

SECTION VIII

OLYMPIA HERITAGE COMMISSION PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Prepared by Mimi Sheridan, AICP

The Olympia Heritage Commission began a formal program assessment in April 2004 with the hiring of a consultant to undertake a series of interviews with community members. A total of 25 interviews were conducted, primarily in person. Developers, historic property owners, citizen activists, heritage community members, business representatives and city and state officials were among those interviewed. There were also two group interviews, with the presidents of the Olympia neighborhood associations and with staff members from the city's Department of Community Planning and Development. A complete list of those interviewed is in Appendix A; a list of the questions asked is in Appendix B.

The Heritage Commission also hosted a public forum on June 29, 2004, which was attended by another 25 people. Another seven written comments were received after the forum. These verbal and written comments have been integrated into this report as well.

“The city’s process is confusing, with layers of regulation; no one looks at how they interact. It seems like the city and the Heritage Commission have different goals and property owners can be caught in the middle. Other cities ask how they can help rather than having lots of rules and little flexibility.”

- Historic building owner

Several of those interviewed had previous experience with design review or historic designation, primarily as owners of downtown properties. Others had worked with the commission on various projects or issues. However, many of the interviewees had little previous contact with the Heritage Commission or its activities. Forum participants had a greater degree of involvement, since many had been active on heritage issues or owned historic houses. The forum also attracted a number of people new to these concerns.

Historic Preservation Priorities

- All of the people interviewed indicated that preservation is important to Olympia residents, a sentiment shared by those attending the June 29 forum. Participants said that historic downtown buildings and older neighborhoods are vital components of the quality of life and the character that Olympians expect, and are part of the city's sense of identity.

Program Assessment

Some people, primarily connected with city government, felt that people are interested in historic preservation, but only as long as it does not place a burden on them or affect other city services.

- The major priority for preservation was downtown Olympia. This was influenced by the fact that many of those interviewed were downtown property or business owners. However, the sentiment was generally shared, as most people felt that the community as a whole benefits from a thriving downtown area with a strong sense of place.
- At the same time, respondents noted that people have little idea about how this quality of life happens. They have little knowledge of the role of the city or of the Olympia Heritage Commission in maintaining Olympia's character.

"The public isn't getting it. Folks need to know not only what the commission does but why it matters. Olympia citizens need to understand how important the city's well-preserved buildings and neighborhoods (especially downtown) contribute to what they like about living here. That the "funky" or "friendly" or "accessible" qualities they like so much about downtown are directly related to its early-20th-century atmosphere. It's why people like downtown Olympia better than Lacey, and they need to be conscious of that."

- Community activist

- The second priority for preservation was older neighborhoods. Most people valued the context and surroundings of older houses and stressed the need for infill buildings to be compatible and in scale with nearby buildings. Streetscapes, including street trees, were also mentioned as an important part of this context.

- Opinions differed considerably in regard to the types of buildings that should be preserved, reflecting individual views of history and senses of aesthetics. While people appreciate the significance of the oldest buildings and those with obvious architectural distinction or important historic connections, not everyone considers newer buildings (those from the 1940s or later) or houses and commercial buildings of simple design to be worthy of preservation.
- Post-war buildings, simpler structures, and common styles of houses seemed to provoke both disagreement and perplexity among some of those interviewed. Accordingly, some

Program Assessment

respondents upheld a strict standard, proposing to designate as historic only those buildings with both architectural and historical value, such as the Old Capitol or houses from the 1890s.

- On the other hand, a considerable number of people expressed interest in preserving a diverse range of buildings, including newer structures. Examples given included Art Deco and Modernist styles and buildings from the 1940-60s.
- One person suggested that the commission focus on heritage programs and education and the designation of districts, deemphasizing designation of individual buildings.
- Considerable importance was placed on preserving and recognizing archaeological sites and other locations of importance to Native American history.
- A number of people appeared to be unclear about the difference between the Olympia Heritage Register (those buildings that have been designated as historic by the Olympia Heritage Commission, with owner consent) and those on the city's Historic Resources Inventory (buildings identified as potentially historic in the 1986 Historic Resources Survey and subsequent surveys).
- Forum participants were quite specific in proposing places to be preserved. These included: Puget Sound Wesleyan Institute (at Union & Adams streets), the bus depot, the Carnegie library, the Security Building, the Eagles Building, the Cunningham Building, the waterfront, Percival Landing, open space on Capitol Lake, brick streets and alleys and transportation corridors such as the Pacific Coast Highway.

