

2012 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process

Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan,
Olympia Municipal Code and Related Maps

Prepared by
City of Olympia, Community Planning and Development

Prepared for the review and comments of citizens, citizen groups, and government agencies
in compliance with the ...

- State Environmental Policy Act of 1971
- Revised Code of Washington 43.21.C
- Chapter 197-11 WAC, effective April 4, 1984 and
- Olympia Municipal Code

DATE OF ISSUE: August 16, 2012



The City of Olympia is committed to the
non-discriminatory treatment of all persons
in the employment and the delivery of services
and resources.

olympiawa.gov



City of Olympia | Capital of Washington State

PO Box 1967, Olympia WA 98507-1967

August 16, 2012

Greetings:

I am pleased to provide you with a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) analyzing proposed amendments to the Olympia Comprehensive Plan. This DSEIS supplements the Olympia Comprehensive Plan Final EIS issued on April 4, 1994; therefore, this analysis does not re-analyze the 1994 Plan. Instead, it examines the changes from the adopted Plan, proposed by each amendment.

This DSEIS addresses a variety of proposed amendments, including one rezone proposal, a Parks, Arts, and Recreation Chapter amendment, and the annual update to the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). The rezone proposal is for a property called "Trillium" and located in Southeast Olympia. Parks, Arts, and Recreation staff is proposing an update that will enable the adoption of new impact fees, and the CFP, updated annually, is a multi-year plan for implementation of capital projects.

The Olympia Planning Commission will hold public hearings for the Trillium and Parks, Arts, and Recreation proposals at 6:30 p.m. on Monday, August 20, 2012, at Olympia City Hall, 601 4th Avenue East. The Commission will also deliberate, or determine their recommendation on the Parks, Arts, and Recreation amendment.

Please direct questions regarding the individual proposed amendments to:

1. Trillium Map Amendments: David Nemens, Associate Planner, 753-8062, dnemens@ci.olympia.wa.us
2. Parks, Arts, and Recreation Chapter: Jonathon Turlove, Associate Planner, 753-8068, jturlove@ci.olympia.wa.us
3. Capital Facilities Plan: Jane Kirkemo, Administrative Services Director, 753-8499, jkirkemo@ci.olympia.wa.us.

Written comments on the DSEIS should be sent to the address below by September 17, 2012:

SEPA Official

City of Olympia Community Planning and Development

PO Box 1967 Olympia, WA 98507

E-mail: chornbei@ci.olympia.wa.us

Following the draft review period, appropriate revisions will be made and a Final SEIS issued. These amendments will be considered by the Olympia City Council later in 2012.

Your interest and participation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Todd Stamm", with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Todd Stamm
SEPA Official

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	
	Fact Sheet	2
	Draft SEIS Distribution List	3
II.	SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FORMAT	
	A. Supplement to the 1994 Olympia Comprehensive Plan Environmental Impact Statement	6
	B. Format of the SEIS	6
	C. Process for Review of the SEIS and How to Comment	7
	D. Process for Review of the Proposed Plan Amendments and How to Comment	8
III.	SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT SUMMARY	
	A. Purpose	10
	B. Proposed Action and Objectives of Proposal	10
	C. Cumulative Impacts of the Proposals	11
	D. Related Policies and Plans	11
IV.	SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS, ISSUES, ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE, RECOMMENDATIONS	
	Chapter 1 – Trillium Rezone	13
	Chapter 2 – Parks, Arts, and Recreation – Chapter 7 Amendment	38
	Chapter 3 – Capital Facilities Plan Annual Update	41
V.	APPENDICES	
	Appendix A – Future Land Use Map with the Trillium Proposal Site Location	48
	Appendix B – Vicinity Map with the Trillium Proposal Site Location	49
	Appendix C. – Zoning Map with the Trillium Proposal Site Location	50

I. INTRODUCTION

Fact Sheet

1. Proposed Action

The proposed action is for the City of Olympia to consider adoption of three proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments pursuant to the requirements of the Washington Growth Management Act and one associated amendment of the Zoning Map. Each individual amendment proposal or group of related proposals has its own alternatives or options listed. These alternatives or options are included with each proposal.

2. Licenses and Permits

Adoption by ordinance by the City Council of proposed amendments to the Olympia Comprehensive Plan, the related amendments to the Olympia Zoning Ordinance, and related amendments to the Olympia Future Land Use and Zoning Maps.

3. Action Sponsor and Location of Reference Documents

City of Olympia Community Planning and Development Department
P.O. Box 1967 601 4th Avenue East, Olympia, WA 98507-1967

Contact Person: Stacey Ray, Associate Planner, (360) 753-8046

SEPA Official: Todd Stamm, Planning Manager, (360) 753-8314

4. Lead Agency

City of Olympia Community Planning and Development Department
PO Box 1967, 601 4th Avenue East, Olympia, WA 98507-1967
Main Desk: (360) 753-8314

5. Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Authors

Chapter 1	David Nemens, Associate Planner
Chapter 2	Jonathon Turlove, Associate Planner, Parks, Arts, and Recreation
Chapter 3	Stacey Ray, Associate Planner

6. Date of Issue of the Draft SEIS: August 16, 2012

7. End of Comment Period: September 17, 2012

8. Expected Date of Issue of Final SEIS: October 2012

DRAFT SEIS DISTRIBUTION LIST¹

Olympia City Council
Olympia Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee
Olympia Planning Commission
Chambers Ditch District – Dan Budsberg
City of Lacey – Rick Walk
City of Tumwater – Mike Matlock
Olympia Community Planning and Development Department
Futurewise
Interagency Committee on Outdoor Recreation – Lorinda Anderson
Intercity Transit - Dennis Bloom
LOTT – Michael Strubb
Nisqually Tribe – George Walter
North Thurston Public Schools – Jeff Greene
Olympia Master Builders – Laura Wolf
Olympia's Recognized Neighborhood Associations
Olympia School District – Tim Byrne
Olympia Thurston County Chamber of Commerce
Olympic Region Clean Air Agency – Micheal Nicolas
News media – KGY Radio, MIXX96, Little Hollywood Blogspot, Olympia Power and Light, The Olympian
Parks and Recreation Commission – Bill Koss
Port of Olympia – Alex Smith
Puget Sound Energy – Amy Tousley
Puget Sound Partnership – Gerry O'Keefe
Quest – Wayde Holmquist, Phil Stevens
Squaxin Island Tribe – Jeff Dickison
Superintendent of Public Instruction – Larry Kessel
Thurston County – Scott Clark, Mike Kain, Cliff Moore, Les Olson
Thurston County Fire Districts 3, 6, 7, 8, 9
Thurston Economic Development Council – Michael Cade
Thurston Regional Planning Council – Lon Wyrick
Timberland Library Olympia Branch
Utilities and Transportation Commission – David Danner
Washington Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation – Robert Whitlam
Washington Department of Corrections – Rebecca Barney
Washington Department of Ecology – SEPA Unit
Washington Department of Ecology – Shoreline Permits-Wetlands – Alex Callender
Washington Department of Ecology – Shoreline Program – Chrissy Bailey
Washington Department of Ecology – Toxic Clean-up Program – Rebecca Lawson

¹ The majority of copies have been distributed in an electronic form. Paper copies are available to government agencies at no cost upon request, and to the public at copying costs.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife – Jeff David, Kris Knutzen, Gloria Rogers

Washington Department of General Administration – Bonnie Scheel

Washington Department of Health – Peggy Johnson

Washington Department of Natural Resources – SEPA Center

Washington Department of Social and Health Services – Elizabeth McNagny

Washington Department of Transportation – District #3 – Debbie Maker

Washington State Department of Commerce – Ann Fritzel

West Olympia Business Association

Applicants:

- Trillium Rezone - SSHI, LLC, (DBA- DR Horton), 12931 NE 126th Place, Kirkland, WA 98034
- Proposed Amendment to the Parks, Arts, and Recreation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan - Jonathon Turlove, Associate Planner, Parks, Arts, and Recreation
- 2013-2018 Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) - Jane Kirkemo, Administrative Services Director

II. SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FORMAT

A. Supplement to the 1994 Olympia Comprehensive Plan Environment Impact Statement

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) is an addition to the Environmental Impact Statement prepared in 1994 for the Comprehensive Plan for Olympia and the Olympia Growth Area (Plan). The SEIS analyzes amendments proposed in 2012 to the 1994 Plan and its implementing regulations. Consequently, the SEIS builds on the EIS completed for the 1994 Comprehensive Plan and on EIS's for related actions listed in Section III below. City Council on the proposed amendments is expected to take place in November of 2012.

