

Submitted on Monday, July 10, 2023 - 12:54pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 158.68.232.221

Submitted values are:

First Name Joshua

Last Name Olsen

Question/Comment

Hello-

I appreciate the open process that the City is running in moving the Wellness Center project down the line. I see that a lot of commenters have covered a lot of ground with regard to the existing sites. I do want to raise two points that I am not seeing the conversation thus far.

1. Washington School site. I share others' concerns regarding the location in general and the difficulty with parking etc. But I also want to make sure that we are being mindful that the Washington parcel is also an asset of the school district. Our schools are perpetually underfunded and behind in staffing and teacher retention. I serve on the Superintendents advisory counsel and we often brainstorm solutions to these issues. One of the most viable solutions seems to be using the districts existing real estate assets to generate either on-going income, or developing a housing program for staff through a community housing trust or other mechanism. If the Washington parcel is taken by the City for the Wellness Center, I am concerned that a potential income producing asset will be permanently removed from the school district.

2. I am wondering if the team has considered siting the Wellness center at both the parking lots on B st. The one owned by the school and the one owned by the city. In my measuring those parcels combined get you to your square footage requirement if you consider two stories. There could be a very cool design to be had with a skywalk connecting the two buildings across B st. with the running track running in the skywalk. That option keeps it central, solves a lot of issues with the other locations and utilizes what are very underused parking lots. I have a designer that I work with that could put together a quick 3-d model of that option if you are interested.

Thanks-

Josh Olsen