

THURSTON COUNTY
Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment for
CHAPTER 6, CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN



THURSTON COUNTY
WASHINGTON
SINCE 1852

Thurston County Board of County Commissioners
Adopted December 17, 2010

Thurston County Courthouse, Building 1, Room 280

Chapter 6, Capital Facilities Plan

Table of Contents

Section I. Introduction	1
Section II. Goals, Objections, and Policies	3
Section III. Level of Service	7
Section IV. Existing Conditions	14
Section V. Additional Capital Needs	28
A. Parks	28
B. Solid Waste	33
C. Stormwater	37
D. Water and Sewer	45
E. Transportation	56
F. County Buildings.....	65
G. Conservation Futures	68
Section VI. Financing the County Capital Facilities Plan.....	72
Section VII Summary of 2011 – 2031 Project Projections.....	77
Section VIII. Public Purpose Lands.....	78

Table of Tables

Table 1 Level of Service Standards and Comparison to Previous CFP.....	7
Table 2 Level of Service Changes from Existing Standards	13
Table 3 Thurston County Inventory of Public Facilities	14
Table 4 Parks.....	32
Table 5 Solid Waste.....	36
Table 6 Stormwater Facilities.....	44
Table 7 Water and Sewer	54
Table 7a Water and Sewer – Boston Harbor	55
Table 8 Transportation.....	63
Table 9 County Buildings	67
Table 10 Conservation Futures.....	71
Table 11 Summary of Six-Year Plan - Capital Costs	72
Table 12 Summary Six-Year Plan - Revenue	73
Table 13 Effect on Local Taxes and Fees.....	74
Table 14 Generalized Project Projections - 2011 - 2031.....	77
Table 15 Facilities of Other Public Entities.....	79
Table 16 Distinguishing Public Purpose Lands from Essential Public Facilities.....	86
Table 17 Interjurisdictional Shared Needs for Public Purpose Lands	87

CHAPTER SIX -- CAPITAL FACILITIES

I. Introduction

The Capital Facilities Plan is a plan in which capital projects necessary to support the County's forecast population growth, and the financing methods by which they will be accomplished, are described. Capital projects are the durable, typically very expensive, facilities and equipment necessary to support County operations and services to the public. These generally include but are not limited to such facilities as roads, bridges, sewers, parks, open space, water supply and conveyance systems, stormwater management systems, waste and wastewater disposal and treatment systems, and government buildings. The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) is Chapter 6 of the Comprehensive Plan that is required by the State Growth Management Act. The Growth Management Act requires the CFP to identify specific facilities, include a realistic financing plan, and adjust the plan if funding is inadequate. Capital facilities are important because they support the growth envisioned in the County's Comprehensive Plan.

The State Department of Commerce, which is the agency responsible for oversight of local government comprehensive planning, recommends that capital facilities plans cover a 20-year planning horizon. Because capital projects are often very expensive, financing often requires multi-year commitments of financial resources. Therefore, financial planning and implementation of capital facilities cannot be effectively carried out on an annual basis and a long-range plan is necessary to assure that funding is available to implement the plan. Thus, development of the Plan is also a tool for effective governmental management.

However, this plan covers a six-year period, the years 2011-2016. Transportation grants typically require a six-year plan, and this period is one in which the County can address its immediate capital needs. Thurston County's growth rates, and therefore the analysis of corresponding capital needs - and ability to fund those needs, may be unpredictable beyond the six-year period.

The Thurston County Comprehensive Plan projects that by the year 2032, the population of Thurston County will grow to 381,200, an increase of 131,400 or 52.6% from the 2009 population of 249,800 . Within the next six years, the population is expected to grow by 1.7%.

Planning for capital facilities is a complex task carried out by each department of the County. It requires an understanding of current conditions relative to future needs, an assessment of various types of capital facilities that could be provided, analysis to identify the most effective and efficient facilities to support the needed service, and addressing how these facilities will be financed. Therefore, this Plan is actually the product of separate but coordinated planning efforts, each focusing on a specific category of facilities.

The CFP is a planning document; not a budget for expenditures, nor a guarantee that the projects will be implemented. It assumes receipt of outside grant resources, and if grants are not received, projects may be delayed or removed. Each capital project listed in the CFP will need to go through an additional separate environmental review and approval process.

The capital facilities covered by this plan are primarily those owned or managed by Thurston County. Facilities provided by school districts and other local governmental entities are referred to in Section VIII of this CFP.

Capital facilities provided by cities, including the extension of water and sewer systems to unincorporated urban growth areas adjacent to the cities, are found in city joint plans. The portions of joint plans that apply to unincorporated urban growth areas are adopted by both the applicable city and Thurston County.

READERS NOTE: This document is a summary of very detailed information contained in a Supplement, which includes funding sources for capital facilities, priorities and project descriptions. For more specific information, please consult the Supplement.

II. Goals, Objectives and Policies

Capital facility planning is guided by goals, objectives, and policies. The first level of guidance is provided by the State Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A). In addition, there are countywide goals, objectives and policies that apply to capital facility planning. These are listed below. Additional programmatic or department-specific goals, objectives, and policies are listed within the subsequent relevant sections of this plan. (Goals and policies specifically related to transportation capital facilities can be found in the Transportation Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan.)

GENERAL GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

GOAL 1: AS THE COUNTY GROWS, PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES SHOULD BE PROVIDED AT REASONABLE COSTS, IN PLACES AND AT LEVELS COMMENSURATE WITH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, AND BUILT TO BE ADEQUATE TO SERVE DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT DECREASING CURRENT SERVICE LEVELS BELOW LOCALLY ESTABLISHED MINIMUM STANDARDS.

OBJECTIVE 1-A: *Public Involvement in Planning* - Public involvement will be provided in all phases of public facilities planning.

POLICIES:

1. The public will be notified of and given opportunities to participate in the drafting and final adoption of:
 - a. Standards for public facilities (such as road standards).
 - b. Capital improvement plans and funding methods (e.g., Boston Harbor or Grand Mound Sewerage Planning, and six year Capital Facilities Plans).
 - c. The identification of levels of service standards or other determinants of need for public capital facilities, and establishment of new public facility management programs (e.g., stormwater).
2. All county departments should notify the public of the development of new plans, programs and regulations.

OBJECTIVE 1-B: *Environmental Impacts* - When designing and locating public facilities, procedures will be followed to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on the environment and other public facilities.

POLICIES:

1. Impacts on critical areas, natural resource lands, and transportation systems should be considered and adverse impacts avoided or mitigated.

2. Public facilities should be sited with the least disruption critical areas and natural resource lands.

OBJECTIVE 1-C: *Paying for Capital Facilities* - Ensure that costs of county-owned capital facilities are within the county's funding capacity, and equitably distributed between users and the county in general.

POLICIES:

1. Use the Capital Facilities Plan to integrate all of the county's capital project resources (grants, bonds, general county funds, donations, real estate excise tax, conservation futures levy, fees and rates for public utility services, and any other available funding).
2. Assess the additional operations and maintenance costs associated with the acquisition or development of new capital facilities. If accommodating these costs places an unacceptable burden on the operating budget, capital plans may need to be adjusted.
3. Promote efficient and joint use of facilities with neighboring governments and private citizens through such measures as interlocal agreements and negotiated use of privately and publicly owned lands or facilities (such as open space, stormwater facilities or government buildings).
4. Explore regional funding strategies for capital facilities to support comprehensive plans developed under the Growth Management Act.
5. Agreements should be developed between the County and cities for transferring the financing of capital facilities in the Urban Growth Areas to the cities when they annex the contributing lands.
6. Users pay for public utility services, except when it is clearly in the public interest not to do so.
7. Provide public utility services at the lowest possible cost, but take into account both construction and operation/maintenance costs.
8. Correctly time and size public utility services to provide adequate growth capacity and to avoid expensive remedial action.
9. If the County is faced with capital facility funding shortfalls, use any combination of the following strategies to balance revenues and needs for public facilities required to serve existing and future development:
 - a. Increase Revenues
 - Bonds.
 - New or increased user fees or rates.
 - New or increased taxes.

- Regional cost sharing.
 - Developer voluntarily funds needed capital project.
- b. Decrease Level of Service Standards
- Change Level of Service Standards, if consistent with Growth Management Act Goals.
- c. Reprioritize Projects to Focus on Those Related to Concurrency
- d. Decrease the Cost of the Facility
- Change project scope.
 - Find less expensive alternatives.
- e. Decrease the Demand for the Public Service or Facility
- Institute measures to conserve or cut use of the facility, such as ride-sharing programs to cut down on traffic demands on roadways.
 - Institute measures to slow or direct population growth or development, such as, moratoria on development, developing only in areas served by facilities with available capacity until funding is available for other areas, changing project timing and/or phasing.
- f. Revise the Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Chapter
- Change types or intensities of land use as needed to balance with the amount of capital facilities that can be provided to support development.

OBJECTIVE 1-D: *Coordination with Growth* - Public utility service plans should be prepared and facilities constructed to support planned growth.

POLICIES:

1. Land use decisions as identified in the Comprehensive Plan and Joint Plans should be the determinants of development intensity rather than public utility decisions and public utility planning.
2. Where land use plans and zoning designate urban levels of land uses and subsequently adopted long-range plans for public utilities show that urban levels of utilities are not feasible, the plan and zoning designations should be reviewed.
3. Extension of services and construction of public capital facilities should be provided at levels consistent with development intensity identified in this Comprehensive Plan, sub-area plans still in effect, and joint plans.

4. Public utility services within growth areas should be phased outward from the urbanizing core as that core becomes substantially developed, in order to concentrate urban growth and infilling.
5. New users of capital facilities should not reduce service levels for current users.
6. The County should coordinate capital facilities planning with cities and towns and identify shared needs for public purpose lands.

OBJECTIVE 1-E: *Coordination with Budget and Related Documents* - The County's capital budget and six year transportation program will be consistent with the Capital Facilities Plan.