This SEIS represents a phase in the environmental review of policy decisions and other actions that will ultimately result in the development of future land uses and infrastructure to support them. The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) regulations, which govern the preparation of environmental impact statements, allow local environmental review to be timely phased as proposed actions become more specific and detailed. This type of environment review is called "phased review".

Phased environmental review is allowed when the sequence is from a broad, non-project based action to a subsequent site-specific proposal. For example, the proposed changes to the Plan's land use designations will likely be reflected in future site-specific development projects. These projects may require additional environmental review. The level of detail of this review will vary based upon project conformance with the Plan's analysis in the original EIS, this SEIS, and any important characteristics of the site or vicinity. This later review can range from the project's approval and reliance upon the original EIS and this SEIS as the basic environmental document, to the preparation of another supplemental environmental impact statement for major projects with significant adverse environmental impacts. It is likely that most projects will fall between these two extremes and will be reviewed by means of an environmental checklist.

B. Format of the Draft SEIS

This Draft SEIS follows a similar format to the original EIS. Section 1 is a Fact Sheet and distribution list for the Draft SEIS. Section II provides a description of the overall format of the document. Section III includes a broad summary of the impacts of the proposed Comprehensive Plan and zoning map amendments. Section IV provides a more details discussion of the proposal, issues, analysis, and recommendations.

C. Process for Review of the Draft SEIS and How to Comment

There are opportunities to comment on either the substance of the proposed Plan amendments (e.g., for or against), or on the Draft SEIS (e.g., on its accuracy or completeness). The review process includes a public review period since the purpose of this Draft SEIS is to provide the public and the decision makers (the Planning Commission and City Council) with sufficient information to understand the proposed amendments and the possible environmental impacts.

This Draft SEIS is issued by the City of Olympia and is being distributed to adjacent jurisdictions, state agencies with expertise, Indian Tribes, and interested parties for review and comment. There is 30-day review period ending September 17, 2012, during which comments will be accepted on the Draft SEIS.

Written comments on the Draft SEIS should be sent to the name and address indicated on the Fact Sheet. Always include your name and address so notification of availability of the Final SEIS can be mailed to you. Comments can be on any part of the document. Try to be as specific as possible by referring to a page and section number. Identify your concerns, desired outcome, and alternatives to resolve your concerns. If you have questions about this process, please contact the persons indicated on the Fact Sheet before the end of the comment period.

Following the close of the comment period, a Final SEIS will be prepared. The City will consider all comments received during the Draft SEIS comment period and may use any of the following methods to respond to those comments:

1. Modify the alternatives, including the proposed action;
2. Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given detailed consideration;
3. Supplement, improve, or modify the analysis;
4. Make factual corrections; or
5. Explain why the comments do not warrant further response, city sources, authorities, or reasons.

The Final SEIS will include copies of comments received and responses by the City.

D. Process for Review of the Proposed Plan Amendments and How to Comment

The tentative schedule for review and adoption of the proposed amendments is as follows:

April 2, 2012	Planning Commission Briefings
August 6 and August 20, 2012	Planning Commission Public Hearings
September 17, 2012	Draft SEIS Comment Period Ends
September 2012	Planning Commission Deliberations and Recommendation
October 2012	Final SEIS Issued
October/November 2012	City Council Review and Action

III. SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT SUMMARY

Purpose

The purpose of this section is to summarize the expected adverse environmental impacts and mitigation measures contained within this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS).

The purpose of this section is to briefly state the proposal's objectives, specify the purpose and need to which the proposal is responding, the major conclusions, significant areas of controversy and uncertainty, if any, and the issues to be resolved, including the environmental choices to be made among alternative courses of action. It is also to determine what, if any, are the cumulative impacts of the proposals.

Proposed Action, Objectives, and Issues

The role of the Comprehensive Plan (Plan) for Olympia and the Olympia Growth Area is to clearly state Olympia's vision for its future, and describe how to achieve it. The role of the implementing zoning is to establish the regulations which will govern land uses in a way that will move in the direction of the desired future vision. The proposed amendments to the Plan and its implementing zoning are intended as refinements to that vision and those regulations, and are intended to be consistent with the original intent of the Plan.

The intent of the 1994 Plan can be described briefly as follows: Olympia's historical lifestyle has been based on suburban sprawl, which is not suitable for carrying the community into the next decade. Anticipated continued growth in population means that Olympia will become increasingly denser; a change that can't be adapted to while maintaining our community livability without thinking comprehensively about accommodating housing, employment, and transportation needs.

Growth can be an opportunity to reshape our community into a more sustainable form where developed land is fully utilized and can accommodate projected growth and changing demographic needs. Neighborhoods and higher density areas, like business districts can become less dependent on cars, and new streets, buildings and neighborhoods showcase great design.

A healthy and desirable community that can accommodate anticipated population growth over the next 20 years needs higher densities and features that enhance and preserve livability. These can include improvements to parks and green spaces, vibrant and environmentally-friendly streetscapes and public spaces, and the preservation of tree canopy

and wildlife habitat. Olympia may need to plan to invest more resources or develop community partnerships to implement these sorts of features and preservation measures. At the same time, the City will need to balance expanding demands for city services and infrastructure, such as sanitary sewers, drinking water supplies, street systems, stormwater management facilities, and solid waste disposal. The Comprehensive Plan contains the goals and policies that will enable the City and community to plan for and implement a vision that balances competing interests to preserve and enhance our community.

Proposed Amendments

1. Changes to the text of the Comprehensive Plan. These include revisions to background material, policy statements, and proposed capital facilities;
2. Changes to maps in the Comprehensive Plan. This includes the map for future land use; and
3. Changes to the Olympia Municipal Code (zoning). This includes a change to the zoning map.

Cumulative Impacts of the Proposals

The State Environmental Protection Act requires that a SEIS include analysis and conclusions about the likely environmental impacts of a particular proposal, including cumulative impacts. The level of detail can vary depending on the significance of the potential environmental impacts.

The three proposed amendments included in this document are very different in scope and purpose, with two have very little to no adverse environmental impacts. Being that the Parks and CFP proposed amendments have minimal depth needed or included in their impacts analysis, there are minimal potential connections between the three proposals on which to address cumulative impacts.

The potential long-range cumulative impacts of the Trillium proposal are addressed in Chapter 1.

Related Policies and Plans

The EIS for the 1994 Comprehensive Plan includes a list of related policies and plans which were used as references for that document. Those policies and plans are also relevant to this document.