“Preservation reinforces the high quality of life in our older neighborhoods—safe streets and neighborliness. Many choose to live here because it is a true neighborhood without character-less houses and strip malls.”

- South Capitol neighborhood resident

- Specific neighborhoods that were mentioned as being important to preserve included the South Capitol neighborhood, the Upper West Side (near Harrison Street and Black Lake Boulevard), the Bigelow House area and the East Side.

Program Assessment

Perceived Threats to Historic Resources

Neglect and lack of maintenance of older buildings, especially by absentee landowners, was considered a significant threat, especially by those involved with downtown issues.

New building codes, and strict interpretations without flexibility for historic buildings, were seen as major barriers to downtown rehabilitation projects. Owners said that costs are increasing rapidly while rents are remaining stagnant, so that few renovation projects are economically viable. Code interpretation is an important factor in this equation.

- Neighborhood residents cited the incursion of commercial uses and insensitive infill, due to the pressure for development and density, as major threats leading to the deterioration of their neighborhoods.
- Several people noted that businesses and governmental agencies often see historic buildings as not being adaptable to their needs, and the requirements of a modern office can make their use a challenge. Current rental policies and specifications of the State of Washington make renting historic buildings to state agencies very difficult.
- The general cultural emphasis on development and progress was also mentioned as an overall threat, leading people to value the new over the old.

Historic Preservation and Economic Development

- Most people interviewed felt that historic preservation is important to economic development, through tourism (attracting both tourists and regional shoppers to downtown) and the renovation and reuse of historic buildings.
- One of the strongest findings was the intense support for downtown among all those interviewed, not just those involved with downtown. Having a “jewel” of a downtown was seen as particularly important, to compete with neighboring towns.
- Most people felt that more could be done to promote Olympia as tourist destination, especially because of the presence of the Capitol campus. They proposed that there be greater coordination among the various entities involved, including the Heritage Commission.

“Olympia has the heart and soul that other cities are searching for.”

- Community activist

Historic Preservation and Growth Management

- Most people interviewed were in agreement that Olympia needs to have greater density, as its expansion is hemmed in by Tumwater and Lacey. A few people, however, felt that the decisions to grow and to increase downtown density were choices made by the City Council and not required by law or circumstances.
- Growth management itself was not seen as a threat. Most respondents said that Olympia has sufficient room that, with sensitive planning, the city can accommodate both growth and the preservation of historic buildings. They noted that development should focus on the less-historic areas, and on the restoration, rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of historic buildings. Two people mentioned the area north of State Street as a good location for increased density.
- A number of people expressed concern about increased height limits (especially where they would affect views or along the downtown waterfront) or about adding density in older neighborhoods. Although there appears to be some perceived potential for growth in these neighborhoods as long as attention is paid to compatible design, there is also disagreement about what would be appropriate in specific areas.

“Make downtown more attractive and appealing to live there. There’s enough space to do both and still save significant buildings.”

- Historic building owner

Historic Preservation Regulations & Incentives

Design Review

- Many of those who had experience with the design review process found it confusing. Currently, some projects go through the city design review process as well as review by the Heritage Commission. The standards can differ, as the commission uses the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, as specified by the National Park Service, and the city design review board uses the city design code.

Program Assessment

- Some feel that design review guidelines and the Secretary's Standards are too vague and interpretation is too strict, requiring replacement or repair of original elements when it is not reasonable or economical. Others noted that both the interpretation of the guidelines and the process are unclear and inconsistent.
- Some respondents said that design review is a bureaucratic process that focuses on what one cannot do, while it should focus more on helping people to do the most appropriate thing for the circumstances. Several people suggested that the process be a more flexible and cooperative process so that people can better see its value to them and to the community, rather than just seeing it as a burden or a barrier. One person noted, however, that applicants often do not prepare adequately for design review meetings.
- Design review of buildings adjacent to historic buildings caused considerable comment, but with differing opinions. Some people indicated that the procedure is unwarranted and unfair, while others said that it is needed to preserve the context of historic buildings and neighborhood character, and should be strengthened, particularly in relationship to commercial buildings near historic homes.
- The adjacency review regulations are considered particularly unclear. Some people noted that the requirements are unreasonable and inflexible, requiring emulation of older buildings and causing unwarranted expense and hardship to property owners. Several people at the forum expressed concern about the ease with which even designated buildings can be significantly altered or even demolished without review and with no consequences to the owner.

