

Submitted on Monday, July 10, 2023 - 4:32pm

Submitted by anonymous user: 172.221.102.133

Submitted values are:

First Name Tim

Last Name Stevens

Question/Comment

Dear Friends- Thank you for the opportunity to provide you comments on the proposed wellness center locations. I greatly appreciate the tremendous amount of work specifically (but not solely) by City Manager Gager, who has diligently worked to identify several viable sites for the public to compare and contrast. It has been an extraordinary effort I'm sure and the work is much appreciated.

As far as the 'best location'-- as has been teased out a bit in the info provided, I've been thinking about the most important things I'd want to flag as you consider a new site-- most are identified in the materials but for me they include:

- Is it the right sized parcel based on priority needs for a wellness center? I'd really hate to do the reverse-- having the location size drive the size of the facility. I'd like to understand how the square footage needs identified in the original plans (I think it was 50,000 sqft) matches up with more recent considerations of a 35,000ish sqft facility. What made up that 15,000 sqft that was lost when the site changed? I'm fine with a more efficient building design but I'd hate to go down the road of cutting out important aspects of the facility to 'match' parcel size. I don't have a good read on which of the options are 'right sized' for the facility, other than the fact that it would seem 3.5 to 4 acres would be in the wheelhouse.

- How accessible is the parcel location to those who will most benefit from the wellness center? From a walkability perspective, I don't think you are going to beat the Civic Center site, given the proximity to the schools but if that site is potentially off the table, additional things to consider-- proximity to lower income families, proximity to public transport and proximity to developed streets and sidewalks to maximize walking/biking to the site. From that perspective, it looks to me like WA School and the M St park locations would be best.

- Site that's consistent with city growth policy-- This one I can't answer because I don't know enough to definitively answer but the soccer field site is in an already growing area and would seem to be a good fit; M St park is a combo of park land and old industrial site in a place that could use some good public infrastructure. WA School may be a bit of an odd fit with the community.

- Cost- this is an important one. I'm really worried about a decision being made that will either take money off the table or end up making the overall costs (including land purchase and infrastructure) higher. There are 2 sites within the new market tax credit area-- that's \$4 million. We can't just make that money up if we decide on a location that's outside the area. Therefore, if we were going to select a location outside the NMT district, we'd need to assure that the overall cost estimates are not needed-- IE- at least \$4M less than the original cost estimate.

Overall, each location has its positives and drawbacks. Civic Center is a great location but many are (I feel unjustifiably) opposed to that location due to the proximity of the river. WA school is

another great location-- perhaps the best- as long as you have a facility sized on what citizens want and need VS. a size based on the lot size. I live in that neighborhood and I'm not worried about parking issues. Also with WA school, we lose the new market tax credits so we'd need to reduce costs without compromising the primary function of the facility. The soccer field location is right in the middle of the higher growth area in town but is fully 2 miles from most of our schools-- too far for most kids to ride a bike and therefore I'd worry about the impact that may have on after school opportunities. Not insurmountable but it's a significant issue. I also like the fact that the city already owns the land but it looks like the parcel may be too small to accommodate a facility and there's not a lot of 'on street' parking but there's certainly an opportunity to poach soccer field parking. Lastly, I do like the M street site-- if additional land is secured. That site is in an area that has had virtually no public or private investment other than the small park itself. It's proximal to low income neighborhoods, 'most' of the site is owned by the city already, there's not a lot of infrastructure teardown costs like there would be @ WA school and Civic Center; Chinook is already on the windrider route and (I think) is a safe routes to schools route. And importantly, it's in the new market tax credit district.

SO after talking myself thru this letter, assuming the civic center location is 'off the table' (as a lifelong conservationist, I nonetheless do not agree with those who suggest building there would impact the river) I'd recommend the M St park as the best location.

Hope that helps. Thanks for all your hard work helping the community think this thru.