IV. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS, ISSUES, ANALYSIS, AND RATIONALE, SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER 1

Trillium Rezone

1. CHAPTER 1

Trillium Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezone Request

Proponent: SSHI, LLC (doing business as DR Horton)

Staff contact: David Nemens, Associate Planner

Proposal

Amend the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (Appendix A) to redesignate a 79.31-acre parcel of land on the south side of Morse-Merryman Road (see Vicinity Map, Appendix B) from the existing Neighborhood Village (NV) designation to R 6-12 (6-12 residential units per acre, the applicant's preferred option) or R 4-8 (4-8 residential units per acre, the applicant's "alternative and secondary" proposal), and make a corresponding change to the City's Zoning Map (Appendix C).

Background

Planning History

1994 Comprehensive Plan: In 1994, the City of Olympia and Thurston County jointly adopted a new Comprehensive Plan that provided for increasing the residential densities of future development in specific areas in the vicinity of Chambers Lake and its drainages. The property now known as the "Trillium site" was designated "Neighborhood Village (NV)" in the 1994 Comprehensive Plan, and was given the corresponding zoning.

1995 Chambers/Ward/Hewitt Comprehensive Drainage Basin Plan: The City of Olympia adopted the plan prepared by the Thurston County Storm and Surface Water Program. The latter plan was jointly developed by Thurston County and the cities of Olympia and Lacey.

2006 Moratorium: The City of Olympia enacted a moratorium barring new subdivision and grading applications in portions of the Chambers Basin. Following a public hearing, the moratorium area was expanded to include a "contributing" area to the west of Wiggins Road that included the subject site.

2007 Chambers Basin Moratorium Evaluation Report: This was an evaluation of development proposals and pre-submission applications for the area, which led staff to conclude that

drainage limitations east of Wiggins Road were inconsistent with the residential densities anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan and with current zoning. The Council reduced the size of the moratorium area to include only those ownerships east of Wiggins Road that are substantially within the area of poor drainage. The Trillium site was one of the properties removed from the moratorium area. The City made no changes to the Trillium site's Neighborhood Village (NV) comprehensive plan designation or zoning.

Trillium Master Plan Proposal: The proposed comprehensive plan amendment and rezone site was the site of a Master Plan development proposal known as "Trillium," under the current Neighborhood Village (NV) zoning. The proposal consisted of 500 single-family and multi-family residential dwelling units, a neighborhood commercial area, parks, trails, and open space, and streets, sidewalks and utilities. The application ultimately was denied by the City, after appeals and remands to the Hearing Examiner, based on a requirement in the NV zone for transit service.

Trillium Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezone Request (Case #11-0152):

On October 31, 2011 the applicant, SSHI LLC, doing business as DR Horton, submitted a 2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Pre-Application to the City. The final application was submitted on March 19, 2012. The subject of the application is a 79.31 acre property located at 3355 Morse-Merryman Road (Assessor's Tax Parcel No. 11830420000). The site is located on the south side of Morse-Merryman Road, adjacent to and east of LBA Park. It is currently designated Neighborhood Village on the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map, and is zoned Neighborhood Village (NV). The request, which the applicant states "is submitted under protest subsequent to City Ordinance 6762... wherein the City denied the Trillium Master Plan," is to amend the Future Land Use Map to designate the site as Residential R 6-12 or, "alternatively and secondarily," as Residential 4-8 (R 4-8), and to rezone the property to R 6-12 or, "alternatively and secondarily," to R 4-8.

Adjacent Development/Project Context:

The site is located in the southeast portion of the City on the south side of Morse Merryman Road between Boulevard Road and Wiggins Road SE. On the north side of Morse Merryman are residential neighborhoods and Margaret McKenny Elementary School. On the west side of the site is LBA Park for approximately the north half, and the proposed Bentrige Neighborhood Village on the south half. Trillium is bounded on the east by single-family residences on large, potentially redevelopable lots, and on the south by the Wilderness neighborhood with long-established homes on large lots fronting on meandering streets. The Wilderness neighborhood is outside the City limits.

Existing Site Conditions:

The Trillium site is undeveloped; most of the site is forested; the remainder is a former rock pit. There is a stand of same-age, closely grown evergreen trees. There are also areas of open-grown trees of larger diameter. The site was partially logged several years ago. There is a generally north/south ridge running diagonally through the middle of the site. There are numerous trails crisscrossing the site. These trails appear to be used by walkers and bicyclists. One of the trails connects to an easement on the north edge of Wilderness. There is an area of Morse Merryman Road that has been used to gain access for equipment, with a meandering "driveway" extending into the north end of the site. There is an old rock quarry on the west side of the site, adjacent to and visible from LBA Park.

ANALYSIS**Elements of the Environment****A. Natural Environment****1. Water**

Existing Conditions: In the existing condition, the forested site is comprised of parts of four different sub-basins within the Chambers Creek Basin. The site is defined with a prominent ridgeline running generally north/south dividing the property in two. The west side infiltrates into onsite soils, the eastern side sheet flows to adjacent properties including an existing wetland.

According to the Environmental Checklist received by the City on March 19, 2012, the subject site contains three separate Category III wetlands, each measuring less than 3,000 square feet in size. Two Category III wetlands and one Category II wetland appear to be located south and east of the site.

A portion (roughly the southeast half) of the proposal site is located in the Chambers Lake drainage sub-basin. The site sits above the Chambers Valley area, which consists of approximately 350 acres south of Chambers Lake, and which extends south toward the City limits at Smith Lake and 40th Avenue, west beyond Wiggins Road and east into Lacey.

The southeastern portion of the proposal site is part of a 200-acre hillside to the west of the Valley which drains toward this area, as does Chambers Lake and the western portion of

Lacey. Most of this hillside is forested. At the foot of the hillside and west of Wiggins Road is a wetland complex that generally drains to the south.

Running diagonally from the northeast across the Valley is the Chambers Ditch, an artificial channel constructed about one hundred years ago that forms the outlet of Chambers Lake. Chambers Ditch extends southwesterly from this area through the Wilderness neighborhood to Yelm Highway, and is managed and maintained by the Chambers Ditch District, a special service government with an elected Board and taxing authority.

Impacts: The applicant's proposal is to change the City's Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map; it is a non-project proposal and as such will not have any direct stormwater-related impacts. Impacts on surface water and drainage would be created by any future development on the site. These impacts may vary based on the amount of building coverage and impervious surface allowed in different zoning districts. The following table compares building coverage and impervious surface standards. The existing Neighborhood Village zoning allows 70 % site coverage by impervious surfaces; the three other zones listed in Table 1 (the applicant's request, the R 6-12 zoning district, the applicant's secondary request, the R 4-8 zoning district, and the alternative being considered in this SEIS, the R-4 zoning district) all allow 70% impervious surfaces for townhouse development, and have lower maximums for detached single-family residential development, as low as a 45% maximum impervious surface coverage in the R4 zone.

Table 1. Allowed Building Coverage and Impervious Surface by Zoning District

DISTRICT	R4	R 4-8	R 6-12	Neighborhood Village
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	35% 60% = townhouses	45% = .25 acre or less 40% = .26 acres or more 60% = townhouses	55% = .25 acre or less 40% = .26 acres or more 70% = townhouses	50 %
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	45% 70% = Townhouses	55%=.25 acre or less 50% = .26 acre or more 70% = Townhouses	65%=.25 acre or less 50% = .26 acres or more 70% = Townhouses	70%

This could result in different percentages of impervious surface in different zones under similar development scenarios.