POLICIES:

1. Thurston County's annual capital budget and six year transportation program required under RCW 36.81.121 will be fully consistent with the intent and substance of this Capital Facilities Plan and the Transportation Chapter of this Comprehensive Plan.
2. The year in which a project is carried out, or the exact amounts of expenditures by year for individual facilities may vary from that stated in the Comprehensive Plan due to:
 - a. Unanticipated revenues or revenues that become available to the county with conditions about when they may be used, or
 - b. Change in the timing of a facility to serve new development that occurs in an earlier or later year than had been anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan.
3. Specific debt financing proposals may vary from that shown in the Comprehensive Plan due to changes in interest rates, other terms of financing, or other conditions which make the proposals in the plan not advantageous financially.
4. The addition of an entirely new facility, not anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan, will require formal amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
5. The transportation projects in the Capital Facilities Plan and Transportation Chapter of this Comprehensive Plan will be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

III. Level of Service Standards:

Level of service standards are quantifiable measures by which the availability or adequacy of the service or facility is evaluated. Typically, levels of service standards are established to provide a goal for the amount of service or facility that is expected to be available. Level of service standards may be “de facto”, which is what exists, regardless of the service goal; “adopted”, which is what the jurisdiction officially has established as a benchmark or goal; or “desired”, which is an unofficial goal for the service or facility. Level of service standards are commonly established in units appropriate to the service or facility, such as acres per capita or tons per capita. Adopted level of service standards are those approved by the governing body – in Thurston County, by the Board of County Commissioners.

Factors that influence level of service standards are national, federal, and state mandates and standards, recommendations from citizens and recommendations from advisory groups.

Table 6-1 below shows (see column labeled “CFP LOS”) the level of service that would be needed to support the growth projection of the six-year period covered by this CFP.

In its last two columns, Table 6-1 also shows how this standard compares to existing level of service, established in 2001 or 2002, and/or other previously adopted standards.

**Table 6-1
Level of Service Standards and Comparison to Previous CFP**

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2011-2016)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
Coroner	Gross Sq. Ft. (GSF) "x" GSF for up to 200 autopsies per year (& medical exam. system)	1994 Space Planning Report: 6,656	6,950 (gross SF) (2003)	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
Courts--District	GSF per courtroom unit (Ctrm., Judic. chamber, Conf. & Jury Rms.)	1994 Space Plng. Report: 3320/jury ctrm. unit; 2346/non-jury unit 2000: 3 Ctrms.; 3 judicial positions 2014: 4 Ctrms. ; 3.5 judicial positions.	Net SF: 2284/jury ctrm. unit 1178/non-jury unit 4 ctrms.	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2011-2016)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
Courts--Superior	GSF per courtroom unit (Ctrm., Judic. chamber, Conf. & Jury Rms.)	1994 Space PIng. Report: 4502/stand. jury unit 5606/large jury unit 2622/non-jury unit 2000: 9 Ctrms.; 8.88 judicial positions 2014: 12 Ctrms. 13 judicial positions.	Net SF: 3346/jury ctrm. unit 1390/non jury unit ctrms.	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
Courts--Juvenile & Family	GSF per courtroom unit (Ctrm., Judic. chamber, Conf. Rms.)	1994 Space PIng. Report: 2,840/non jury courtroom unit (GSF) (1938 NSF [net sq. ft.] for non-jury courtroom unit)	1940 net SF at new Juve bldg. 4 ctrms.	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
Detention—Juvenile	Beds for target years (based on arrest-sentencing trend for juvenile population)	1994 Space PIng. Report: 99 beds for 2005 112 beds for 2014 (not counting beds for outside contracts) 20-40 in day detention	2005: 44 beds av. daily; 71 high; 25 Low; 80 bed capacity. 2005 Day Detention: 10 av. daily	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
Jail—Adult (incl. Satellite)	Beds/inmates for target years (based on peak population forecasts by Regional Jail Advisory Committee [RJAC] 8/28/96)	2005: 408 beds/487inmates 2015: 777 beds/653 inmates TCCF Population Project No. 2 – reviewed 7/3/2003	2004: 404 av. daily 408 beds operational capacity.	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
All Co. Gov't. Administration	"x" GSF per FTE employee	219 GSF—for new construction. For existing facilities & rental space: meet the new construction standards to the extent possible.	202 (1994)	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP without the proposed new addition.
<p>GSF = Gross Square Feet (includes internal office and external building circulation [hallways, stairwells and elevator shafts], mechanical, public restrooms, etc.) NSF = Net Square Feet (does not include the above items)</p>				
Parks & Trails	LOS 1: Develop all or part of previously acquired property, or complete development projects that are underway, focusing on those that fill deficiencies in priorities defined by the public, i.e., trails, water access, athletic facilities.	LOS 1: Development (by 2014): An additional 815 acres will be developed to provide additional water access, and athletic facilities. The County continues to look for additional revenue sources to develop existing park sites.	6 of 34 park sites and 29 miles of 42.5 miles of trails have been developed (as of 2008). Acquired: 2,712 acres have been acquired (as of 2008)	Same as 2008-2013 CFP.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2011-2016)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
Parks & Trails (Continued)	<p>Main emphasis is on development of existing undeveloped park properties.</p> <p>LOS 2: Acquire additional park lands to insure that a 4.5 acre/1,000 population of developed park and recreation facilities LOS can be maintained through 2020.</p>	<p>LOS 2: Acquisition: Acquire opportunity properties to insure an adequate land base in the future for maintaining the 4.5 acres/1,000 population LOS. Currently, the inventory of undeveloped land is adequate to meet this LOS 2012.</p>		
Roads	<p>Letter designations based on motorist delays & traffic flow (<i>A=no delays to F=delays of over one minute</i>)</p> <p>Table 5-1 (p. 5-8) in Chapter 5 of the Comp. Plan describes the letter system.</p>	<p>Urban: <i>Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater UGAs--D (E for high density residential corridors)</i> <i>Yelm UGA--C resid. zones; D commercial & Lt. Indus. zones; F urban core</i> <i>Tenino & Rainier UGAs—D Grand Mnd. UGA--D</i> Rural: C For exceptions: see p. 6-39</p>	<p>Urban: Varies: A - E</p> <p>Rural: Varies: A - D</p>	Standard only relates to LOS for roadway capacity – for overall roadway needs / priorities see supplement.
Sewer Systems Rural: Boston Harbor, Tamoshan, Beverly Beach, and Olympic View; Urban: Grand Mound	<p>Equivalent Residential Units (ERU): Cubic feet per month of sewerage discharge as measured at the source, based on the following minimums;</p> <p>Rural: ERU=900 cf/mo Urban: ERU=700 cf/mo</p>	<p>Rural: Capacity to provide sewer collection and wastewater treatment services for residential uses.</p> <p>Urban: Capacity to provide sewer collection and wastewater treatment services for residential, commercial, and industrial uses.</p> <p>In addition, Rural and Urban systems shall meet federal, state and local permit requirements for receiving water standards, whenever possible.</p>	For both Rural and Urban systems, the number of ERUs varies by facility.	Same as 2009-2010 CFP.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2011-2016)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
Water Systems Rural: Boston Harbor and Tamoshan; Urban: Grand Mound	Equivalent Residential Units (ERU): Cubic feet per month of water consumed as measured at the source, based on the following minimums: Rural: ERU=900 cf/mo Urban: ERU-700 cf/mo	Rural: Capacity to provide domestic water and fire flow services for residential and limited commercial uses. Urban: Capacity to provide domestic water and fire flow services for residential, commercial, and industrial uses. In addition, Rural and Urban water systems shall meet current federal, state and local drinking water standards, whenever possible.	For both Rural and Urban systems, the number of ERUs varies by facility	Same as 2005 – 2010 CFP
Solid Waste	LOS A – Includes all 3 service level units; LOS B – Includes a combination of any 2 service level units. LOS C – Includes 1 or no service level units.			
	1. Regulatory	New or Existing Facility: Meets or exceeds federal, state, and/or local regulatory requirements.	Capacity to meet waste generated by users: Disposed of 172,000 tons per yr.	Last standards adopted 2001.
Solid Waste (continued)	2. Health/Safety:	New or Existing Facility: Meets or exceeds federal, state, and/or local health / safety issues for public or employees.	Capacity to meet waste generated by users: Diverted (reduced or recycled 38% of waste generated.	Last standards adopted 2009.
	3. Policy:	New or Existing Facility: Addresses a solid waste comprehensive plan goal or policy.		

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2011-2016)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
Stormwater	<p>LOS A - Includes all 3 service level units</p> <p>LOS B - Includes a combination of any two service level units.</p> <p>LOS C – Includes 1 or no service level unit.</p>			
	<p>Local Flood Control: Provide capacity to store stormwater runoff volume and / or reduce peak flow from an "x" year storm event.</p>	<p>Facilities for new growth: Conveyance meets 25-year 24-hour event for public and private street piped systems and 100-year, 24-hour event for open channels and property protection.</p> <p>Detention: Provide capacity to store stormwater runoff volume and reduce peak durations such that post-development stormwater discharge durations match pre-development durations for a range of pre-developed discharge rates from 50% of the 2-year peak flow up to the full 50-year peak flow.</p> <p>Infiltration: Match pre-development to post development average annual infiltration for sites where they pre-developed short-term infiltration rate exceeds 0.5 inches/hour.</p> <p>Facilities to improve existing deficiencies: Meet the new growth standard wherever possible.</p>	<p>New facilities: At the standards.</p> <p>Pre-existing facilities: Varies</p>	<p>New Drainage Manual effective Nov. 16, 2009</p>

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2011-2016)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
	<p>Water Quality: Meet federal, state, or local water quality standards in streams, rivers, lakes, and Puget Sound</p>	<p>Facilities for new growth: Water Quality Design Storm Volume: The 91st percentile, 24-hour runoff volume estimated by an approved continuous runoff model.</p> <p>Water Quality Design Flow Rate: Preceding detention facilities: Flow rate at or below which 91 percent of runoff volume is routed through the facility as determined by a continuous runoff model.</p> <p>Downstream of detention facilities: Flow rate of 2-year recurrence interval release from detention facility designed to meet flow duration standard using an approved continuous runoff model.</p> <p>Facilities to improve existing deficiencies: Meet the new growth standards wherever possible.</p>	<p>Varies: See 303D list, County Water Resources Profile, and Monitoring Reports</p>	<p>New Drainage Manual effective Nov. 16, 2009</p>
	<p>Habitat: Maintain or restore in-stream flows, reduce peaks, minimize bank full flow durations, improve water quality to address habitat related issues (e.g. salmonid, shellfish, etc)</p>	<p>In-stream Flow Goals at Basin Buildout Conditions</p> <p>Peak Flows: Maintain, or where possible, reduce durations.</p> <p>Bank full Flows: Maintain or where possible, reduce durations.</p> <p>Base Flows: Maintain, or where possible, increase.</p>	<p>In-stream flows: Site development proposals may not exceed 2 year pre-developed release rate per Regional Drainage Manual.</p>	<p>Same as 2005-2010 CFP.</p>

Table 6-2

Level of Service Change from Existing Standards Comparison of this Plan's standards for Level of Service To the existing actual service level

The existing actual service levels for these facilities are THE SAME as the Plan's adopted standards:

- Water and Sewer
- Solid Waste
- Stormwater – facilities for new growth
- Rural Roads
- New Coroner Facility, New Juvenile Detention & Family Court Building, Emergency Management Center, Public Health Building, and Evaluation and Treatment Center.
- Parks Acquisition

The existing actual service levels for these facilities are BELOW the plan's adopted standards:

- Some Urban Roads
- County buildings (except for the new ones noted above)
- Stormwater – Facilities to improve existing deficiencies
- Parks Development

The existing actual service levels for these facilities are HIGHER than the plan's adopted standards:

- Some Urban Roads

IV. Existing Conditions

Existing conditions refers to the capacity or condition of the current facilities. In order to develop the list of needed capital projects, the existing conditions are compared to the “adopted” or “desired” levels of service. Deficiencies in existing conditions relative to the future need become the basis of capital facilities plan.