Designation

- Few of those interviewed had had much contact with the Heritage Register designation process. Those who had generally felt that it was easy to do. However, some had the perception that it was an onerous process. One person felt that the standards of integrity are too high, making it difficult for people with less money to have their homes designated (referring primarily to the requirements regarding original windows).
- There seems to be little incentive for designation, although the house research that is done for the designation process is a benefit appreciated by the homeowners.

Program Assessment

- Confusion exists about the difference between Heritage Register properties and those on the Historic Resources Inventory, since they seem to be regulated in much the same way. It was noted that designation is currently done solely by the Heritage Commission, without a formal legislative process with due notice and a public hearing.
- Some respondents called for better information on the requirements, expectations and benefits from being on the Heritage Register. Some consider the information for homeowners as too “lawyer-like” and hard to understand.
- People are also unclear about the actual impacts, requirements or benefits of historic districts, including the proposed downtown district. The various levels of designation (local, state and federal) are also confusing. Some people were unclear how another layer of bureaucracy (the historic district) would help them. However, others recognized that the added regulation would be minimal.
- It was noted that owner consent is required for placing a building on the Olympia Heritage Register, but adjacent properties are impacted without any input into the process. Adjacent owners are often not aware of the design review requirement until they apply for a building permit.
- Several people said the commission should be more proactive about explaining to contractors and homeowners what they can expect if they plan to renovate or remodel a historic home. Notice should be given to neighbors when a building is being considered for designation, as it will affect them as well.
- Some suggested emphasizing historic districts over the designation of individual buildings, since most buildings are more important when they are preserved as a group and in a compatible context.

“The city needs to have standard policies and procedures that are easily understood and uniformly applied.”

- Homeowner

Incentives

- People were generally positive about the concept of financial incentives to encourage rehabilitation, but said that these would not be sufficient to encourage them to do more projects.

Program Assessment

- There was relatively little interest in actually using potential financial incentives, perhaps due to the types of people interviewed. One person felt that a revolving loan fund or similar incentive would appeal to low-income homeowners.

“Financial incentives come with strings that may not be worth it. The city’s attitude towards projects is the most important factor. The city should decide what it wants downtown to look like, including what should be preserved, and work toward achieving it.”

- Historic building owner

- Property owners were generally aware of the Special Tax Valuation Program, which is currently the primary financial incentive for rehabilitation. Those who had used it said that it is quite a simple process, and can be a valuable part of a project’s economics.

One resident, however, said that the expenditure threshold for the program is too high and that more people would take advantage of it if they could spend less money.

- Grants to restore commercial facades, an incentive used in many cities, would probably appeal more to smaller property owners or tenants. One person noted that façade details can be particularly costly to restore, with no return to the owner. However, the amount would have to be a significant percentage of the project cost to make it worth the increased effort and time.
- By far the most popular potential incentive proposed was a waiver of fees or increased code flexibility for historic buildings. Examples given were the high fees for changes of use and for going through design review, even for very small projects. These were seen as disincentives that particularly impact improvements to downtown historic buildings.
- Those involved in the rehabilitation of commercial buildings generally felt that the city does not welcome downtown projects. They said that “a better attitude with more flexibility and a common sense approach” was needed to encourage more building rehabilitation projects. One person said, however, that the city officials had wanted his project to succeed and were helpful in providing flexible code interpretations. Those who had completed single family residential projects felt that city officials understood them and facilitated their completion.

Program Assessment

- One non-financial incentive proposed for residents was a consulting service that would help people remodel their homes correctly while preserving its original character. Such assistance would help motivate people to make improvements and would advise them on how to do it properly and within a reasonable budget.
- All of those interviewed felt that the additional cost that would fall on non-historic properties due to incentives for historic buildings is not a concern. They said that it would be a reasonable price for the benefits of preservation to the general community and would help property values in general.

Historic Preservation Information and Education

- Virtually everyone said there is a strong need for more outreach and education of the general public in order to encourage awareness and support for preservation.
- Since few of those interviewed were familiar with the fledgling Olympia Historical Society, people look to the Heritage Commission to lead the education efforts.
- Those involved in outreach and sales activities emphasized that preservation needs to be marketed and sold to the public like any other concept in today's world, in order to attract the attention of people who are not already interested.
- People spoke very positively about the historic house tours, speeches, newspaper articles and other activities that are already underway.
- Several people mentioned the need to have imaginative activities that make preservation more fun, rather than just a requirement. Examples could be a variety of neighborhood events such as picnics to highlight the Olympia Heritage Register houses in an area, tell their history and explain how to get on the register.