Mitigation Measures: This is a non-project proposal; no mitigation measures are necessary at this time. Mitigation measures to limit the impacts of stormwater run-off can and should be incorporated into any development proposal for the site. These could include on-site detention facilities, as well as off-site improvements to assure that site development does not worsen existing off-site drainage problems. Any development proposal for the site should include an off-site downstream analysis that identifies the most serious of these off-site problems, and proposes specific mitigation measures.

Existing stormwater runoff regulations will mitigate some of the impacts of development. For example, regardless of the zoning designation, post-development stormwater runoff must be detained so that the post-development rate of runoff leaving the site does not exceed the pre-development rate.

B. Built Environment

1. Land Use / Housing / Neighborhood Character

Existing Conditions: The existing Future Land Use Map designation, Neighborhood Village (NV), was first applied to the site in 1994 with the adoption of the City's new Comprehensive Plan. The Land Use and Urban Design chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan states, in part, that this designation:

"... will enable development of innovative residential communities offering a wide variety of compatible housing types and densities, neighborhood convenience businesses, recreational uses, open space, trails, and other amenities that are seldom achieved under conventional, segregated zoning districts."

The Comprehensive Plan also states that the residential component of a Neighborhood Village will average up to 13 units per acre.

The Olympia Unified Development Code (UDC) describes the purpose of Neighborhood Villages and Urban Villages in part as follows:

"To enable development of integrated, mixed use communities, containing a variety of housing types arranged around a village center, which provide a pleasant living, shopping, and working environment; a sense of community; and a balance of compatible retail, office, residential, recreational, and public uses. [NOTE: Urban villages and neighborhood villages are very similar, except for the size and service area of their commercial component. Urban villages contain a larger and more diverse commercial component intended to serve multiple neighborhoods while the commercial uses in neighborhood villages are scaled to serve the immediate neighborhood.]"
(Section 18.05.020 OMC)

The Neighborhood Village zoning district allows a wide range of residential dwelling units, including single-family residences (which are required), cottage housing, townhouses, apartments (also required), duplexes, and certain types of group homes. The mix of housing types, including the required types, would be reviewed as part of the master plan that is required prior to development in the NV district.

The NV zoning district requires a neighborhood commercial area as part of a NV master plan. Associated development regulations spell out requirements for housing mix and densities, transit, village centers, neighborhood commercial uses, and design criteria for site, building, and landscape design. All development in the NV zone is subject to design review standards.

The NV zoning District allows a maximum housing density of 24 dwelling units per acre, a maximum average housing density of 13 units per acre, and a minimum density of 7 units per acre.

Based on the existing NV zoning, buildable land assumptions published by the Thurston Regional Planning Council in its October 2007 *Buildable Lands Report*, and on achieved residential densities in the approved Bentrige, Woodbury Crossing, and Village at Mill Pond developments, it is possible that as many as 560 residential dwelling units could be built on the proposal site. Due to the nature of the available data, this estimate combines various housing types. (Note that this residential dwelling unit estimate is based on the calculated capacity of the site, not upon the 500 dwelling units in the specific Trillium Master Plan proposal that was denied by the City.)

Impacts – R 6-12: The Applicant's primary request is for the Future Land Use Map designation of the entire site to be changed to Residential 6 – 12 (R 6-12), and for the property to be rezoned to the equivalent zoning district. The Land Use and Urban Design chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan states:

"This designation provides for single family, duplex, and townhouse development at densities from six to twelve units per acre. Areas designated for such use should be relatively close to arterials or major collectors with transit service."

The UDC states that the purpose of this district is "... to accommodate single-family houses, duplexes and townhouses, at densities between six (6) and twelve (12) units per acre, in locations with frequent mass transit service (existing or planned). This includes areas along or near (e.g., within one-fourth (¼) mile) arterial and major collector streets." (Section 18.04 OMC)

The residential uses allowed in the R 6-12 district are very similar to those allowed in the NV district, except that apartments and boarding homes are not allowed, and a mix of specific housing types is allowed but not required. New duplexes are allowed in R 6-12. With the

exception of home occupations, commercial uses are not permitted outright in the R 6-12 zoning district. Child day care centers, churches, and plant nurseries are allowed through the Conditional Use Permit process. The R 6-12 zoning district does not have general residential design standards. According to Section 18.100.060 OMC, single-family homes on lots less than 5000 square feet in area, duplexes, triplexes, and townhouses in this zone are subject to design criteria. The R 6-12 zoning district does not have a requirement for transit service.

As set forth in Section 18.040.080 OMC, the R 6-12 zoning District allows a maximum housing density of 12 dwelling units per acre, a maximum average housing density of 12 units per acre, and a minimum density of 6 units per acre.

Based on the requested R 6-12 zoning, and buildable land assumptions published by the Thurston Regional Planning Council in its October 2007 *Buildable Lands Report*, it is possible that about 430 single-family residential dwelling units could be built on the proposal site.

Amending the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and the City's Zoning Map to designate the subject property as R 6-12 might reduce the number of dwelling units that could be built on the site by about 85 or 90 dwelling units, although maximum average density and the minimum density requirements in R 6-12 are only slightly lower than the corresponding requirements in NV. However, the change to R 6-12 could impact future neighborhood character: NV requires a mix of uses, including apartments, single family homes, and a neighborhood commercial area, and has design standards for all of these uses; R 6-12 has no corresponding requirements for a mix of uses or design standards. Therefore the change to R 6-12 probably would result in a more uniform development pattern, with less diversity in housing types. The lack of design standards could also result in the development of less visually appealing housing.

Impacts – R 4-8: The Applicant's "alternative and secondary" request is for the Future Land Use Map designation of the entire site to be changed to Residential 4 – 8 (R 4-8), and for the property to be rezoned to the equivalent zoning district. The Land Use and Urban Design chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan states, in part:

"This designation provides for single family and townhouse development at densities between four and eight units per acre. Areas designated for such use should be relatively close to arterials or major collectors with transit service."

The UDC states that the purpose of this district is "To accommodate single-family houses and townhouses at densities ranging from a minimum of four (4) units per acre to a maximum of eight (8) units per acre; to allow sufficient residential density to facilitate effective mass transit service; and to help maintain the character of established neighborhoods." (Section 18.04 UMC)

The residential uses allowed in the R 4-8 district are very similar to those allowed in the NV district, except that apartments, boarding homes, and new duplexes are not allowed in the R 4-8 zoning district, and specific housing types are allowed but none are required, as in NV. With the exception of Home Occupations, commercial uses are not permitted outright in the R 4-8 zoning district. Child day care centers and plant nurseries are allowed through the Conditional Use Permit process. The R 4-8 zoning district does not have general residential design standards. According to Section 18.100.060 OMC, single-family homes on lots less than 5000 square feet in area, duplexes, triplexes, and townhouses in this zone are subject to design criteria. The R 6-12 zoning district does not have a requirement for transit service.

As set forth in Section 18.040.080 OMC, the R 4-8 zoning District allows a maximum housing density of 8 dwelling units per acre, a maximum average housing density of 8 units per acre, and a minimum density of 4 units per acre.

Based on the secondarily-requested R 4-8 zoning, and buildable land assumptions published by the Thurston Regional Planning Council in its October 2007 *Buildable Lands Report*, it is possible that about 340 single-family residential dwelling units could be built on the proposal site.

