure support</td>
<td>Tax incentives Greater than current investment in roads and other infrastructure</td>
<td>A Public Housing Agency acquires site and constructs a qualifying project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bluff Parcel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bluff Parcel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mixed Use Project</td>
<td>Some question if the market would support a private mixed use development on this parcel due to financial considerations, location and number of alternative sites available in the market area.</td>
<td>Zoning changes regulation / permit issues, street improvements and access and infrastructure support</td>
<td>Tax incentives for retail / commercial / office and affordable housing Business development funding Greater than current investment in roads and other infrastructure</td>
<td>A Public Housing Agency acquires site and constructs a qualifying project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bluff Parcel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Office / Commercial Use Project</td>
<td>Some question if the market would support a private commercial use development on this parcel due to financial considerations, location and number of alternative sites available in the market area.</td>
<td>Zoning changes regulation / permit issues, street improvements and access and infrastructure support</td>
<td>Tax incentives for commercial / office Business development funding Greater than current investment in roads and other infrastructure Space lease as a funding tenant</td>
<td>A government (federal, state, local government acquires the site and builds a facility/office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Ideas / End Use (Development)</td>
<td>Market Driven</td>
<td>Possible City Facilitation Actions</td>
<td>Possible Public - Private Partnership Actions</td>
<td>Possible Public Initiative(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valley Asset Considerations:</strong> Major warehouse structures are in excellent condition. Rail service provides potential Access and utility services are problematic. The extent of the flood plain is a significant issue for some uses. The river access and potential connectivity to other trails and public spaces offers much.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Warehousing business and operations using rail line and surface transportation for operations</td>
<td>Some question as to whether the market has the potential to support warehouse space by purchase or lease due to availability of space in the market, current limitations of access and traffic as well as the cost of rail operations</td>
<td>Zoning changes regulation / permit issues, street improvements and access and infrastructure support / agreements</td>
<td>Tax incentives for commercial / office Business development funding Greater than current investment in roads and other infrastructure Space lease as a funding tenant Agreements related to access and operations that facilitate operations</td>
<td>Warehouse facilities and/or land is acquired for public purpose(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 5.1 Brewery End Use Ideas

**Range Of Possibilities for Achievement Methods and Strategies (How)**

*DRAFT: Not a Final Document or Final Conclusions*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Ideas / End Use (Development)</th>
<th>Market Driven</th>
<th>Possible City Facilitation Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public - Private Partnership Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public Initiative(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Manufacturing business and operations using rail line and surface transportation for operations | Some question as to whether the market has the potential to support use of the space for manufacturing by purchase or lease due to availability of space in the market, current limitations of access and traffic as well as the cost of rail operations | Zoning changes regulation / permit issues, street improvements and access and infrastructure support / agreements | Tax incentives for commercial / office  
Business development funding  
Greater than current investment in roads and other infrastructure  
Space lease as a funding tenant  
Agreements related to access and operations that facilitate operations | Warehouse facilities and/or land is acquired for public purpose(s) |
| **Valley**                            |              |                                  |                                               |                               |
| 3. Other “Market based” ideas (Industrial, Research Labs, Business Incubator, health care facility, Artists’ Studios and Galleries, Drive In Movie Theater, Bowling Alley, Family Fun Center - Indoor Putt-Putt Golf, Batting Cages, Go-Carts, Bumper Cars, Etc | | | | |
### Exhibit 5.1 Brewery End Use Ideas

**Range Of Possibilities for Achievement Methods and Strategies (How)**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Ideas / End Use (Development)</th>
<th>Market Driven</th>
<th>Possible City Facilitation Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public - Private Partnership Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public Initiative(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LOTT Clean Water / Water Reuse Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning changes regulation / permit issues, street improvements and access and infrastructure support / agreements</td>
<td>Operating and access agreements that facilitate operations and may be synergistic with LOTT functions</td>
<td>Warehouse facilities and or land is acquired for public purpose(s) including economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Traditional “public” or “non profit” purpose Uses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Boys And Girls Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conference/Convention/Events Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural Center-Riverfront Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• World Cultural Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aquarium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culinary Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planetarium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Events/Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Event Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Event Center With Riverfront</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Park And Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minor League Baseball Stadium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Music/Arts/Concert Venue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Natural Amphitheater-Concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Use (Public Works, Utilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Center for History or Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Hatchery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Paths Thru Beauty Of Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym-Soccer Arena-Roller Derby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Rink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Soccer Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Sports Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Sport Complex Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails And Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velodrome/Bicycling Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access/Public Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Corridor/River Access and Improvements including Habitat, Salmon Recovery and Off-Channel Restoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amtrak Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Knoll Asset Considerations

*Dramatic geographic and situational possibilities.* A unique site in terms of identity, accessibility, location and some amenities when compared to other local opportunities. Buildings are essentially solidly constructed and able to be adapted to many uses if the cost of demolition and reuse construction cost is overcome by the use(s).