Table 6-3, which follows, describes the status of existing facilities relative to future needs and identifies some of the future projects for which financing plans are needed.

Table 6-3
Thurston County Inventory of Public Facilities

Parks Department

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
PARKS Active Regional Parks							
Deschutes Falls	SE	1992		155 Acres	Develop trails, interpretive center, overlooks, picnic areas, caretaker facilities	2011 - 2016	\$2,500,000
Burfoot	NE	1973		60 Acres	Misc-renovation of trails, bridges, restroom	2011-2016	\$100,000
Frye Cove	NW	1973		86 Acres	Develop trails, picnic areas, playfields, restroom, picnic shelters, playground	2014	\$500,000
Kenneydell	SW	1988 / 1997 1999		18 Acres 23 Acres Addition	Misc repairs as needed Parking trails, picnic areas, ball fields, restroom	2012	\$300,000
Deschutes River	SW	1991		50 Acres	Develop parking areas, picnic areas, restrooms, viewpoints, trails, camping areas	2012	\$500,000
Guerin	NW	1976		40 Acres	Develop trails, viewpoint, picnic shelters, picnic areas, playground, viewpoints /dock, parking areas	2014-2016	\$1,200,000
Griffin Athletic Fields	NW	Not acquired. Griffin School District property developed as partnership with County.		40 Acres	One baseball /softball and two soccer fields developed in 2000. Additional fields to be developed as funds become available over the next 3 years.	2012-2014	\$600,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Louise H. Meyers	NW	1988		38 Acres	Develop trails, picnic areas, parking & restroom facilities, playfields /ball fields.	2015	\$300,000
Rainier View Park	SE	1996		54 Acres	Picnic areas, trails, camping areas, restrooms.	2013	\$300,000
Ruth Prairie Park	SE	1996		35 Acres	Picnic areas, trails, camping areas, restrooms, picnic shelters	2013	\$300,000
Cooper Point	NW	2005		32 Acres	Develop trails, restroom facilities, and parking	2014	\$1,000,000
Boston Harbor Boat Ramp	NE	1980		1 Acre			
Total Sites: 13				Total acres: 698			
PRESERVES							
Lake Lawrence Park	SE	1988		15 Acres	Develop trails, parking areas, elevated boardwalk, viewpoints, and restroom.	2014	\$300,000
Glacial Heritage Preserve	SW	1989-90		1,020 Acres	Develop interpretive trails, interpretive center, and basic support facilities.	2014	\$1,500,000
Woodland Creek Wetlands	NE	1987		75 Acres	Develop interpretive trails, viewpoints, parking area.	2015	\$300,000
Johnson Point Wetlands	NE	1990		26 Acres	Develop interpretive trails, parking.	2014	\$100,000
Black River Natural Area	SW	1991		13 Acres	Develop trails, parking, picnic sites.	2015	\$50,000
Indian Road	NE	1940		5 Acres	Under consideration for disposal /trade /sale.		
Total preserve sites: 6				Total acres: 1,154			

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
TRAILS							
Chehalis Western	NE-SE	1991		182 Acres	Pave, develop trailheads for parking & restrooms, benches, scenic overlooks.	2011-2016	\$700,000
Chehalis Western Trailhead 89 th Ave.	SE	1991		20 Acres	Develop parking area, restrooms, ball fields, picnic areas & shelters.	2012-2014	\$800,000
Chehalis Western (Vail Loop Trailhead)	SE	1996		3 Acres	Develop parking areas, picnic sites.	2015	\$250,000
67 th Ave. Trailhead	NE	1991		Included in trail acreage	Misc. repairs, renovations	2014	\$150,000
Chambers Lake Trailhead	NE	1991		3 Acres	Misc. repairs, renovations	2014	
Fir Tree Road Trailhead	SE	1991		2 Acres	Add benches, signage, repairs, and renovations	2014	
Yelm Center Trailhead	SE	1993		Included in trail acreage	Misc. repairs, renovations	2015	\$25,000
Tenino Park Trailhead	SW	1993		Included in trail acreage	Add kiosk, signage, benches, misc. repairs, renovations	2013	\$75,000
Rainier Trailhead	SE	1993		Included in trail acreage	Add kiosk, plantings, signage, benches, misc. repairs, renovations	2012	\$75,000
Yelm-Tenino	SE-SW	1993		400 Acres	Pave, develop trailheads with parking & restrooms, scenic overlooks, benches.	2011-2016	\$1,200,000
Gate-Belmore	NW-SW	1996		243 Acres	Pave, develop trailheads with parking & restrooms, viewpoints, and benches	2012	\$5,000,000
Smith Lake	NE	2007	3 AC			2012	
Total sites: 12				Total acres: 856			

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
HISTORIC SITES							
Mima Cemetery	SW	1869		2 Acres			
Ft. Eaton Monument	SE	1982		1 Acres	Misc repairs, renovations	2013	
George Washington Bush Monument	SE	1995		1 Acres	Misc. repair	2012	
Total sites: 3				Total acres: 4			

Department of Resource Stewardship

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
STORMWATER DRAINAGE FACILITIES (legend: cf = cubic feet, lf = lineal feel, ea = each)							
Detention Pond SSWU	Steilacoom Road	1992	\$7,500	12,000 cf	Replace / rehab. pond	2020	\$21,000
Fish Passage	Green Cove Creek	1996	\$70,000	200 lf	Replace Facility	2046	\$647,000
Mountain Aire	Mountain Aire Drive	1998	\$118,300	5,333 cf Retention 2,400 gal. treatment	Facility Replacement	2018	\$337,000
Tanglewilde East	Queets and Skykomish	1998	\$237,325	12,182 cf Retention 6,000 gal treatment	Replace Infiltration Gallery	2018	\$460,000
Forest Glen	Forest Glen Drive	1998	\$163,820	3,600 gal treatment	Replace Gallery	N/A	\$587,000
Boulevard Road	Boulevard Road	1998	\$318,250	503,200 cf Retention 294,700 cf treatment	Restore infiltration system.	N/A	\$567,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Evergreen Terrace	Sitka Street	1998	\$153,000	9,146 cf Retention 2,100 gal treatment	Replace Gallery	N/A	\$423,000
Hidden Forest	Hidden Forest Drive	1999	\$728,800	6,740 cf Retention and treatment	Replace pump station, conveyance, outfall.	N/A	\$1,009,000
Carpenter Loop Phase 1 SSWU	Carpenter Loop	1999	\$150,000	6,283 cf Retention	Replace gallery & treatment facility.	N/A	\$472,000
Carpenter Loop Phase 2	Carpenter Loop	2000	\$175,500	12,436 cf Retention 2,400 gal treatment	Replace gallery & treatment facility.	N/A	\$479,000
Lake Forest	Walthev Dr., Harvard Dr. Lake Forest Dr.	2000	\$201,800	9731 cf Retention 4,800 gal treatment	Replace treatment facility and gallery.	N/A	\$585,000
Tanglewilde South	5 th Way SE	2000	\$174,000	12,436 cf Retention 2,400 gal treatment	Replacement treatment facility and gallery.	N/A	\$529,000
Tnglewilde South	6 th Avenue and Bulldog Street	2001	\$237,500	20,561 cf Retention 7,200 gal treatment	Replacement treatment facility and gallery.	N/A	\$798,000
McAllister Treatment Upgrades	Wendy Dr SE; Planer St. SE; Northwood Dr. SE; Gem Dr. SE; Summerfield Ave. SE;	2001	\$222,600	1272 cf Treatment	Replace facilities.	N/A	\$336,000
Timberlakes Location 1 -6	Sierra Drive SE, Mill Ct SE, Timberlake Dr. SE	2002/2003	\$715,500	<u>9,500 gal. treatment</u> <u>25,000 cf retention</u>	Replace facilities.	N/A	\$2,060,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Thompson Place 1 – 3.	Along 14 th Ave. NE from Merkel to Horne St. NE	2004	\$895,000	11 cfs treatment, 52,000 cf retention	Thompson Place Phase 1 – 3 Regional Pond	2034 – 2036	\$2,726,000
Hawaiian Court	Cult sac	2005	\$172,000		Replace Treatment facility and gallery	2035	\$687,000
Jim Court	Cult sac	2005	\$69,300	12 cfs treatment	Replace treatment facility	2045	\$492,000
Mallard Pond	Mallard Dr. @ Rockcross	2006	\$543,000	25,000 cf retention	Replace facilities and profile pond	2026	\$305,000
Athens Beach		2006	\$21,600	Conveyance	Replace conveyance	2056	\$179,000
Lakemont and 49 th	Lakemont Ave. and 49 th	2007	\$235,000	8 cfs treatment	Treatment & conveyance.	2042	\$249,000
Evergreen Terrace Phase I	9 th Ave	2008	\$365,000	Treatment retention	Replace facilities	2048	\$1,095,000
Evergreen Terrace Phase II	8 th Ave	2009	\$126,000	Lf conveyance retention	Replace conveyance and profile pond	2049	\$155,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
SEWER SYSTEMS							
Grand Mound	Southwest	1998	\$10,700,000	1,880 – 5,560 ERU	1) Biosolids handling, WWTP expansion, treatment facility for Class A reclamation, collection system upgrades, treatment facility upgrades, treatment facility expansion. 2) Lift Station completion	2011 - 2016	1) \$500,000 2) \$200,000
Boston Harbor	North	1990	\$3,000,000	254 ERU	1. Sewer collection upgrades 2. Waste water Treatment Plant Upgrades	2011 – 2015	1) \$ 135,800 2) \$58,500
Tamoshan / Beverly Beach	Cooper Point	1976	\$500,000	116 ERU	Waste water Treatment Plant Upgrades.	2011 – 2014	\$2,300,000
Olympic View	NW	1977 Upgraded 1998	\$210,000	27 ERU	1) Sewer collection improvements. 2) Wastewater disposal field improvements.	2011 – 2015	1) \$30,000 2) \$50,000
WATER SYSTEMS							
Grand Mound	Southwest	1998	\$3,500,000	2,400 – 4,800 ERU	1) Well and pumps #3 and #4. 2) Grand Mound water system upgrades. 3) Grand Mound Way Loop Water Main	2011 - 2016	1) \$1,000,000 2) \$27,000 3) \$900,000
Boston Harbor	North	1989	\$1,500,000	300 ERU	1) Water system upgrades. 2) Water main replacements.	2011 – 2016	1) \$180,000 2) \$100,000
Tamoshan	Cooper Point	1994	\$300,000	94 ERU	1) Water system upgrades. 2) Primary and secondary water main replacement	2011 – 2015	1) \$130,000 2) \$260,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
SOLID WASTE							
Thurston County Waste and Recovery Center (WARC) formerly Hawks Prairie Landfill	Hogum Bay Road	1948	\$20 million	175,000 tons per year	None – see below for specific improvements		
Rainier Drop Box	Rainier	1960	\$300,000	5,000 tons per year	Tollbooth repair and maintenance, facility improvements..	2014 - 2016	\$1,050,000
Rochester Drop Box	Rochester	1960	\$900,000	5,000 tons per year	Repair and maintenance.	2012	\$30,000
Summit Lake Drop Box	Summit Lake	1987	\$100,000	1,000 tons per year	Repair and maintenance.	2012	\$5,000
WARC Process Controls and Alarms	WARC	Included above in Thurston County Waste and Recovery Center (WARC).	\$563,000		None		
WARC Industrial Wastewater Facilities	WARC	1990	\$1,000,000	3.8 million gallons per year			
WARC Self Haul Recycle area	WARC	1988	\$250,000	3,000 tons per year	Completion expected 2010		
WARC HazoHouse	WARC	2010	\$2,000,000	150 customers per day	Completion expected 2010		
WARC Closed Loop Park	WARC	Included above in Thurston County Waste and Recovery Center (WARC).					
WARC Metal Material Recovery	WARC	2007 .	\$300,000	20,000 sf	None		
WARC Gas collection system	WARC	2001	\$1,250,000	2,500 cfm	Construct and modify existing collection system	2013 – 2015	\$1,000,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
WARC Yard Waste Recovery Area	WARC	1993	\$600,000	4,400 tons per year	Construct necessary site improvements	2012	\$100,000
WARC Equipment Storage Bldg.	WARC	1988	\$50,000	500 SF	Construct new Automotive and Equipment Storage Building	2011 – 2013	\$700,000
WARC Inbound and Outbound Tollhouse Plazas	WARC	1999	\$800,000	1,000 SF	Install Tollhouse Plaza in conjunction with new Flat Floor Public Tipping Area.	2013 – 2015	\$2,000,000
WARC Transfer Station	WARC	2000	\$6,775,000	205,000 tons per year	Expansion to existing building	2011 – 2012	\$2,500,00