“History needs to be shared with the public; otherwise it means nothing. Activities and interpretation can be a link in the chain of history, carrying on traditions from the past. People don’t understand that preservation grounds them to their past.”

- Heritage professional

Program Assessment

- A primary topic at the public forum was the need to establish a museum and archive focusing on Olympia history. The Carnegie library was suggested as a good location; it could also be a venue for regular heritage meetings. It was also suggested that the Puget Sound Wesleyan Institute building be moved to the bus depot area, with the upper floors used for historical purposes and the Chamber of Commerce on the first floor. The lodging tax, as well as private contributions, was suggested as a funding source for a museum.
- Installing more historic markers was another emphasis. People suggested that these be outside of downtown (examples used Garfield School, Liberty Field, the first courthouse and Priest Point) as well as downtown. However, funding would need to be identified, as they cannot always be included in other street improvement projects.
- More walking tours, driving tours and house tours were suggested both at the forum and by interviewees. The annual South Capitol neighborhood tour is an effective means of raising awareness and people would like to see more of this type of activity. However, many seem to be unaware of the written materials, such as tour brochures and maps, which already exist. Downtown was a particularly popular area suggested for tours; other suggestions were for bus tours going into the county and occasional harbor tours.
- Plaques on historic buildings are seen as one of the most effective means of raising awareness. They are often a person's initial contact with the city's preservation program, and give concrete evidence of what is considered important.
- Another popular idea was to have regular articles in the Olympian, not just about local history, but about the process for designation, the reasons particular buildings are considered historic, the importance of preservation, and the benefits the city gains from preservation.
- Another suggestion was to have speakers, slide shows and brainstorming sessions to solicit ideas for preservation and heritage.
- Forum participants suggested several specific preservation activities that would gain attention: Build a 10-story tower on the site of Edmund Sylvester's tower; delineate the original shoreline with bricks; have living history presentations and reenactments; build a replica of Lathrop Smith's cabin on its original site; erect statues of historical figures like Margaret

Program Assessment

McKenny and Edmund Sylvester; reinstall the clock tower on the Old Capitol Building; restore the Greyhound bus station for use as a police station; and, rename some streets with historic names.

City and State Government

Role of Preservation within City Government

- Interviews with people involved with the city generally indicated that historic preservation is not considered a significant goal or objective of the city, although it is in the comprehensive plan.
- Historic preservation is located physically apart from the city's planning staff, and is not seen as high a priority as other zoning and land use matters; it is something of an afterthought. Historic preservation staff is very responsive to inquiries and plan review needs, but, because staff is located elsewhere, they are not a part of regular activities and day-to-day interaction.
- The larger amount of infill construction has increased the need for design review adjacent to historic properties, which is time consuming and presents particular problems for city staff; information given at the counter or on the telephone may sometimes be inaccurate.
- Some people expressed a need to have the Heritage Commission's role clarified. One suggestion was that its role be broadened to make recommendations directly to City Council. A related suggestion was that the commission take a stronger role by making recommendations rather than simply advising, and that it become more involved in discussing and making recommendations on broader issues that relate in some way to preservation or community character. This would help the city to make better use of the depth of expertise on the commission.

Relations with State Government

- The representative from the state Department of General Administration welcomed city participation in the state master plan for facilities and increased city-state consultation regarding preservation goals.
- It was noted that many state-owned buildings are on the city's Historic Resource Inventory, and the state has a responsibility to continue to care for them. Efforts should also be made to avoid state actions that harm historic resources, regardless of ownership.

Program Assessment

- Several people noted that, because of the state’s massive presence in the city, coordinated efforts should be made to encourage agencies to remain in the city, to lease historic buildings and to construct high quality buildings that will enhance the city’s character.

Recommendations

Increasing the awareness of the general public about historic preservation and its benefits to the city as a whole is clearly an important goal for the commission.

Successful preservation programs face a constant process of raising the visibility of their issues and helping the public to understand and value preservation in order to gain support over the long term. Important initial steps toward accomplishing this goal are:

- Develop effective partnerships to increase awareness of the importance of historic preservation to the quality of life in Olympia. Potential partners include the Olympia Historical Society, local museums, the State Capitol Visitors’ Center, the Olympia Downtown Association, the Visitors’ and Convention Bureau and the Squaxin Island Tribe.
- Working with one or more partners, develop a strategic marketing plan to accomplish the most benefits with the limited resources (both money and people) available, and find funding for key components of the plan.
- Join with a partner to successfully implement a major project that will raise the visibility of historic preservation, demonstrate its value to the city and capture the public imagination.