Amending the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and the City's Zoning Map to designate the subject property as R 4-8 could reduce the number of dwelling units that could be built on the site by almost 200 units, based on the calculated estimate of buildable units under NV zoning; the maximum density, average density, and minimum density requirements in R 4-8 are lower than the corresponding requirements in NV. The change to R 4-8 also could impact future neighborhood character: NV requires a mix of uses, including apartments, single family homes, and a neighborhood commercial area, and has design standards for all of these uses; R 4-8 has no corresponding requirements for a mix of uses or design standards. Therefore the change to R 4-8 probably would result in a more uniform development pattern, with less diversity in housing types. The lack of design standards could also result in the development of less visually appealing housing. The result probably would be a more suburban, lower density development pattern, and could result in a less efficient use of land.

Impacts – R 4: The Land Use and Urban Design chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan states that the Residential 4 designation:

".... provides for single family residential development at densities that will maintain environmental quality and prevent stormwater related problems. Residential development may occur in these areas at densities of up to four units per acre, provided that the applicant demonstrates that stormwater generated by the proposed development can be accommodated without creating off-site problems."

The UDC states that the purpose of the R-4 and R-4CB districts is "To accommodate residential development in areas sensitive to stormwater runoff in a manner and at a density (up to four (4) units per acre) that avoids stormwater related problems (e.g., flooding and degradation of environmentally Critical Areas." (Section 18.04 UMC)

The residential uses allowed in the R 4 district are different than those allowed in the NV district, Apartments, boarding homes, cottage housing, and new duplexes are not allowed in the R 4 zoning district, and a mix of specific housing types are not required, as in NV. With the exception of home occupations, commercial uses are not permitted outright in the R 4 zoning district. Child day care centers, churches, and plant nurseries are allowed through the Conditional Use Permit process. The R 4 zoning district does not have residential design standards.

As set forth in Section 18.040.080 OMC, the R 4 zoning District allows a maximum housing density of 4 dwelling units per acre, and a maximum average housing density of 4 units per acre; it does not have a minimum density requirement. According to Section 18.100.060 OMC, single-family homes on lots less than 5000 square feet in area in this zone are subject to design criteria. The R 4 zoning district does not have a requirement for transit service.

Based on R 4 zoning, and buildable land assumptions published by the Thurston Regional Planning Council in its October 2007 *Buildable Lands Report*, it is possible that about 210 single-family residential dwelling units could be built on the proposal site; this is less than half the estimated number of buildable units under the current NV zoning.

Amending the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and the City's Zoning Map to designate the subject property as R 4 would impact the number of dwelling units that could be built on the site: the maximum density and average density requirements in R 4 are much

lower than the corresponding requirements in NV and R 4 has no minimum density requirement. The change to R 4 also could impact future neighborhood character: NV requires a mix of uses, including apartments, single family homes, and a neighborhood commercial area, and has design standards for all of these uses; R 4 has no corresponding requirements for a mix of uses or design standards. Therefore the change to R 4 would result in a more uniform development pattern, with less diversity in housing types. The lack of design standards could also result in the development of less visually appealing housing. The result would be a more suburban, lower density development pattern, which could result in a less efficient use of land.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures for the land use, housing, and neighborhood character impacts noted above could include the adoption of a zoning text amendment to remove the transit service requirement in the NV zone. This would make it more feasible for NV sites, including the proposal site, to be developed under the current NV zoning. Any such NV development would be required to incorporate the higher residential density, the mixed use requirements, and the design standards required in the NV zoning district.

Table 2. Permitted Uses by Zoning District

DISTRICT	R 4	R 4-8	R 6-12	NV
1. SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING				
Accessory Dwelling Units	P	P	P	P
Co-Housing	P	P	P	
Cottage Housing		P	P	P
Manufactured/Mobile Home Parks				
Manufactured Homes	P	P	P	P
Single-family Residences	P	P	P	R
Townhouses	P	P	P	P
2. MULTIFAMILY HOUSING				
Apartments				R
Boarding Homes				P
Dormitories				
Duplexes - Existing	P	P	P	P
Duplexes			P	P
Triplexes & Fourplexes			18.04.060	
Fraternities, Sororities				
Group Homes (6 or less)/Confidential Shelters	P	P	P	P
Group Homes (7 or More Clients)		C	C	C
Lodging Houses				
Nursing/Convalescent Homes		C	C	P
Retirement Homes				P
3. COMMERCIAL				
Child Day Care Centers	C	C	C	P
Commercial Printing				

DISTRICT	R 4	R 4-8	R 6-12	NV
Drive-In/Drive-Through Businesses Existing				
Food Stores				R
Hardware Stores				P
Home Occupations (incl. Adult Day Care, Eldercare Home, Family Childcare Home, Bed & Breakfast)	P	P	P	P
Hospice Care				C
Laundries				
Nursery (Retail and/or Wholesale Sales)	C	C	C	P
Offices				P
Personal Services				P
Pharmacies				P
Restaurants, w/o Drive-In/Drive-Through				P
Personal Apparel and Equipment Service				P
Specialty Stores				P
Veterinary Clinics - Existing	P	P	P	P
Veterinary Clinics				C
4. ACCESSORY USES				
Accessory Structures	P	P	P	P
Electric Vehicle Infrastructure	P	P	P	P
Garage/Yard/Rummage/Other Outdoor Sales	P	P	P	P
Large Garages		C	C	
Residence Rented for Social Event, 7 or more/yr	C	C	C	C
Satellite Earth Stations	P	P	P	P
5. RECREATIONAL USES				
Community Parks & Playgrounds	C	C	C	P/C

DISTRICT	R 4	R 4-8	R 6-12	NV
Country Clubs	C	C	C	
Golf Courses	C	C	C	
Neighborhood Parks	P/C	P/C	P/C	R
Open Space - Public	P/C	P/C	P/C	P
Racing & Performing Pigeons	C	C	C	
Stables, Commercial and Private Existing	C	C		
Trails - Public	P/C	P/C	P/C	P
6. AGRICULTURAL USES				
Agricultural Uses	P	P	P	P (EXISTING)
Greenhouses, Bulb Farms	C	C	C	
7. TEMPORARY USES				
Emergency Housing	P	P	P	P
Model Homes	P	P	P	P
Residence Rented for Social Event, 6 or less/year	P	P	P	
Wireless Communication Facility	P	P	P	
8. OTHER				
Animals	P	P	P	P
Cemeteries	C	C	C	
Community Clubhouses	P	P	P	P
Crisis Intervention	C	C	C	
Fraternal Organizations				
Historic House Museum	C	C	C	
Parking Lots and Structures				
Places of Worship	C	C	C	C
Public Facilities	C	C	C	C

DISTRICT	R 4	R 4-8	R 6-12	NV
Public Facilities - Essential	C	C	C	
Radio, TV, Other Communication Towers	C	C	C	C
Schools		C	C	C
Mineral Extraction - Existing		C		
Utility Facility	P/C	P/C	P/C	P/C
Wireless Communication Facilities	P/C	P/C	P/C	
Workshops for Disabled People		C	C	
LEGEND				
P = Permitted Use	C = Conditional Use	R = Required Use (NV only)		
R-4 = Residential - 4	R 4-8 = Residential 4-8	R 6-12 = Residential 6-12	NV = Neighborhood Village	