Public Works Department - Roads

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
TRANSPORTATION							
Rural Minor Arterial	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	14.467	Note 3	2008 - 2028	\$7,578,000
Rural Major Collector	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	225.549	Note 3	2008 - 2028	\$120,117,000
Rural Minor Collector	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	53.630	Note 3	2008 - 2028	\$31,573,000
Rural Local Access	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	483.313	Note 3	2008 - 2028	\$30,834,000
Urban Principal Arterial	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	7.308	Note 3	2008 - 2028	\$4,369,000
Urban Minor Arterial	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	34.667	Note 3	2008 - 2028	\$26,795,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Urban Collector	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	17.901	Note 3	2008 - 2028	\$8,535,000
Urban Local Access	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	184.717	Note 3	2008 - 2028	\$5,582,000
Bridges	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	107	Note 3	2008 - 2028	unknown

Bike Lanes--As upgrades are made to any road above local access, paved shoulders are added which provide space for pedestrian and bicycle use.

Note 1: Date acquired varies for each road and many times even sections of roads have different acquisition dates, some dates go back to territorial times.

Note 2: No valuation for roadway classification exists. The total value of our transportation system is \$294,420,268, based on Government Accounting Standards (GASB) procedures used to establish bond rating.

Note 3: See Capital Facilities Plan Supplement "Basis for Selecting Projects For the CFP".

Central Services Department

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
COUNTY BUILDINGS							
McLane Facilities	Mud Bay	April 2, 2007	\$773,650	16,225 sq. ft.	Roof electrical and fire protection	2008	\$250,000
Roads Tilley Complex (6)	Tilley Rd	1986	\$3,250,175	42,150 sq. ft.			
Roads Tilley Traffic Building	Tilley Rd	2004	\$1,300,000	13,730 sq. ft.			
Roads Boulevard Buildings	Blvd. Rd		\$4,302,662	86,428 sq. ft.	Sold and leased back	2004	
Roads Mud Bay Equip. Bldg	Mud Bay	2008	\$600,000	2,000 Sq. ft.			
Roads Mud Bay Equip. Bldg.	Mud Bay		\$45,623	936 sq. ft.	Sold in 2007		

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Roads Littlerock Equip. Bldg.	Littlerock		\$45,623	936 sq. ft.			
Roads Rainier Equip. Bldg.	Rainier		\$102,360	2,100 sq. ft.	Needs new roof		
Roads Rochester Equip. Bldg.	Rochester		\$102,360	2,100 sq. ft.			
Heritage Hall	Fairground		\$1,030,925	9,120 sq. ft.	Good	2005	\$800,000
Benoschek Building	Fairground		\$329,400	4,392 sq. ft.	Fair physical condition		
Deck Building	Fairground		\$137,728	2,560 sq. ft.			
Fir Building	Fairground		\$136,006	2,528 sq. ft.			
Sharp Building	Fairground		\$139,450	2,528 sq. ft.			
Craft and Hobby	Fairground		\$334,421	6,216 sq. ft.			
Lake Building	Fairground		\$172,160	3,200 sq. ft.			
Food Court	Fairground		\$150,640	2,800 sq. ft.	Fair physical condition		
Deschutes Grange	Fairground		\$42,454	912 sq. ft.	Fair physical condition		
Restroom Buildings	Fairground		\$228,229	1,702 sq. ft.			
Caretakers Residence	Fairground		\$42,000	840 sq. ft.			
Exposition Hall	Fairground		\$942,000	7,000 sq. ft.			
All sheds and booths	Fairground		\$49,065	3,271 sq. ft.	Fair physical condition		

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
All Barns	Fairground		\$696,000	48,600 sq. ft.	Fair physical condition		
Courthouse Bldg. 1	Olympia	1978	\$4,786,496	45,421 sq. ft.	HVAC, ADA, MMR, security, façade	2008	\$3,000,000
Courthouse Bldg. 2	Olympia	1978	\$4,949,940	35,914 sq. ft. Superior Ct.: 6 Ctrms.	HVAC, ADA, MMR, security, façade	2008	\$2,000,000
Courthouse Bldg. 3	Olympia	1978	\$12,899,284	74,471 sq. ft. Jail: 266 beds Dist. Ct.: 3 Ctrms	HVAC, ADA, MMR, security, façade	2008	\$4,000,000
Courthouse Bldg. 4	Olympia	1987	\$1,849,432	17,622 sq. ft.			
Bldg. 5	Olympia			22,000 sq. ft.	Roof, HVAC, Structural, parking lot	2008	\$500,000
Evaluation and Treatment Center	Olympia			20,050 sq. ft.			
3400 Building	Olympia			65,612 sq. ft.	Change of use pending	2008	\$100,000
CSA	Tumwater			10,800 sq. ft.	Change of Use Pending		
Al's Welding	Tumwater			10,000 sq. ft.	Demolition pending		
Social Services BHR	Lacey	1978 Leased	\$791,750		By tenant per lease agreement		
Heritage Court	Olympia	1992	Leased	17,850 sq. ft.	N/A		
Elections 2905-29th Ave SW	Tumwater	1994	Leased	9,000 sq. ft.	N/A		
PAO Civil 2415 Evergreen Park Dr.	Olympia	1996	Leased	5,500 sq. ft.			

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Records Center	Tumwater	1991	Leased	10,000 sq. ft.	N/A		
Juvenile Justice Center	Tumwater	1998 opened	\$18,000,000	82,000 sq. ft. in 4 Ctrms.; Detention : 80 beds; Day Detention : 40-80.	N/A		
Emergency Services Center	Olympia	1997	\$5,000,000	17,997 sq. ft.			
Social Services	Olympia	1978	\$300,000 Leased out to tenant	House	By tenant per Lease Agreement		
Courthouse Jail Annex and Bathroom Facilities	Olympia	1997	\$850,000	3,810 sq. ft. (92 beds)	None	n/a	n/a
Family Support Center	Olympia	1997	Leased	1,000 sq. ft.	N/A		
Grays Harbor Job Training Center	Aberdeen	2000	Leased	9,219 sq. ft.	N/A		
Health and Social Service Building	Olympia	2000	\$5,881,772	25,836 sq. ft.	None	2001	\$5,771,772
Coroner Facility	Tumwater	2002	\$1,028,000	6,950 sq. ft.	None	N/A	N/A
Social Services	Lacey	Leased	\$300,000 Lease Out to Tenant	2,500 sq. ft.			
Drug Court / Bristol Court	Olympia	2005	Lease	3,000 sq. ft.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Office of Assigned Counsel / Irving Street Station	Tumwater	2008	Lease	10,000 sq. ft.	N/A	N/A	N/A

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size	Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
PAO Civil Division / Glenn Building	Olympia	2005	Lease / Purchase Option	4,337 sq. ft.	N/A	N/A	N/A
PAO//Civil Services/EO C/ WWM Bldg. 6	Olympia	2008	Lease Purchase Option	9,050 Sq. ft.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Social & Health Services Needle Exchange	Olympia	May 2009	Lease		N/A	N/A	N/A
Weeds Lease at Millersylvania State Park	Olympia	2010	Lease		N/A	N/A	N/A

V. COUNTY CAPITAL FACILITIES

A summary of the Level of Service Standards for all of the facilities appears at the beginning of this chapter in Section II.

A. Regional Parks, Trails, Open Spaces and Preserves:

Recreation, the pursuit of leisure activities, enjoyment of the outdoors and preservation of open space, habitat and the natural environment are essential elements in maintaining a balance in the quality of life throughout Thurston County.

The Capital Facilities planning process provides a way to establish a comprehensive plan that identifies existing resources, involves an understanding of community needs, and organizes critical information into goals, policies and procedures to acquire, develop, implement, and manage parks and recreation assets.

