

**Final Review and Evaluation Criteria
Olympia Municipal Code - Section 18.59.040**

Olympia Public Works Department Request – 2030 Transportation Map Amendments
Project #: 17-1279

Chapter 18.59 of the Olympia Municipal Code addresses the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process. Section 18.59.040 identifies the final review and evaluation criteria to be used during the review and decision-making process for such applications.

18.59.040 Final review and evaluation

A. The Department shall distribute the final docket of proposed amendments, including rezones, to any state or local agency which is required by law to receive notice of proposed amendments and revisions to the Comprehensive Plan and implementing development regulations within the time required. In addition, the Department shall distribute the final docket of proposed amendments to recognized neighborhood associations and other affected interests identified by the City Council. The Department shall include issues identified in amendment proposal analyses and conduct any review required by SEPA of the proposed amendments, including rezones, listed on the final docket.

Routed to State Agencies: April 6, 2017

60 Day Notice of Intent to Adopt Comment Period Ends: June 6, 2017

Routed to Recognized Neighborhood Associations: April 13, 2017

Notice of Application Published in the Olympian: April 19, 2017

Planning Commission Briefing: April 17, 2017

SEPA Determination Issued: June 23, 2017

SEPA Determination Notice Published, Mailed, and Posted: June 28, 2017

SEPA Comment Period Ends: July 12, 2017

SEPA Appeal Period Ends: July 19, 2017

B. The Department shall prepare a report including any recommendations on each proposed amendment, including rezones, on the final docket and forward the report to the Planning Commission. At a minimum the Planning Commission recommendation and the Council decision should address the following:

1. Does the proposed amendment or revision maintain consistency with other plan elements or development regulations? If not, are amendments or revisions to other plan elements or regulations necessary to maintain consistency with the current final docket that will be considered by the Planning Commission and the City Council?

Staff Opinion: Staff believes the requested amendments are consistent with other plan elements and development regulations. The first and second proposed changes reflect the Kaiser Harrison Opportunity Area Subarea Plan that was approved last year. The third proposed change, for Pattison Street, would support the addition of a bicycle lane in an area that does not currently have a distinct bicycle connection between Martin Way and Pacific Avenue. The last three amendments are proposed in order to be more consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, the natural environment, and existing conditions.

2. Is the proposed amendment or rezone consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan?

Staff Opinion: Staff believes the amendments as proposed are consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan.

3. Is the proposed amendment or revision consistent with the county-wide planning policies?

Staff Opinion: Yes, the proposed amendments are consistent with the county-wide planning policies adopted by Thurston County and the cities within its borders.

4. Does the proposed amendment or rezone comply with the requirements of the GMA?

Staff Opinion: Yes, the proposed amendments are compliant with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A). Consistent with the Act, the proposal was routed to the Washington State Department of Commerce and other state agencies for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposal. No comments were received.