Table 3. Residential Development Standards by Zoning District

DISTRICT	R4	R 4-8	R 6-12	Neighborhood Village	
MAXIMUM HOUSING DENSITY (units / acre)	4	8	12	24	
MAXIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (units/acre)	4	8	12	13	
MINIMUM AVERAGE HOUSING DENSITY (units/acre)	---	4	6	7	
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	2,000 SF minimum 3,000 SF average = townhouse 5,000 SF = other	2,500 SF = cottage 4,000 SF = zero lot 2,000 SF minimum, 3,000 SF average = townhouse 5,000 SF = other	2,000 SF = cottage 3,500 SF = zero lot 1,600 SF minimum, 2,400 SF average = townhouse 7,200 SF = duplex, triplex 9,600 SF = fourplex 5,000 SF = other	1,600 sq. ft. = cottages 3,000 sq. ft. = zero lots 1,600 sq. ft., minimum 2,400 sq. ft. average = townhouses 6,000 sq. ft. = duplex 7,200 sq. ft. = multifamily 4,500 sq. ft. = other	
MINIMUM LOT WIDTH	50' except: 18' = townhouse	50' except: 35' = cottage 45' = zero lot 18' = townhouse	50' except: 30' = cottage 40' = zero lot 16' = townhouse 80' = duplex, triplex, fourplex	50' EXCEPT: 30' = cottages 40' = zero lots 16' = townhouses 70' = duplexes 80' = multifamily	
MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACKS	20'	20' except: 10' with side or rear parking; 10' for flag lots; 50' for agricultural buildings with farm animals.	20' except: 10' with side or rear parking; 10' for flag lots; 50' for agricultural buildings with farm animals.	20' EXCEPT: 10' with side or rear parking or on flag lots.	
MAXIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK				25'	
MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACKS	25'	20' except: 50' for agricultural	20' except: 50' for agricultural	20' EXCEPT: 15' for multifamily; 10' for	

DISTRICT	R4	R 4-8	R 6-12	Neighborhood Village	
		buildings with farm animals; 10' for cottages, wedgeshaped lots, and zero lots	buildings with farm animals; 10' for cottages, wedgeshaped lots, and zero lots	cottages, wedge-shaped lots, and zero lots. Zero Lot = A lot with only one side yard.	
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACKS	5' except: 10' along flanking street; except garages shall meet Minimum Front Yard Setbacks 6' on one side of zero lot; 50' for agricultural building with farm animals.	5' except: 10' along flanking streets; except garages shall meet Minimum Front Yard Setbacks 6' on one side of zero lot; 3' for cottages; 50' for agricultural buildings with farm animals.	5' except: 10' for triplex, fourplex 10' along flanking streets; except garages shall meet Minimum Front Yard Setbacks 6' on one side of zero lot; 3' for cottages; 50' for agricultural buildings with farm animals.	5' EXCEPT: 10' along flanking streets; 6' on one side of zero lots; 3' for cottages.	
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	35', except: 16' for accessory buildings	35', except: 16' for accessory buildings; 25' for cottage 35' on sites 1 acre or more, if setbacks equal or exceed building height	35', except: 16' for accessory buildings; 25' for cottages	35' EXCEPT: 25' for cottages; 16' for accessory buildings.	
MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE	35% 60% = townhouses	45% = .25 acre or less 40% = .26 acres or more 60% = townhouses	55% = .25 acre or less 40% = .26 acres or more 70% = townhouses	50%	

DISTRICT	R4	R 4-8	R 6-12	Neighborhood Village	
MAXIMUM ABOVE-GRADE STORIES	2 stories	2 stories	2 stories, 3 stories = triplex, fourplex	3 Stories	
MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE	45% 70% = Townhouses	55%=.25 acre or less 50% = .26 acre or more 70% = Townhouses	65%=.25 acre or less 50% = .26 acres or more 70% = Townhouses	70%	
MINIMUM OPEN SPACE		450 SF/unit for cottage developments	450 SF/unit for cottage developments	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.	
LEGEND					
SF = Square Feet	Zero Lot = A Lot with Only One Side Yard		--- = No Regulation		
NV = Neighborhood Village			R 6-12 = Residential 6-12		
R-4 = Residential - 4	R 4-8 = Residential 4-8				

Table 4. Estimated Number of Dwelling Units

Trillium Comprehensive Plan Amendment & Rezone		
Estimated Number of Dwelling Units		
Zone		# Dwelling Units
NV (existing zone)		560
Residential 6-12		429
Residential 4-8		343
Residential 4		206

Notes

1. Trillium gross site area = 79.31 acres
2. Trillium net site area = 51.55 acres, using 35% "Assumption for Percent Deducted for Open Space and Rights of Way" in "Buildable Lands Report," Thurston Regional Planning Council, October 2007.
3. # Dwelling Units in NV zone calculated based on gross site area of Trillium site, and average net unit density of Bentrige, Woodbury, and Village at Mill Pond approved Neighborhood Village developments. (TRPC report did not provide net density numbers for NV developments.)
4. # Dwelling Units in other zones calculated based on net site area (using TRPC 35% deduction for open space and rights of way) and TRPC calculated net density assumptions for each zone.

3. Transportation/Trip Generation

Existing Conditions: Based on the existing NV zoning, buildable land assumptions published by the Thurston Regional Planning Council in its October 2007 *Buildable Lands Report*, and on achieved residential densities in the approved BentrIDGE, Woodbury Crossing, and Village at Mill Pond developments, it is possible that about 560 residential dwelling units could be built on the proposal site. (Due to the nature of the available data, this estimate combines various housing types.) Applying standard trip generation rates (blended to reflect a typical mix of housing types), this could result in a total of 4,542 daily trips generated by development on the site, including up to 459 PM Peak-hour trips. (Note that this residential dwelling unit rate is based on a calculated estimated zoning capacity of the site, not upon the number of dwelling units in the Trillium Master Plan proposal that was denied by the City.)

Impacts – R 6-12: Based on the requested R 6-12 zoning, and buildable land assumptions published by the Thurston Regional Planning Council in its October 2007 *Buildable Lands Report*, it is possible that about 430 residential dwelling units could be built on the proposal site. Applying standard single-family residential trip generation rates, this could result in about 4,106 daily trips generated by development on the site, including about 433 PM Peak-hour trips. This is similar to the trip generation under the existing NV zoning because trip generation rates for multifamily residential units are lower than the corresponding rates for single-family residential units, and the NV trip generation estimates are based upon a trip generation rate that blends the individual single-family and multifamily rates. This does not include a small number of new trips that could be generated by the neighborhood commercial uses; most trips to and from the neighborhood commercial area probably would be “pass-by” trips rather than new trips.

Therefore, amending the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and the City’s Zoning Map to designate the subject property as R 6-12 could reduce the number of trips that would be generated by development on the site by approximately 436 total daily trips, and by about 26 PM peak hour trips.

Impacts – R 4-8: Based on the “alternative and secondary” requested Residential 4 – 8 (R 4-8) designation and zoning, and buildable land assumptions published by the Thurston Regional Planning Council in its October 2007 *Buildable Lands Report*, it is possible that about 340 single-family residential dwelling units could be built on the proposal site. Applying standard single-family residential trip generation rates, this could result in about 3,283 daily trips generated by development on the site, including about 346 PM Peak-hour trips.

Therefore, amending the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and the City's Zoning Map to designate the subject property as R 4-8 could reduce the number of trips that would be generated by development on the site by about 1259 total daily trips, and 113 PM peak hour trips.

Impacts – R 4: Based on Residential 4 (R 4) designation and zoning, and buildable land assumptions published by the Thurston Regional Planning Council in its October 2007 *Buildable Lands Report*, it is possible that about 208 single-family residential dwelling units could be built on the proposal site. Applying standard single-family residential trip generation rates, this could result in a total of 1,971 daily trips generated by development on the site, including up to 208 PM Peak-hour trips:

Therefore, amending the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and the City's Zoning Map to designate the subject property as R 4 could reduce the number of trips that would be generated by development on the site by approximately 2,571 total daily trips, and by about 251 PM peak hour trips.