Thurston County Parks and Recreation Department provides for the regional parks, recreation and natural resource preserve needs of County residents. The Parks Department, while recognizing the need to provide neighborhood, community and local parks and recreation areas in the urban and urban growth areas, will focus its efforts outside the adopted growth management areas. While this focus does not limit the County's ability to work with local communities on less than regional issues and in the urban growth management areas, it sets a distinctly higher priority on regional issues. This defines Thurston County Parks and Recreation Department's mission as providing regional parks, public/private enterprise parks, natural resource/preserves and trails and greenways.

In achieving this mission, Thurston County Parks recognizes the importance of coordinating its efforts with other municipal park and recreation based agencies, school districts, parks and recreation districts, private industry and other entities with similar missions. To meet this coordination goal, Thurston County participates as a partner to maximize available resources in meeting the recreation, trail and natural resource preserve needs of the entire county.

Thurston County currently has 33 park sites, accounting for a total of 2645 acres. These sites include twelve active parks (631 acres), only five of which are fully or partially developed, six preserves and three historic sites (1,158 acres) and 12 trails/trail properties, accounting for 47.8 miles of planned 58-mile recreational trail system. Approximately 34.3 miles of the trail system have been developed. The rest of the trail system is currently undeveloped. The county focuses on providing parks, trails and preserves

that contain special features intended to be used by all residents of the county, inside and outside cities. Therefore, the county does not provide small neighborhood or community parks of the kind typically found inside cities.

In 2002, the Parks and Recreation Department and Board of County Commissioners adopted an updated Parks Plan and Level of Service Standards. This new plan insures that ongoing work plans and priorities are in line with current needs and demands of the public and is coordinated with efforts and projects of other public agencies.

As a result of this Parks Plan review it was determined that Thurston County establishes a 4.5 acres per 1,000 resident population Level of Service. This 4.5 acre/1,000 level of service standard, based on 2013 population data, creates a need for 1170 acres of operational park land.

Since Thurston County has 288 acres of parkland and trails developed and operational, the net increase of land dedicated for park and trail purposes that meets the LOS standard is 815 acres. This LOS standard amounts to a total of 570.5 acres of Urban / Regional Park land, 81.5 acres of Public/Private Enterprise Park land, and 163 acres of Greenways/Trail lands. Further definition of the Park Classifications and details of park development are found in the Comprehensive Parks, Recreation, Trails and Natural Resource Preserve Plan.

When the proposed land acquisitions in this six year Capital Facilities Plan are added to the current acreage, an adequate level of service is maintained to address the needs and demands of an increasing population through 2016. To insure proper planning for specific needs through the 2020, the Parks Plan is reviewed annually and is fully updated every five years. As part of this long-range planning process, the county will explore acquisition of valuable active park, preserve or other properties that may become available on an "opportunity to acquire" basis. Parklands to be acquired will be focused on meeting specific needs for types of park facilities, not met by other jurisdictions and/or the private sector. The size and amount of specific recreational facilities will vary from area to area, and for a specific Park sub-classification.

Based on public input, the County has identified the highest priority needs as development and acquisition of multiple use trails, water access sites, athletic fields and other active recreation facilities, picnic sites and natural resource preserves.

User fees are currently being utilized for county parks. The fees help to support parks operations and maintenance, however, not capital costs.

[Resolution No. 14162(12/15/08)]

PARKS AND RECREATION OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES:

OBJECTIVE 1-K: *Parks, Trails, and Preserves* - The County should provide parks, trails and preserves to serve all residents of the county, with needs and funding coordinated with other local governments within the county.

POLICIES:

1. The County should work with cities and other local governments to coordinate park needs throughout the county and to identify regional funding strategies.
2. Acquisition of parks, trails and preserves and development rights to farmlands should occur in a coordinated manner, within an overall plan that identifies priorities, funding sources and a timetable for acquisition.
3. County-wide funding methods where the cities and schools districts may participate with the county should be explored as a means of coordinating acquisition, operation, and maintenance of public parks, open spaces, and year-round recreational programs.
4. Large regional parks should be provided by the county to serve all residents of the county. Medium-sized district parks should serve residents of higher intensity growth portions of the unincorporated county. Area residents, adjacent cities and others should participate in the funding for acquisition and support of the medium-sized district parks.
5. The county should cooperate with other public agencies to share public facilities for park and year-round recreation use by county residents.
6. An intergovernmental funding system should be established to acquire, maintain and operate parks and to involve participation by school districts, city and county governments, and others. Such approaches should be explored as county-wide bond measures and a county-wide parks and recreation district.
7. A cooperative program with the cities and school districts should be established to acquire lands for new community and neighborhood parks in the unincorporated urban growth area, as new schools sites are established.

8. Existing schools should be considered as a resource to meet the needs for parks, and the county should help fund the use of school facilities for park and year-round recreational use by county residents.
9. In acquiring and developing parks, trails and other recreation facilities, the County should explore every opportunity to create revenue centers within the park system to generate funding for ongoing park maintenance and operation needs.

NOTE: See Natural Environment Chapter for other park policies.

Table 6-4
**PARKS and OPEN SPACE CAPITAL PROJECTS
 2011 -2016**

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS Fund Source	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2011 - 2016 6 Yr. Total
Beginning Fund Balance from capital reserves		10,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	90,000
Bonds (1)		660,000	1,650,000		2,875,000	2,100,000	7,285,000
Grants		200,000	875,000	1,025,000	1,275,000	1,150,000	4,525,000
Other	120,000	30,000	420,000	170,000	280,000	180,000	1,200,000
REET (Real Estate Excise Tax)	375,000	162,000	362,000	387,000	417,000	500,000	2,203,000
Conservation Futures	2,200,000	1,500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	7,700,000
Trail Permit Fees	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000	50,000	140,000
TOTALS	\$2,705,000	\$2,572,000	\$4,337,000	\$2,612,000	\$5,917,000	\$5,000,000	\$23,143,000

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS			2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 Yr. Total
Project Name	Type	Fund Source							
Chehalis Western Trail	Dev	B, C, G, T, O, BF		400,000	525,000		600,000	200,000	1,725,000
Major Maint./Repair	Dev	R, T, C	385,000	147,000	362,000	387,000	417,000	100,000	1,798,000
Master Plans	MP	R, T, C		25,000		25,000			50,000
Gate - Belmore trail	Dev	B, G, R, O, T		500,000	750,000	1,000,000	1,250,000	1,500,000	5,000,000
Gate - Belmore trail Acquisition	Acq.	CF		500,000					500,000
Yelm - Tenino Trail (1)	Dev	C, G, T, B, O			1,000,000			200,000	1,200,000
Deschutes Falls Park (1)	Dev	B					2,500,000		2,500,000
Cooper Point Park	Dev	B, G, O						1,000,000	1,000,000
Kenneydell Park (3)	Dev	G, O			300,000				300,000
Griffin Athletic Fields (2)	Dev	G			400,000		150,000		550,000
Guerin Park	Dev	G, O, B				200,000		1,000,000	1,200,000
Monarch Park	Dev	G, O, B	25,000						25,000
Tolmie Park	Dev	G, O, B	50,000						50,000
Gibson Reclamation Project	Dev	G, O, B	20,000						20,000
Joint County/Lacey Property Acquisition	Acq.	CF	200,000						200,000
Commissioner's Challenge Grant	Acq.	CF	25,000						25,000
Parks and Open Space Acquisition of Property	Acq.	CF	2,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	7,000,000
TOTALS			\$2,705,000	\$2,572,000	\$4,337,000	\$2,612,000	\$5,917,000	\$5,000,000	\$23,143,000

DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Future Bonds		660,000	1,650,000		2,875,000	2,100,000	7,285,000
Total Debt Service	\$0	\$660,000	\$1,650,000	\$0	\$2,875,000	\$2,100,000	\$7,285,000

LEGEND:

B	Bonds (See Note #1)	G	Grant	TR	Thurston Regional Planning Council
BF	Beginning Fund Balance from capital reserve	PFD	Public Facilities District	W	Washington State Department of Transport
C	County Budget Allocation/Capital Fund	O	Donations, Other Sources	CF	Conservation Futures
D	Donations	R	Real Estate Excise Tax		
		T	Trail Permit Fees		

NOTE: (1) These projects would be funded if a source for repaying bonds is found (e.g., property tax approved by the voters, existing revenue sources, or a combination). such as Conservation Futures or other sources.

(2) The Griffin Athletic Fields are a joint project with the Griffin School District and are being constructed on school district property.

(3) Tumwater UGA

B. Solid Waste:

The RCW 70.95.080 states that: “Each county within the state, in cooperation with the various cities located within such county, prepare a coordinated, comprehensive solid waste management plan.” Thurston County coordinated with local jurisdictions to develop the Thurston County Solid Waste Management Plan of 1993 and subsequent plan of 2001. A new Solid Waste Management Plan is currently under review by Department of Ecology for adoption in 2010. This Solid Waste Capital Facilities Plan identifies those capital projects required to: 1) meet the policy goals and objectives in the Thurston County Solid Waste Management Plan of 2001 (a new Solid Waste Management Plan is currently under development for adoption in early 2009), and Thurston County Comprehensive Plan; 2) comply with federal and state law; and 3) address facility safety, operational, capacity and obsolescence issues.

Prioritization and Scheduling

A project assessment process objectively ranks projects based on a project’s ability to meet Level of Service (LOS) units including regulatory compliance, health/safety goals and policies, sustainability, technical feasibility and associated project costs. Projects are scheduled over a six-year period relative to their ranking. Higher ranking scores indicate a higher priority; whereas lower scores indicate lower priority.

Any project that addresses multiple LOS units will score relatively high and is considered a priority project. For example, a project required by a solid waste regulation for handling may also address public/employee safety and meet a specific local agency planning policy or goal. Projects that address fewer LOS units receive a lower ranking score and will be scheduled accordingly.

In cases where a priority project requires other ranked projects to be constructed first in order to proceed, the lesser projects receive the same ranking as the higher priority project. Projects currently under engineering design, environmental permitting, and/or construction efforts have a priority over other projects. Shifting priorities is therefore avoided to maintain a programmatic approach to both successfully and efficiently complete the Annual and 6YR capital plan. Changes in priorities occur only when an unforeseen circumstance causes a capital failure requiring immediate attention.

Funding

Solid waste capital projects are typically funded through two-revenue sources, including solid waste tipping fees and post-closure reserve funds. Tipping fees are those rates, charges and fees paid by the self-haul (public) and commercial customers that use Thurston County Solid Waste Facilities.

