

## Exhibit 26 –

## Comprehensive Plan Language Comparison:

The purpose of this document is to provide context regarding how the language of the Public Service chapter has shifted since 2003 -2004 when the Land Use Approval for the Ingersoll Stadium Remodel was initially granted. To provide this context staff reviewed the “Comprehensive Plan for Olympia and the Olympia Growth Area” adopted 7/14/2004 and compared it to the current version of the Comprehensive Plan which was adopted in December of 2014. It should be noted that there have been minor updates to the 2014 Comprehensive Plan, however they have not affected the language related to schools within the Public Services Chapter.

In the earlier 2004 version of the Comprehensive Plan the chapter was called “Utilities and Public Services” and the applicable pages are attached to this memo. In that document, there was only goal related to schools, PF 23 which states “To enhance the strength and vitality of our neighborhood schools.” Of the 10 supporting policies, two appear most applicable:

PF 23.7: School officials should be encouraged to retain existing neighborhood school locations, because of the importance of school in maintaining a strong healthy neighborhood.

PF 23.8 City and school facilities should be shared for neighborhood parks, recreation, and open space.

In part, the intent of the 2014 update was to clarify and simplify the existing goals and policies within the plan. It appears that the goals and policies were refined and reorganized. The outcome included two separate goals relating to Schools; the first addressing location and the second community partnerships. The supporting policy cited in the staff report (PS2.2) states “promote sharing school facilities for neighborhood parks, recreation and open space.” is very similar in terms of policy guidance to the 2004 Policy PF 23.8. While the language document is reorganized, it does not appear to have substantively changed in relationship to this specific supporting policy.

customer service, programming variety, and signal transmission.

**GOAL PF21. To use advances in television cable technology to improve communications to and from public buildings.**

**POLICIES:**

PF 21.1 Cable service to major public buildings should allow programs to originate there as well as to be received there.

PF 21.2 Cable service to schools, medical facilities, police and fire stations, libraries, and other major public buildings should allow intercommunication among them as such capabilities become technologically and economically feasible.

**GOAL PF22. To provide a high quality of local access programming on the television cable service.**

**POLICIES:**

PF 22.1 The City should ensure that cable service includes one or more local access channels which are responsibly and fairly administered in the public interest.

PF 22.2 Policy for administration of local access channels shall be established by the Community Television Plan.

PF 22.3 Administration of local access channels should emphasize opportunities for programming of local interest, such as:

- a. Locally produced programs by organizations or individuals working with video, film, slides, or live performances or interviews; or
- b. Educational programs for credit and/or for training purposes, or public

meetings by local educational bodies; or

- c. Public meetings sanctioned by governmental bodies, teleconferences, and training programs by governmental bodies.

*For additional policies relating to television cable facilities, see the Privately-Owned Utility Facilities section of this chapter, below.*

## **SCHOOLS**

### **Background**

Schools are among the most important public facilities our society provides for its citizens. Not only are they the centers of learning for our children, they are also important focal points for all kinds of neighborhood activities. (In the Parks and Open Space Chapter, we note the importance of their play fields, ball fields, and gymnasiums.) Their libraries and auditoriums often serve as neighborhood meeting places. The health and vitality of a neighborhood school is invariably a clear indicator of the health and vitality of the neighborhood itself.

The City has a modest role to play in school planning. Public schools are operated by local school districts and governed by state and federal laws and regulations. State funds provide the bulk of school finances. Some funds come from the Federal government. School districts raise the rest from local property taxes. State laws set standards for service levels and facility development, such as site size and enrollment. They also specify funding methods. These laws thus perform much of the role of a functional plan for schools. School districts themselves do the remaining tasks of planning.

Nevertheless, there are important things the City can do. Through good planning, we can see to it that the environments around existing and future school sites are conducive to their needs. We can take into account the safety needs of school children, and also

the need for school buildings to be appropriately accessible to their service areas. We can see to it that when large developments are proposed, school sites are dedicated as needed. We can certainly continue to work closely with school officials to serve our citizens together.

In addition, the Growth Management Act requires cities and school districts to cooperate in capital facility planning. Future school sites are among the types of "lands needed for public purposes", which must be identified somewhere in a city's comprehensive plan. If a school district is to collect impact fees for new schools, they must be reflected in the city's Capital Facility Plan (CFP). In fact, the CFP in this Plan does include the facility needs of the Olympia School District (see Volume Three, the Capital Facilities Plan).

Olympia is served by Olympia School District No. 111, a district with two high schools, four middle schools, and twelve elementary schools. A small part of the eastern most part of the city is also served by North Thurston School District No. 3.

## GOALS AND POLICIES

**GOAL PF23.\* To enhance the strength and vitality of our neighborhood schools.**

### POLICIES:

- PF 23.1\* Land use decisions should take into account the needs of schools, such as pedestrian safety and a quiet environment conducive to learning.
- PF 23.2 Elementary schools should be centrally located in their service areas on a site allowing children to walk safely to school, and on or convenient to a neighborhood collector street to minimize the impact of school bus traffic.
- PF 23.3 Middle schools should be centrally located in their service areas, and on or convenient to a neighborhood collector

or major collector to minimize the impact of school bus traffic.

- PF 23.4 High schools should be easily accessible to vehicular as well as pedestrian traffic because of the traffic generated by student drivers, school personnel, and interscholastic events. They should be located on arterials or major collectors. A central location within each service area also is desirable but less important than for elementary or middle schools.
- PF 23.5\* New residential developments should take into account the impact they may have on school capacity. If a development is large enough to generate the need, one or more school sites should be dedicated.
- PF 23.6 City and school officials should build further on their cooperative relationship. Consideration should be given to joint planning, which could include prioritization of sites for future school construction, and preservation of historic sites.
- PF 23.7 School officials should be encouraged to retain existing neighborhood school locations, because of the importance of the school in maintaining a strong, healthy neighborhood.
- PF 23.8 City and school facilities should be shared for neighborhood parks, recreation, and open space uses.
- PF 23.9 Work with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Olympia School District, and the Legislature to develop new school site standards that are appropriate for urban settings.
- PF 23.10 The City and the Olympia School District should jointly develop a plan for sharing and programming school sites for common activities.