Specific ideas that should be considered for inclusion in the marketing plan, based on the public input, include:

- Use existing publicity methods, such as the Olympian, to the greatest extent possible; a regular feature on preservation issues has been suggested.
- Distribute information on historic resources, such as walking tour maps, at a downtown kiosk, at the Capitol Visitors Center and other appropriate places. Also use these places to publicize relevant activities and events.
- Coordinate information and tours with the Visitors’ and Convention Bureau, and work with them and other business organizations to encourage tourists, shoppers and businesses of all types to come to downtown Olympia.

Program Assessment

- Target specific audiences that would be most important to long-term success, such as local officials and other community leaders, educators and owners of buildings houses on the Historic Resources Inventory.
- Develop a comprehensive long-range plan for historical markers, to be implemented as funding becomes available. This would allow the city to take advantage of street improvement projects and other funding sources and would ensure that a variety of topics and areas are included in the program.
- Increase the presence of the city’s historic resources and the preservation program on both the city website and the local public access television station.
- Increase outreach to neighborhood associations and to school children.
- Increase the research, documentation and recognition of the contributions of various groups, including Native Americans, to local history.
- Use workshops, seminars and projects to involve and train interested people to become active in preservation in ways that best use their talent and interests. This could include research, marketing or other skills needed to increase support for preservation.
- Sponsor events that could become the impetus or focus to use preservation to help build a sense of community by helping people improve their houses and their neighborhoods.
- Sponsor seminars such as hands-on window workshops to help people remodel and update without changing the feel of the house. Windows are a particular challenge to maintain and are especially important to building integrity.
- Publicize the buildings placed on the Olympia Heritage Register, explaining how they enhance the understanding of Olympia’s history.
- Work with tribal representatives to explore appropriate options for identifying and preserving Native American historic sites.
- Continue the dialog begun at the June 29 forum to solicit ideas and broader participation.
- Develop more clear and appealing information materials about the historical design review process and standards; target the information at contractors and architects as well as homeowners.

Program Assessment

- Develop a how-to kit for those considering applying to be on the register, with simple, easy-to-understand guidance and examples.

The interviews made it apparent that the city’s historic preservation ordinance and related regulations should be reviewed and amended to ensure that they accomplish the city’s preservation goals in a fair and effective manner.

Design review appears to be the area of greatest concern, particularly in regards to buildings adjacent to buildings on the Heritage Register or the Historic Resources Inventory. While many see it as a valuable and necessary tool, the current system has proven difficult to implement effectively.

- Review the historic design review process and guidelines for consistency, clarity and fairness and the appropriate level of specificity and flexibility to address various circumstances, while still remaining in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitations.
- Review the regulation of buildings that are on the Historic Resource Inventory but which have not been designated as historic landmarks through a public process.
- Evaluate the design review process and guidelines so that they can encourage appropriate infill while maintaining the historic character of neighborhoods.
- Clarify and simplify the design review process, avoiding duplicate reviews of the same project by different boards.
- Consider having staff review minor alterations, in order to streamline the design review process for small projects.
- Provide continuing education for Heritage Commission members, design review board members and staff on issues relating to preservation and the application of both city design guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.
- Provide information and appropriate training for staff throughout the city on regulations pertaining to historic buildings and on preservation’s importance to the city as whole.
- Identify procedural, policy or regulatory changes that will help avoid or reconcile conflicts between various requirements for historic building rehabilitations and other city requirements.
- Assess the problem of owner neglect and evaluate potential legal options for addressing it.

Program Assessment

- Work with city officials, other jurisdictions and heritage organizations to address concerns about building code interpretation, with the goal of providing appropriate flexibility for historic buildings while protecting public safety.
- Research potential options for a demolition delay ordinance that would be suitable for Olympia’s needs.
- Develop a city policy for dealing with artifacts (both prehistoric and historic) and a plan for actions to be taken if artifacts are discovered inadvertently.
- Assess the feasibility of designating more local historic districts with regulations tailored to the needs of the community.
- Explore options for incentives such as fee reductions for projects on historic buildings.
- Identify methods in which the city, the Heritage Commission and other parties can work cooperatively with property owners to facilitate building renovations, including clarifying and coordinating regulations and processes and identifying appropriate tenants.
- Place more information about historic designation and review requirements on the city website, including a means for people to determine what regulations applies to their property.
- Work with city officials and other parties to identify buildings that could be restored or rehabilitated to accommodate new uses that would enhance the growth management goals.