In 2009, the Board of County Commissioners adopted an ordinance establishing solid waste tipping fees at the Waste and Recovery Center and Drop Box

Facilities effective January 1, 2010. The ordinance also automatically increases the tipping rates from \$80/ton to \$110/ton on Jan 1, 2010. The current tipping fees plus an increase scheduled for January 1, 2012 of \$8/ton appear sufficient to fund planned solid waste programs and capital facility projects for the next 20 years. Programs and projects are reviewed annually. Future tipping fees and annual adjustments may be modified at the Board's discretion, if the tipping fees plus the automatic annual adjustments are insufficient to fund planned solid waste activities.

WAC 173-304-467 requires municipal corporations establish a financial surety known as a Post Closure Reserve to fund monitoring, maintenance and other activities on a closed landfill for a period of thirty-years. Thurston County established this reserve by dedicating a portion of tipping fees to the Post Closure Reserve from the early 1990s through December 31st 2002. The post closure care period was subsequently initiated January 1, 2003. As of December 31st 2009, the county had approximately \$18,000,000 in post closure reserve. Capital projects required to maintain the closed landfill cells are funded from the post closure reserve. The following table shows what projects are being funded through post closure funds and what projects are being funded through tipping fees.

Solid Waste Goals and Policies

GOAL: PROVIDE FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF SOLID WASTE AND HAZARDOUS WASTES ON A COUNTY-WIDE BASIS, INCLUDING PLANNING FOR FACILITIES AND SERVICES.

POLICIES:

1. The county should require that handling and disposal of solid and hazardous waste be done in ways that minimize land, air and water pollution and protect public health.
2. The county should undertake strategies for dealing with solid wastes in the following order: waste reduction, recycling, energy recovery, and disposal.
3. The county should continually explore new approaches for waste reduction, recycling, energy recovery, and methods of disposing of solid wastes.
4. The county should continue to implement programs recommended in the county's Moderate Risk Waste Plan to provide for safe disposal of household and small business hazardous wastes outside of landfills.
5. The county should seek practical solutions to problems of illegal dumping.
6. The county should require that dredging and disposal of sediments be done in a manner that does not pose serious health risk to humans or result in adverse effects to water and land resources, including biological organisms.

7. The county should require that all facilities which store, process or use hazardous materials or generate or treat hazardous wastes in their operations be sited in compliance with state and local laws, best management practices for the protection of groundwater, surface waters, and air quality and be periodically monitored for compliance with such laws and practices.
8. The county should implement and update the county Moderate Risk Waste Plan.
9. The county should maintain and update the county Solid Waste Management Plan.
10. The county should support and enhance all waste reduction and recycling efforts.
11. The county should act as the coordinating entity in the upland disposal of clean and contaminated dredge sediments, under the authority of Article 5 of the Sanitary Code.
12. The county should revise the Zoning Code to ensure consistency with the adopted Moderate Risk Waste Plan, the Northern Thurston County Ground Water Management Plan, the Critical Areas Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan's policies.
13. The county should encourage through education and technical assistance the use of safer, less hazardous products and the reduction of hazardous materials.
14. The county should consult with the appropriate regional transportation planning agencies and neighboring jurisdictions prior to establishing prohibitions for commercial hazardous materials transport.

Table 6-5
THURSTON COUNTY
SOLID WASTE CAPITAL PROJECTS
2011 - 2016

REVENUE	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR TOTAL
<i>Solid Waste Tipping Fees, Rates and Charges</i>	\$1,500,000	\$3,185,000	\$1,950,000	\$5,350,000	\$1,400,000	\$50,000	\$13,435,000
<i>Post Closure Reserve</i>	\$50,000	\$150,000	\$550,000	\$50,000	\$550,000	\$150,000	\$1,500,000
<i>Other⁰</i>	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$300,000
REVENUE TOTALS:	\$1,600,000	\$3,385,000	\$2,550,000	\$5,450,000	\$2,000,000	\$250,000	\$15,235,000

PROJECT EXPENDITURES	Policy No.	Funding Sources ¹	Objective ²	UGA ³	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR TOTAL
WARC Development (Old Lakeside Area)	#3	Fees	WR/G/R	Lacey		\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000		\$1,600,000
Hazo House Complex	#1, 4, 7	Fees	WR/G/R	Lacey	\$250,000						\$250,000
Rainier Drop Box Improvements	# 1, 3	Fees	G/M	Rural	\$500,000			\$50,000		\$50,000	\$600,000
WARC Transfer Station Expansion	#2, 3	Fees	G/M	Lacey	\$250,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,000,000				\$2,750,000
WARC Automotive and Equipment Storage Area	#1	Fees	M	Lacey	\$500,000	\$150,000	\$50,000				\$700,000
Summit Lake Drop Box Improvements	#1,0	Fees	G/M	Rural		\$5,000					\$5,000
Rochester Drop Box Improvements	#1,3	Fees	G/M	Rural		\$30,000					\$30,000
WARC Transfer Station Compactor	#2,3	Fees	G/M	Lacey		\$1,000,000					\$1,000,000
WARC Yard Waste Materials Recovery Facility	#2,3	Fees	R/M	Lacey		\$100,000					\$100,000
Post Landfill Closure Improvements	#7	PCR	R	Lacey			\$500,000		\$500,000		\$1,000,000
WARC Tollhouse Plaza	#1,9	Fees	G	Lacey			\$200,000	\$1,900,000	\$500,000		\$2,600,000
WARC Flat Floor Public Tipping Area	#3	Fees	WR/G	Lacey			\$300,000	\$2,500,000	\$500,000		\$3,300,000
Construction and Demolition Area	#3	Fees	WR/G	Lacey				\$500,000			\$500,000
Beneficial Re-use of Closed Landfill	TBD ⁴	PCR/Other	TBD	Lacey	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$600,000
WARC Landfill Settlement and Repairs	#7	PCR	R	Lacey		\$100,000				\$100,000	\$200,000
EXPENDITURE TOTALS:					\$1,602,011	\$3,385,000	\$2,550,000	\$5,450,000	\$2,000,000	\$250,000	\$15,235,000

Notes:

Referenced policies and goals within Solid and Hazardous Waste Comprehensive Plans

⁰Other revenue could include other local agencies, grants, providing funding for mutually beneficial projects

¹Funding sources include: Fees= Solid Waste Tipping fees, rates and charges; and PCR= Post-Closure reserve funds.

²Project Objectives include; WR= Waste Reduction; G= Growth; M=Maintenance; and R=Regulation

³UGA= Designated Urban Growth Area

⁴TBD=no specific project is identified. Funding provides for planning, design and inter-agency coordination for development of mutually beneficial project(s) at WARC facility.

10/5/2010

C. Stormwater Facilities:

Thurston County's rich diversity of terrain, including mountain foothills, high bluffs, floodplains, wetlands, and multiple drainage basins leading to Puget Sound and the Pacific Ocean via the Chehalis River, provide extensive wildlife habitat, potable water and interesting challenges in managing impacts of development. Chapter 9 of the Comprehensive Plan provides policy guidance related to how stormwater should be managed in Thurston County to the maximum extent practicable avoiding adverse impacts to the natural environment.. The County is in the process of developing a number of important tools for managing stormwater in accordance with these policies, including basin characterizations and a GIS inventory of existing facilities. These tools will support the County in assuring that natural wetlands, streams, lakes and rivers are preserved in their most natural states or that impacts to them are mitigated.

These tools as well as existing basin plans will be used by the Thurston County Stormwater Management Utility to augment current capital plans. The original Stormwater Utility was formed in 1986 in the northern part of the county pursuant to Chapter 36.89 RCW. The stormwater utility has completed seven (7) basin plans to date, and has partnered with the cities on two others. The County will share the cost of constructing facilities within the Woodland, Chambers and Moxlie Basins with the Cities of Lacey, Olympia and Tumwater. Planning for the peninsulas and more rural basins will be undertaken to complete basin planning efforts for all the county drainage basins as funding and priorities allow.

In 2008¹, the Stormwater Management Utility was expanded countywide to address NPDES permitting and countywide basin planning. Projects for the expanded area will be generated by the basin characterization and GIS inventory mentioned above. The stormwater facilities in this Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) are placed on the 6-year and 20-year stormwater CFP, as well as for capital projects intended to address emerging environmental or regulatory issues relating to flooding, water quality and/or habitat degradation. Annually, projects are comprehensively reviewed and prioritized according to a ranking system. This ranking system was first established in 2002. The ranking system was revised in 2008 and again 2010 and considers:

1. *Compliance with federal and state water quality regulations*
 - a. Identified in long range plan document
 - b. Facility maintenance identified in resource plan
 - c. Project required under regulatory action

¹ Board of County Commissioners action on August 6 , 2007

2. *Project Life*
 - a. Project reduces threat to human safety, health or welfare.
 - b. Frequency of reoccurrences
3. *Protection of Property*
 - a. Existing drainage problem
 - b. Detrimental impact to public facilities
 - c. Problem Frequency
 - d. Provides maximum benefit to ratepayers
 - e. Protects water Quality
 - f. Enhances environmental protection to sensitive resources
 - g. Increases public education and citizen involvement
4. *Public Stewardship*
 - a. Special opportunity for high priority project may be lost
 - b. Significant reduction in maintenance and operations costs
 - c. Support economic development by solving regional stormwater problem
 - d. Urgent problem
 - e. Supports interjurisdictional solutions

Once ranked, each project is given additional consideration as it relates to drainage basin planning and utility needs, as appropriate.

The following projects were ranked using the system described:

Capital Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Meridian Heights	Project underway Protect the loss of public and private property from erosion caused by stormwater runoff	Ready to build pending property owner authorization for site access

Capital Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Nisqually Watershed Characterization	Project underway Identification of resource restoration and preservation sites for the TC portion of the watershed.	Project complete June 30, 2011
Waddell Creek Rd. @ Pants Creek	Priority #1 Culvert replacement to reduce local flooding and improve fish passage	Planning & Design begins in 2011
Tilley Rd. @ the curves	Priority #2 Culvert Replacement to reduce local flooding	Planning and design begins in 2011.
Acquire Countywide Lidar Imagery	Priority #3 Critical information for drainage facility inventory, flood response and Illicit Discharge Detection Elimination program	Project scope to be developed in 2008 Acquire data in 2011
Swayne Rd.	Priority #4 Reduce marine shoreline erosion at outfall	Planning and design begins 2013
Stuart Place	Priority #5 Reduce local flooding and provide WQ treatment	Planning and design begins 2013
Sherwood Firs	Priority # 6 Reduce local flooding and provide WQ treatment	Planning and design begins 2013
Manzanita Rd.	Priority # 7 Reduce marine shoreline erosion at outfall	Planning and design begins 2013

Capital Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Hidden Forest Pump Station outfall	<p>Existing Facility Replacement –</p> <p>Facility is at the end of it useful life. Provides energy dissipation for pump station</p>	Planning and design begins 2014
Donnelly Drive	<p>Priority #8</p> <p>Reduce urban street flooding, reduce peak flows to Chambers Ditch and treat stormwater before discharge to ground water and Chambers Ditch</p>	Planning and design begins 2015.
Mallard Pond Phase II	<p>Priority # 9</p> <p>Prevent the disintegration and drainage of the Mallard Pond Wetland Complex</p>	Thurston County to negotiate with local homeowners association to develop potential cost-sharing formulas
Land Acquisition	<p>Opportunity</p> <p>Land acquisition is executed as opportunities supported by the Board of County Commissioners are authorized.</p>	Land acquisition is executed as opportunities supported by the Board of County Commissioners are authorized.
Future Capital Facility Projects	<p>Unknown</p> <p>Projects to be identified during county-wide drainage infrastructure mapping assessment efforts.</p>	Drainage Facility Mapping completion expected 2012.
Reserve For Future Capital replacement	<p>Built facilities depreciate annually, a future replacement fund preserves the Utility's infrastructure.</p>	Annual contributions begin in 2011.