### Proposed Ideas / End Use

**Knoll**

1. Mixed Use
   - Residential, retail office
   - Condominiums
   - Apartments
   - Retirement Community
   - Pub and restaurants
   - Retail Gift Shops
   - Small businesses
   - Roof top restaurant
   - Whole Foods Market grocery store
   - High density residential
   - Live/Work/ night life
   - Transitional Housing
   - Restaurant (S) And Brew Pub

2. Market Driven

3. Possible City Facilitation Actions

4. Possible Public - Private Partnership Actions

5. Possible Public Initiative(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Ideas / End Use (Development)</th>
<th>Market Driven</th>
<th>Possible City Facilitation Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public - Private Partnership Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public Initiative(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some question if the market would support a private mixed use development using the Knoll buildings due to financial considerations, location and number of alternative sites available in the market area as well as demolition and construction costs.</td>
<td>Zoning changes regulation / permit issues, street improvements and access and infrastructure support</td>
<td>Tax incentives for retail / commercial / office and affordable housing Business development funding Greater than current investment in roads and other infrastructure</td>
<td>A Public Agency could become an anchor tenant in a reuse facility and subsidize the cost of the development of the rest of the site. A Non profit development authority could be formed to foster the development, with or without tax based revenue support and grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed Ideas / End Use (Development)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Ideas / End Use (Development)</th>
<th>Market Driven</th>
<th>Possible City Facilitation Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public - Private Partnership Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public Initiative(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knoll</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some question if the market would support a business use development using the Knoll buildings due to financial considerations, location and number of alternative sites available in the market area as well as demolition and construction costs.</td>
<td>Zoning changes regulation / permit issues, street improvements and access and infrastructure support</td>
<td>Tax incentives for retail / commercial / office and affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• R&amp;D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Non-profit development authority could be formed to foster the development, with or without tax based revenue support and grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knoll</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hotel And Conference Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knoll</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Traditional “public” or “non profit” purpose Uses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Art Studios And Gallery Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Community Of Artists-Piece By Piece)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsidized Biotech R&amp;D Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsidized Business Incubator For Startups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural Center-Riverfront Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Traditional “public” or “non profit” purpose Uses:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning changes regulation / permit issues, street improvements and access and infrastructure support</td>
<td>Tax incentives for retail / commercial / office and affordable housing</td>
<td>Business development funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater than current investment in roads and other infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Art Studios And Gallery Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Community Of Artists-Piece By Piece)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsidized Biotech R&amp;D Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsidized Business Incubator For Startups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural Center-Riverfront Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Cultural Center (Later Phases Hotel And Golf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Center (From Capitol Campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Center (Possibly Combined With Hotel) (Great Wolf Lodge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, City Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access/Public Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit/Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Ideas / End Use (Development)</th>
<th>Market Driven</th>
<th>Possible City Facilitation Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public - Private Partnership Actions</th>
<th>Possible Public Initiative(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Entire Site Asset Consideration:</strong> Many compelling reasons to consider a campus approach especially for education use. Potential uses include:</td>
<td>It is unlikely that the entire site would be developed as a master planned approach for any of the potential uses unless the end user was willing to subsidize the overall development based on other than market considerations</td>
<td>Zoning changes regulation / permit issues, street improvements and access and infrastructure support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Active recruitment, creation of public funding assistance sources(s), political action, direct grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Artist Campus (studios, housing, education and sales)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition, master planned development and investment strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi / Sector Oriented Business Campus (multiple businesses and related jobs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Single Business Campus Headquarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community/Cultural Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residential Community Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conference/Convention/Events Center with Hospitality Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Government Office Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health Care Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Theme park &quot;Wally World&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Access/Public Space/Riparian Corridor/River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Town Center / Downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transit/Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuum and Examples of Public/Private Partnerships

**Low Passive:**
*Let the Market Do It*

- Little to no Investment In Infrastructure
- Full Cost of Externalities Born By Development
- Little to no flex in Regulatory System

**High Aggressive:**
*Local Responsibility*

- Joint Purchase With Other Public Entities
- Public Purchase With Leaseback Option
- Tax Incentives For Preferred Development
- Advocate For State And Federal Funds
- Business Development Funding
- Operating And Access Agreements
- Active Recruitment

---

Zoning Changes
Code Changes
Permitting
Master Plan Development
Prioritize Infrastructure Improvements

- Tax Incentives
- Direct Tax Or Revenue Contributions
- Property Acquisition
- Large Investment In Infrastructure
- Political Action
- Creation Of Public Funding Assistance

---

Brewery Visioning Project  
Exhibit 5.2
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