Of equal importance to increasing general public awareness is the need to increase the support for historic preservation both within city government and within the State of Washington.

Successful preservation efforts are complex undertakings that require partnerships among the public, non-profits, the city, the state and individuals. It is crucially important to ensure that local and state officials and community leaders understand these issues and the ultimate benefits to the city.

- Demonstrate how historic preservation supports the city’s primary principles of sustainability, growth management and urban design.
- Integrate historic preservation into appropriate places throughout the Comprehensive Plan (such as the Land Use chapter), rather than isolating it in the Historic Preservation chapter.

Program Assessment

- Facilitate implementation of both growth management goals and historic preservation goals by identifying areas where density can be increased with minimal damage to the historic fabric.
- Explore options for having preservation staff at city offices on a regular basis to answer clients' questions directly, to enhance communication and to further the integration of preservation into the city's culture and priorities.
- Evaluate the commission's current role and the potential benefits and consequences of broadening it or otherwise changing it.
- Work together with the City Council and State of Washington officials to coordinate the state master plan with city plans, including policies to protect both historic properties owned by the state and those owned by others that could be affected by the state's actions.
- Work with state officials, other jurisdictions and heritage organizations jurisdictions to explore options to increase state use of historic buildings, thereby enhancing the preservation of historic character in Olympia and other cities throughout the state.
- Provide historical information to building managers of state properties, so they are aware of the need for consultation and of their buildings' history and character-defining features.

Program Assessment

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEWEES

City of Olympia

City Manager Steve Hall and CP & D Director Subir Mukerjee
CP & D Staff

Randy Wesselman, Transportation

Karen Messmer, Planning Commission

Community Activists and Residents

Neighborhood Presidents

Steve Langer, Carnegie Group

Bonnie Jacobs, Friends of the Waterfront

Alan Hardcastle, South Capitol Historic District

Kathleen Burns, Homeowner

Business Organizations

Connie Lorenz, Olympia Downtown Association

Joe Hyer, Olympia Downtown Association

Tamara Garcia, Visitors' and Convention Bureau

David Schaffert, Chamber of Commerce

Building and Development Community

Doug Deforest, Olympia Master Builders

Chris McDonald, Artisan Group (residential remodeling)

Sandy Desner, Deskoba

Steve Cooper, Orca Construction

Brian Kolb, Kolb Properties

Pat Rants, Rants Group

Suzanne Schaeffer, Coldwell Banker

Don Rhodes, Heritage Bank

Preservation and Heritage Community

Rhonda Foster, Squaxin Island Tribal Preservation Officer

Derek Valley, State Capital Museum

Joe Lynch, Bigelow House Museum

Lanny Weaver, Olympia Historical Society

State of Washington

Mary Grace Jennings, Department of General Administration

Public Forum, June 29, 2004

Attendance included about 20 members of the public as well as Heritage Commission members.

This page left blank intentionally

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Have you had direct involvement with Olympia's Historic Preservation Program?
Was it successful or satisfying? Why or why not?
2. Generally, what is the value of the historic preservation program in Olympia? Is it important to Olympia residents generally?
Why do they value it (or not)?
3. To you, what types of historic resources are most important to preserve?
4. Do you think there are the threats to historically significant resources in Olympia?
What are these threats?
5. What should be the role of the historic preservation program in Olympia?
 - Should historic preservation be a part of economic development activities?
 - How could historic preservation play a role in transportation?
 - Does historic preservation have a role in growth management? How can the city best balance these two concepts?
 - Does the historic preservation program have a role in providing for community education and interpretation of historic resources?
5. On the whole, do you think there should be changes in the city's Historic Preservation Program? What kinds of changes should there be?

For property owners of historic properties:

6. How could the city's historic preservation regulation information be improved?
7. Are you aware of the Special Property Tax Valuation Program?
How could it be easier to use?
8. Should the city have more incentives for owners of historic properties?
 - Revolving loan fund? Façade improvement grants?
 - Non-financial incentives?

Do you think you would take advantage of such incentives?

Program Assessment

For property owners of non-historic properties:

8. Would you be willing to absorb the transfer of costs for these incentives?

For those in city government:

9. How do you see historic preservation fitting with overall city goals?
10. How could the historic preservation program be a more effective part of Olympia city government?
11. How could the commission serve citizens better? Should its role be re-defined?