The stormwater utility is undertaking a seven-year project to acquire data that will provide a detailed map of the County's drainage systems. This work will also assess the integrity of each drainage component and will aid in identifying future capital facility projects.

Types of Stormwater Facilities:

There are three types of stormwater facilities.

Flood Control Facilities: Retrofit of stormwater storage facilities, which add storage capacity with additional dry well disposal systems, enlarged conveyances with new collection and detention systems within existing developed areas.

Water Quality Facilities: Install or retrofit treatment devices to existing dry well systems, wet ponds, constructed wetlands, or conveyance discharging to surface or ground water. This facility may include grit separators, filters in vaults, rain gardens, bio-swales or other best management practices or new technologies.

Habitat Facilities/Surveys: Install in-stream structures to improve fish passage and improve down-gradient shellfish habitat. (Placement of large woody debris, riparian cover, bank stabilization projects are not included in the CFP, but in the stormwater base budget.) Conduct habitat surveys to identify and quantify stream health and down-gradient shellfish areas in association with capital facility planning efforts.

In many instances, flood control facilities (which are intended to provide additional storage) often provide water quality and/or habitat improvements. The additional storage can allow settling of pollutant-carrying sediments. The storage also provides additional detention time, before peak flows enter the stream system. This aids by reducing peak flow rates and erosion of the existing stream channel, which can inhibit fish passage and degrade shellfish areas.

Some of the current CFP projects are located within the county's shellfish districts. However, it is recognized that by applying the current best management practices to these projects will not be effective in reducing fecal coliform loading. Therefore, the county encourages infiltration of stormwater within the shellfish districts as a primary means of managing and treating stormwater whenever technically feasible.

None of the proposed facilities include combining stormwater with domestic sewage (e.g. CSO) and transporting the combined fluids to a waste water treatment plant.

The majority of the proposed stormwater capital facility projects in this plan are intended to correct or alleviate existing flooding, water quality or habitat problems, as well as address public health and safety issues.

Dedicated Storm and Surface Water Utility Rates and Charges for Capital Facilities:

Table 6-6 highlights specific capital facility projects, which will be designed and constructed with a dedicated stormwater capital facility rate or a combination of rates and other funding sources. The projects on this 6-year list are taken from the 20-year CFP that in turn is based upon projects identified in adopted stormwater basin plans and projects intended to address emerging issues.

Several projects are planned and will be constructed within the Urban Growth Area (UGA) for Olympia, Lacey, and Tumwater. Reimbursement for county-funded expenditures related to constructed capital facilities within a city's UGA is subject to further review and future policy decisions. The future policy decisions should also consider how reimbursement might occur for planned capital facilities within future annexations.

From preliminary assessment, revenues generated by the rates and charges for each city's stormwater utility may not be sufficient to reimburse the county for the total capital expenditures associated with constructing stormwater facilities within annexed areas in any one year, however over time reimbursement is possible.

This plan includes stormwater facilities across most of the unincorporated area of Thurston County

In 1998 a capital facility rate was incorporated into the stormwater rates. By 1999, there was enough public interest to expand the Storm and Surface Water Utility rate boundary south to include the Salmon Creek Drainage Basin, located south of Tumwater, WA.

Utility rates and charges collected from within the boundary expansion, combined with a grant and a portion of the real estate excise tax, funded a study to identify the basin's stormwater and shallow groundwater problems, as well as evaluate possible solutions. The Storm and Surface Water Utility rates and charges took effect for the Salmon Creek Drainage Basin in August 1999.

[Resolution No.13265 12/20/04]

In August 2007, the County expanded the stormwater utility making stormwater services county-wide beginning January 2008. These services include planning for and implementing capital facilities projects in the south County.

[Resolution No.13876 8/06/07]

STORMWATER OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES:

OBJECTIVE 1-G: *Stormwater Facilities* - Thurston County will coordinate with jurisdictions that share stormwater drainage basins to provide stormwater

facilities and related management programs that protect surface and ground water quality and habitat, prevent chronic flooding from stormwater, maintain natural stream hydrology and protect aquatic resources.

POLICIES:

1. Thurston County will work with local governments within the same drainage basins to develop common standards and design requirements for stormwater facilities. The County will also plan together with the other jurisdictions for major regional stormwater facilities. Maintenance of stormwater facilities, such as retention ponds and street drainage systems, could be handled by each jurisdiction separately or together with other jurisdictions.
2. Stormwater utility rates should recognize and implement other Comprehensive Plan recommendations such as providing incentives to preserve agriculture and forestry lands through reduced rates.
3. Comprehensive Drainage Basin Plans will be used to identify and prioritize necessary stormwater services and capital facilities. As new Basin Plans are adopted, the County should periodically review and update the Stormwater element of the Capital Facilities Plan. Basin Plans should also be periodically reviewed and updated to address changing environmental conditions.
4. Thurston County should address emerging flooding, water quality, and habitat issues as they arise and in a timely manner to avoid adverse impacts to residents, critical areas, resource lands, or infrastructure.

NOTE: See Natural Environment and Utilities Chapters for other policies related to stormwater management.

Table 6-6
2011 - 2016 Stormwater Capital Facilities

REVENUE	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR TOTAL
Rates - Resolution 13135 + Ending Fund	\$1,350,000	\$745,000	\$787,000	\$875,000	\$650,000	\$650,000	\$5,057,000
Grants / Road Fund	\$1,905,000	\$950,000	\$350,000	\$325,000	\$300,000	\$250,000	\$4,080,000
Capital Replacement Reserve				\$47,000			\$47,000
REVENUE TOTAL:	\$3,255,000	\$1,695,000	\$1,137,000	\$1,247,000	\$950,000	\$900,000	\$9,184,000

PROJECT EXPENDITURES	Policy No. ⁰	Funding Source ¹	Objective ²	UGA ³	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR TOTAL
Meridian Heights	#4	SW Rates	Property Protection	Lacey	\$200,000	\$10,000	\$10,000				\$220,000
Mallard Pond Phase II ⁴	#4	SW Rates	H/WQ	Lacey						\$6,000	\$6,000
Deschutes River Wetland Protection and Enhancement	A.Groundwater and Aquifer Recharge Areas 9-7; B. Important Fish, Wildlife, and Plant Habitat 9-15;	Grant	H/WQ	Tumwater	\$1,000,000	\$800,000					\$1,800,000
Deschutes Basin Retrofits	#1,3,4	SW Rates/Grants	H/F/WQ	not limited to UGA			\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000		\$750,000
Vactor Waste Decant Facility	#9 - (Utilities)	SW Rates	WQ	Lacey	\$20,000						\$20,000
Nisqually Watershed Characterization	#1,3,4	SW Rates/Grants	F/WQ/H	Oly	\$225,000						\$225,000
Woodland Creek Pollutant Reduction - Tanglewilde Retrofit	#4, C-1 & 3 (Natural Environment)	Grant/ SSWU Rates	WQ	Lacey	\$600,000						\$600,000
Stormwater Infrastructure Asset management data collection	#3, H-Obj.1-3, H-Obj.2-3 (Natural Environment)	SW rates/Grant	F/WQ/H	not limited to UGA	\$740,000						\$740,000
Waddell Creek Rd. @ Pants Creek	#4, C-2, E-8 (Natural Environment)	SW Rates/Roads	F/H	NA	\$50,000	\$35,000	\$202,000				\$287,000
Tilley Rd. @ the Curves	#4, C-2, E-8 (Natural Environment)	SW Rates/Roads	F	NA	\$75,000	\$163,000					\$238,000
Aquire Countywide Lidar Imagery	#3, A-5, H-Obj.1-3, H-Obj.2-3 (Natural Environment)	SW Rates/Grants	F/H/WQ	not limited to UGA	\$0	\$300,000					\$300,000
Swayne Rd. NE	#4, E-1, E-10, H-Obj.1-6, H-Obj.2-8 (Natural Environment)	SW Rates/Roads	H/WQ	NA			\$120,000	\$330,000			\$450,000
Stuart Place	#4	SW Rates/Roads	H/WQ	Lacey			\$80,000	\$280,000			\$360,000
Sherwood Firs - Phase II	#4	SW Rates/Roads	H/WQ	NA				\$90,000	\$370,000		\$460,000
Hidden Forest Outfall	#4	SW Capital Replacement Reserve	WQ	NA				\$47,000			\$47,000
Manzanita Dr. NW	#4, E-1, E-10, H-Obj.1-6, H-Obj.2-8 (Natural Environment)	SW Rates/Roads	H/WQ	NA					\$80,000	\$280,000	\$360,000
Donnelly Drive	#4	SW Rates / Roads	F/WQ	Oly						\$130,000	\$130,000
Future Capital Projects ⁵	TBD	Rates	F/WQ/H	not limited to UGA						\$200,000	\$200,000
Reserve for future Capital replacement		Rates	Facility Preservation	TBD	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$1,500,000
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE TOTALS:					\$3,160,000	\$1,558,000	\$912,000	\$1,247,000	\$950,000	\$866,000	\$8,693,000
Projected End Fund Balance					\$95,000	\$137,000	\$225,000	\$0	\$0	\$34,000	\$491,000
EXPENDITURE TOTALS					\$3,255,000	\$1,695,000	\$1,137,000	\$1,247,000	\$950,000	\$900,000	\$9,184,000

Notes:
⁰ Refer to Comprehensive Plan Stormwater Objectives and Policies
¹ Funding sources include: Rates = Stormwater Capital Rates, Grants, and Real Estate Excise Tax
² Project Objectives include: F=Flooding; WQ=Water Quality; and H=Habitat.
³ UGA - Urban Growth Area. NA indicates the project is not within a current urban growth areas of Olympia, Lacey, or Tumwater.
⁴ This project may be contingent on negotiated cost sharing between the county and local Homeowners Association
⁵ The SSWU is undertaking a 7-year project to provide a detailed infrastructure map and condition assessment of the County's drainage system. A 20-year CFP will be developed using data from this project.