Mitigation Measures: The proposal is to change the City's Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map; it is a non-project proposal and as such will not directly have any traffic-related impacts. All of the zones analyzed in the SEIS would result in development that generated the same or fewer trips than would be generated by development under the current NV zoning. Mitigation measures to limit the impacts of traffic generation can and should be studied and incorporated into any future development proposal for the site.

Table 5. Estimated Trip Generation

Trillium Comprehensive Plan Amendment & Rezone										
Estimated Trip Generation										
			Trip Rates				Trip Generation			
Zone		# Units	Daily	PM Peak	Enter	Exit	Daily	PM Peak	Enter	Exit
NV - Existing	Single Family Multi Family	560	8.11	0.82	0.64	0.36	4,542	459	294	165
R6-12	Single Family	429	9.57	1.01	63%	37%	4,106	433	273	160
R4-8	Single Family	343	9.57	1.01	63%	37%	3,283	346	218	128
R4	Single Family	206	9.57	1.01	63%	37%	1,971	208	131	77

Notes

1. Trillium gross site area = 79.31 acres
2. Trillium net site area = 51.55 acres, using 35% "Assumption for Percent Deducted for Open Space and Rights-of-Way" in "Buildable Lands Report," Thurston Regional Planning Council, October 2007.
3. # Dwelling Units in NV zone calculated based on gross site area of Trillium site, and average net unit density of Bentrige, Woodbury, and Village at Mill Pond Neighborhood Village developments. (TRPC report did not provide net density numbers for NV developments.)
4. # Dwelling Units in other zones calculated based on net site area (using TRPC 35% deduction for open space and rights-of-way) and TRPC calculated net density assumptions for each zone.
5. Neighborhood Village (NV) trip generation rate is the average of Single Family and Multi-family rates.

4. Parks / Open Space

Existing Conditions: Under the existing Neighborhood Village zoning designation, any development on the proposal site would have to meet minimum open space requirements. Section 18,05.080 OMC establishes an overall open space requirement for neighborhood villages:

"Neighborhood villages, urban villages, and community oriented shopping centers shall contain at least five (5) percent open space available for public use or common use. Ownership of open space areas and type of access will be determined during the Master

Planned Development review (see Chapter 18.57, OMC). As much as fifty (50) percent of this open space may be comprised of environmentally Critical Areas and associated buffers.”

In addition, the Neighborhood Village zone requires a minimum of 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; and 30% open space in those portions of the site designated for multi-family development.

Impacts: The proposal is to change the City’s Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map; it is a non-project proposal and as such will not directly have any open space-related impacts. Impacts due to varying minimum open space requirements will be created by any future development proposal on the site. The applicant’s two proposed zoning designations, R 6-12 (the applicant’s requested zone) and R 4-8 (the applicant’s alternate request) both only have a minimum open space requirement for cottage developments. Neither has any minimum open space requirement for single-family residential or townhouse development (which is allowed in both zones) or for duplex development (which is allowed in R 6-12). There are no minimum open space requirements for residential development in R 4..

Mitigation Measures: This is a non-project proposal; no mitigation measures are necessary at this time. Mitigation measures to assure the retention of adequate open space can and should be incorporated into any development proposal for the site. Impacts of single-family residential development not subject to minimum open space requirements will be partially mitigated by the mandatory payment of park mitigation fees.

Table 6. Residential Open Space Requirements by Zoning District

	R 4	R 4-8	R 6-12	NV
MINIMUM OPEN SPACE	No minimum open space requirement	450 SF/unit for cottage developments	450 SF/unit for cottage developments	5% plus 450 sq. ft./unit for cottage developments; 30% for multifamily.

4. Public Services: Schools

Existing Conditions: The Olympia School District (OSD) sent a letter, dated April 15, 2010, to the City of Olympia in response to the Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance issued for the Trillium Neighborhood Village master plan proposal. The letter notes that the

elementary, middle and high schools serving the proposal site are operating at over-capacity levels, and that the OSD would bus students from the proposed development to more distant schools, where there is currently sufficient capacity. The letter goes on to note that the OSD may place a construction bond proposal before voters, and that such a bond issue could include new or expanded facilities in the Southeast service area. In the letter the OSD also suggests that large developments in the Southeast portion of the City consider providing land for a future elementary school.

Impacts: The proposal is to change the City's Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map; it is a non-project proposal and as such will not directly have any impacts on public schools or other public services. Impacts on public school enrollment probably would be created by any future development proposal on the site.

Mitigation Measures: This is a non-project proposal; no mitigation measures are necessary at this time. Mitigation measures to assure the provision of adequate public school capacity can and should be incorporated into any development proposal for the site. Impacts of single-family residential development would be partially mitigated by the mandatory payment of school mitigation fees. Developers could also mitigate impacts of any development proposal by providing land for the construction of a new elementary school.

CHAPTER 2

Parks, Arts, and Recreation Chapter 7 Amendment

2. CHAPTER 7

Parks, Arts and Recreation Chapter Updates to Make Chapter Consistent with 2010 Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan.

Proponent: Olympia Parks, Arts and Recreation Department

Staff contact: Jonathon Turlove, Associate Planner, 360.753.8068, jturlove@ci.olympia.wa.us

Proposal

- Update outdated park inventory and target outcome tables. ("target outcome" is another term for "level of service standard" which refers to the desired ratio of parks to population expressed in acres per thousand)
- Remove references to "Special Use Park" now that this park classification has been consolidated into the Community Park category
- Remove outdated park project list (An updated park project list can be found in the 2010 Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan)
- Replace the implementation strategy section with a short paragraph referring the reader to the 2010 Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan for the implementation approach
- Replace the existing park map with an updated map of existing parks and trails

Background

The City is updating its park impact fee rates. The rate analysis will be done by the end of 2012 in anticipation of adopting a new fee schedule to go into effect on January 1, 2013. The rates are based on levels of service standards adopted in the 2010 Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan. The current Parks, Arts and Recreation Chapter of the existing Comprehensive Plan has outdated level of service standards and land inventory tables that conflict with the 2010 Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan.

On February 14, 2012, City Council directed staff to propose changes to the Comprehensive Plan necessary to adopt new park impact fees. The minor changes proposed by this amendment will probably be superseded by an entirely rewritten Parks, Arts and Recreation chapter now being reviewed by the Olympia Planning Commission.

Issues

If these proposed amendments are not implemented, a new park impact fee rate will probably not be adopted on January 1, 2013. This will likely result in less park impact fee collections in 2013 than would have been collected with an increased fee in effect.

Options

Option 1: Amend the chapter as proposed.

Option 2: No change.

Analysis

Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies

As the proposed amendments do not significantly change any of the goals or policies in the plan, the chapter will remain consistent with the Growth Management Act, county-wide planning policies, other elements in the Comprehensive Plan, and the Olympia Municipal Code.

Summary of Analysis

Amendments proposed under Option 1 will make this chapter of the Comprehensive Plan consistent with the Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan which will allow the City to adopt a new park impact fee rate. These changes are not projected to have any significant environmental impact.

If these proposed amendments are not implemented, a new park impact fee rate will probably not be adopted on January 1, 2013. This will likely result in less park impact fee collections in 2013 than would have been collected with an increased fee in effect.

Staff Recommendation

Option 1: Amend the chapter as proposed.

Planning Commission Recommendation

To be determined.

Detailed Summary of Recommended Option

For a detailed summary of the proposed changes, please see the Parks Chapter 7 with highlighted changes on the City website, City of Olympia - Calendar, Planning Commission meeting packet for August 20, 2012.

CHAPTER 3

Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Annual Update

3. CHAPTER 3

2013-2018 Capital Facilities Plan

Proponent: City of Olympia Administrative Services

Staff contact: Stacey Ray, Associate Planner, 360.753.8046, sray@ci.olympia.wa.us

Proposal

Amend the Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Plan Chapter to reflect the planned capital costs and year of expenditure associated with proposed projects and maintenance for the 2013-2018 planning period. The Plan totals \$134 million over six years; the 2013 total is \$19.6 million, with major emphasis throughout the Plan on projects that maintain and sustain existing facilities and infrastructure.

Background

The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) is a multi-year plan of capital projects with project beginning and completion dates, estimated costs, and proposed methods of financing. The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that the Comprehensive Plan includes a minimum six-year facilities plan element.

The purpose of the CFP is to be prepared financially and plan in advance to have capital facilities in place and readily available when new development occurs or the population grows. The need, location, and construction for new capital facilities are guided by the Land Use Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. The Land Use Chapter includes a future land use map and designates where the City will accommodate new residents and employment.

To prepare for anticipated population growth, the 2013-2018 CFP relies on figures determined by the Thurston Regional Planning Council, which projects future growth of roughly 11% in the City's population from 2005-2015, or from approximately 45,000 to 50,000 persons (Thurston Regional Planning Council, Population & Employment Forecast Work Program, 2004-2005, 2007). Each of the capital project category sections in the CFP demonstrates how the facilities listed under the section have been planned to accommodate the additional growth while maintaining levels of service for community members. A key element of the development of the CFP is also the Long Term Financial Strategy, developed by citizens in 2000.

The Olympia CFP is reviewed and updated annually according to the availability of resources, changes in City policy and community needs, unexpected emergencies and events, and changes in cost and financial strategies. The annual review and update process engages local citizens, advisory boards, and the Planning Commission, and the final product incorporates

many separate but coordinated planning documents, each focusing on a specific type of facility. For example, future sewer requirements are addressed via a sewer plan, parks facilities through a parks and recreation plan, and transportation needs through a transportation plan.

While the CFP doesn't represent a financial commitment, it identifies projects needed to implement these plans. Approval of the CFP on an annual basis allows the city to prioritize projects and identify funding sources.

Issues

If the 2013-2018 CFP is not adopted, the City will be unable to move forward with prioritizing and funding necessary projects for maintaining and sustaining existing facilities and infrastructure. Proactively addressing these needs saves on future costs and ensures the City continues to provide minimum levels of service that community members need and expect.

Options

Option 1: Recommend approval of the 2013-2018 Capital Facilities Plan as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Option 2: Recommend approval of the 2013-2018 Capital Facilities Plan with specific recommended changes based on public comment and as determined by the Planning Commission.

Option 3: Do not recommend approval of the 2013-2018 Capital Facilities Plan.

Analysis

This analysis focuses on substantive changes made to the 2012-2017 CFP. Projects new to the 2013-2018 CFP are noted in the "New and Completed Projects" section of the document.

Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies

Growth Management Act. Option 1 and 2 is consistent in meeting the GMA, Comprehensive Plan requirement for a Capital Facilities element, including a minimum six-year plan to finance capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identified sources of public money for that purpose.

Comprehensive Plan. Option 1 does not significantly impact the existing goals or policies in the Comprehensive Plan, and are in fact a means for implementation. Applicable goals in the existing Comprehensive Plan include:

GOAL CFP1. To annually develop a six-year Capital Facilities Plan to implement the Comprehensive Plan by coordinating urban services, land use decisions, level of service standards, and financial resources with a fully-funded schedule of capital improvements.

GOAL CFP2. To meet current needs for capital facilities in Olympia and its Growth Area, correct deficiencies in existing systems, and replace obsolete facilities.

GOAL CFP3. To provide capital facilities to serve and direct future growth within Olympia and its Urban Growth Area as these areas urbanize.

GOAL CFP4. To provide adequate funding for capital facilities in Olympia and its Growth Area to ensure the Comprehensive Plan vision and goals are implemented.

GOAL CFP5. To ensure the Capital Facilities Plan is current and responsive to the community vision and goals.

A variety of City and regional planning efforts, such as the Parks, Arts, and Recreation Plan or Thurston Regional Trails Plan, which contribute to the CFP project lists, are also consistent in planning to implement the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

County-wide Planning Policies. Option 1 and 2 are consistent with the existing County-wide Planning Policies, adopted August 16, 1993. Preparation of the CFP incorporates regional planning efforts, and the update process provides an opportunity for the county, adjacent jurisdictions, and other potentially affected agencies to review and comment on proposed projects. Applicable County-wide Planning Policies include:

2.2 Coordinate Urban Services, Planning, and Standards through:

a. Coordinated planning and implementation of urban land use, parks, open space corridors, transportation, and infrastructure within growth areas.

e. Phasing extensions of urban services and facilities concurrent with development.

2.3 Provide capacity to accommodate planned growth by:

a. Assuring that [Olympia] will have adequate capacity in transportation, public and private utilities, stormdrainage systems, municipal services, parks and schools to serve growth that is planned for in adopted local comprehensive plans

6.1 Provide in [Olympia's] Comprehensive Plan for an adequate amount of appropriately located land, utilities, and transportation systems to facilitate environmentally sound and economically viable commercial, public sector, and

industrial development.

8.1 Encourage efficient multi-modal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans.

Summary of Analysis

Option 1 and 2 allow the City to adequately plan for the financing, construction, and maintenance of needed capital facilities to address anticipated population growth and new development, fulfilling a requirement of GMA.

Recommending approval of Option 1, and potentially Option 2, will implement the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, and are in alignment with plans developed and adopted by multiple jurisdictions, including the Transportation Mobility Plan, Olympia Bicycle Master Plan, and Water System Plan.

Lastly, Recommending Option 1 results in a project list that overall, emphasizes maintaining and sustaining existing facilities to extend the life expectancy, usefulness, and community benefits of those facilities. However, two projects may result in minor adverse environmental impacts and that should undergo an environmental review at the time of project land use or permit application.

Those projects include the installation of trailhead access, a nature trail, and interpretive program improvements at Grass Lake Park, and the development of a new off-leash dog area. Grass Lake Park is a wildlife refuge, in which there is potential to impact existing sensitive shoreline area, and an off-leash dog area needs careful evaluation for neighborhood and stormwater impacts.

Option 2 could include recommended additions or changes developed by the Planning Commission. Those additions or changes may result in projects with minor environmental impacts, which shall be reviewed at project level, or staff may need to complete additional analysis.

Option 3 would result in the 2012-2017 CFP remaining in place. Expenditures and revenues proposed for 2013 would not be incorporated into the Annual Operating Budget as the Capital Budget, which may delay or eliminate proposed projects from being completed. Being that the intent of this year's proposal is to maintain or sustain existing facilities, a delay in recommending approval may result in additional costs or an inability to fund those needs in the future.

The 2013-2018 CFP is also intended to respond to project schedules, new information, evolving community priorities or other assumptions. If not adopted, those changes in direction or priorities are delayed, potentially resulting in reduced levels of service for the community or a strain on City resources.

Staff Recommendation

Option 1: Approve the 2013-2018 Capital Facilities Plan as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Planning Commission Recommendation

To be determined.

Detailed Summary of Recommended Option

The 2013-2018 Capital Facilities Plan is available to view on the City website:
www.olympiawa.gov.

V. APPENDICES