D. Water and Sewer Systems:

Rural Areas:

As a matter of policy, Thurston County does not provide municipal water and/or municipal sewer service to rural areas, with the exception of those areas where a public health-related issue or water quality concern necessitates county involvement. Therefore, this plan does not provide for programmatic construction of capital facilities in association with rural sewer and water systems, which are not currently owned, operated, and maintained by the county.

The county owns 2 rural water systems (Boston Harbor and Tamoshan), and 3 rural sewer systems (Boston Harbor, Tamoshan/Beverly Beach, and Olympic View).

There are occasions when other rural privately-owned water and sewer systems experience operating troubles or failures which have a high potential for affecting a high risk of public health. In those cases the county will often assist the local residents in the planning, engineering and construction of improvements to the existing water and sewer systems to solve these local problems.

This plan also recognizes some existing privately-owned rural water systems may fail financially and become either another municipality's responsibility or a county responsibility by default.

Urban Growth Areas:

City UGAs: Sewer and water systems are expected to be provided to unincorporated parts of areas identified and zoned for urban growth, with these systems constructed as the areas urbanize. The cities are typically responsible for extending these services within the unincorporated parts of urban growth areas.

Grand Mound UGA: An urban growth area was established in the Rochester/Grand Mound area in the late 1970s. The UGA boundaries and zoning were updated in 1995. A Utility Local Improvement District (ULID) was formed through approval by the community in late 1996 to provide water and sewer system improvements in the Grand Mound UGA. Both water and sewer systems are in operation providing service to customers located within the UGA. In 2002, the county established policies to provide water service to properties located outside of the UGA.

[Resolution No. 14162 (12/15/08)]

Criteria or Basis for Setting Priorities:

Water and sewer capital facility projects are generally based on the criterion (in order of priority) as listed below:

1. Address existing or emerging public health and/or safety issues;

2. Address compliance with local, state and federal regulatory requirements;
3. Meet goals and objectives of adopted Comprehensive Waste System Plans or Master Sewerage Plans of each respective utility;
4. Improve system reliability and/or reduce dependency on critical facilities;
5. Maintain the current level of service by removing and replacing degraded or aged facilities;
6. Availability of funding (e.g. ULID, rates and charges, grants, loans, etc);
7. Improve or enhance the utility's current level of service; and
8. Acquire existing private utilities or develop new utilities.

PROJECT LIST IN ORDER OF PRIORITY

The following projects were ranked using the criteria above:

Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Other Utilities		
Woodland Creek Estates Sanitary Sewer Service	Priority # 1 Regulatory/ Modernization	Planning work complete. Funding expected to be secured in 2010. Design work expected to begin in 2011.
Tanglewilde Sanitary Sewer	Unranked Sanitary sewer will replace current onsite septic systems that contribute to degrading water quality in Henderson Inlet.	Pending Board authorization and funding.

Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Grand Mound Sewer and Water Utilities		
Grand Mound Bio-Solids Handling & Dewatering	Priority # 2 Regulatory/ Modernization	Design and construction is scheduled to begin in 2010 with construction completion expected early 2011.
Grand Mound Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion & Class A Standards	Priority # 3 Regulatory/ Modernization	Planning level study to develop costs and expected in 2011 with REET funding. Acquisition of funding is necessary in order to design, bid and construct improvements. Construction will be based on system demand over the next four to ten years
Grand Mound Sewer Collection System Upgrades	Priority # 4 Equipment obsolescence/ Modernization	Ongoing upgrades and minor improvements.
Grand Mound Water System Upgrades	Priority # 5 Equipment obsolescence/ Modernization	Ongoing upgrades and minor improvements.
Grand Mound Wastewater Plant Upgrades	Priority # 6 Equipment obsolescence/ Modernization	Ongoing upgrades and minor improvements.
HWY 99 Sewer Force Main/Lift Station/Wet Well	Priority # 7 Construction completed but system is not in operation.	Construction of improvements complete. System startup cannot occur until private contractor's punchlist items are resolved.

Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Utility Capital Planning WTR/SWR-Asset Management Plan Development	Priority # 8 Develops long-term asset management plan for repair and replacement of capital improvements	Pending Board Consideration
Grand Mound Well and Pump # 3	Priority # 9 Would like to increase the priority on well #3 & #4 System demand – This is the third of four pumps to complete the Grand Mound Water System total build out	Planning Phase- Construction will be based on system demand over the next six to twenty-years.
Grand Mound Well and Pump # 4	Priority # 10 System demand -This is the third of four pumps to complete the Grand Mound Water System total build out	Planning Phase- Construction will be based on system demand over the next six to twenty-years.
Grand Mound Way Loop Water Main	Priority # 11 Project will add to system redundancy and water security to maintain water service in event of damage or repairs to existing main.	Pending acquisition of funding.

Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Tamoshan Sewer and Water Utilities		
Tamoshan Waste Water Treatment Plant Upgrades	Priority # 1 Equipment obsolescence/ Modernization	Ongoing upgrades and minor improvements.
Tamoshan Beach Front Sewer System Collection Improvements	Priority # 2 Remove sewer collection main on beach and install sewer lift station	Construction of improvements expected to begin in 2010.
Tamoshan Water System Upgrades	Priority # 3 Equipment obsolescence/ Modernization	Ongoing upgrades and minor improvements.
Tamoshan Secondary Watermain Replacement	Priority # 4 Remove and replace a failed watermain to provide distribution system redundancy.	Design and construction scheduled for 2012.
Tamoshan Primary Watermain Replacement	Priority # 5 Replace obsolete watermain	Acquisition of funding is necessary in order to design, bid and construct improvements. Please refer to Table 6-9 for planned year of construction

Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Olympic View Sewer Utility		
Olympic View Sewer Collection and Sewage Treatment System Improvements-	Priority # 1 Remove and replace existing STEP systems and related appurtenances and other improvements at disposal field site maintain current level of service to rate-payers.	Incremental improvements to begin in 2011.
Boston Harbor Water and Sewer System		
Sewer Collection System Upgrades	Priority # 1 Equipment obsolescence/ Modernization	Pending Board authorization
Waste Water Treatment Plant Upgrades	Priority # 2 Equipment obsolescence/ Modernization	Pending Board authorization
Water System Upgrades	Priority # 3 Equipment obsolescence/ Modernization	Pending Board authorization
Water System Water Main Replacement	Priority # 4 Modernization	Pending Board authorization

WATER AND SEWER OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

OBJECTIVE 1-H: Sewer Systems - Sewer systems should be provided in designated urban growth areas and in rural areas only under limited circumstances.

POLICIES:

1. Thurston County should allow sewer systems in designated urban growth areas. In rural areas, sewer systems should be allowed only to correct identified health hazards or water quality deficiencies of areas of existing development. Expansion or extension into rural areas must be consistent with the Growth Management Act.
2. Decisions on the design capacity and service area designation for such sewer systems in rural areas should be made with consideration of adopted zoning designations of adjacent areas.
3. Where sewer systems are being provided to unincorporated rural areas or the Rochester-Grand Mound area, Thurston County should be the primary sewer system provider through the County Services Act.
4. In unincorporated areas inside the Urban Growth Areas around cities, the cities should be the primary sewer provider. As an exception, the county could provide sewers in a UGA on an interim basis (if the cities are unable to provide the service) or to protect water quality.
5. Utility services within growth areas should be phased outward from the urbanizing core as that core becomes substantially developed, in order to concentrate urban growth and infilling.

NOTE: Other related policies dealing with sewer systems and water quality are found in the Natural Environment.

6. The County should develop, and periodically review and update, a comprehensive sewerage general plan for all unincorporated rural areas where there are health and water quality problems related to sewage in areas of existing development, and in all urban growth areas where no sewerage planning has been done.

OBJECTIVE 1-I: *Wastewater Treatment and Disposal* - All factors and impacts should be considered in determining appropriate sewage treatment and disposal methods.

POLICIES:

1. Wastewater disposal methods should be determined by considering all factors, such as environmental impacts, long-term effects, technical feasibility, cost effectiveness and especially the maintenance and improvement of water quality.
2. Wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal alternatives should be encouraged where feasible, where water quality can be protected and/or where appropriate operation and maintenance are provided.
3. Alternative methods of wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal should be discouraged in areas where sewer service is provided or planned. In other areas, they should be considered only when an acceptable plan for operation and maintenance is provided, and they will not adversely affect ground and surface water quality and/or public health.
4. The county should monitor the functioning of on-site wastewater disposal systems and require that they be maintained in a condition that will assure their longevity, protect public health, and prevent contamination of surface and ground water.
5. The county should periodically review and update the capacity and alternatives for wastewater treatment related to the limits of the LOTT treatment plant.
6. The county should review and revise policies for on-site wastewater disposal alternatives to comply with the above policies and adopted state wastewater disposal regulations.
7. The county should examine the building code for standards for low-water use fixtures, and should make available to residents literature comparing efficiency of low-water use fixtures and issues related to the no-flow alternative.

NOTE: Ecology does not allow discharge of chlorine.

OBJECTIVE 1-J: *Water Supply Facilities* - Drinking water service inside urban growth areas should be provided by cities or private utility systems which are the designated service providers through coordinated water

system planning; the County should provide drinking water systems in rural areas only under limited circumstances.

POLICIES:

1. In order to resolve documented health hazards, safety or pollution in areas of existing rural development, the county may serve as the water utility owner, or develop a proactive assistance program focused on keeping small distribution systems in private ownership.
2. In rural areas where the county provides sewer service, the county or a private utility system should also be the water provider.

NOTE: See Natural Environment and Utilities Chapters for other policies related to management of water systems and water resources.

**Table 6-7
Thurston County
Water and Sewer Capital Projects
2011-2016**

REVENUE:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR TOTAL
REET ¹ /Grants/Loans ²	\$1,980,500	\$1,762,000	\$7,092,000	\$2,600,000	\$3,000	\$50,000	\$13,487,500
Utility Revenue	\$42,000	\$39,500	\$50,200	\$38,000	\$168,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,337,700
REVENUE TOTAL:	\$2,022,500	\$1,801,500	\$7,142,200	\$2,638,000	\$171,000	\$1,050,000	\$14,825,200

PROJECT EXPENDITURES	Policy No.	Funding Source	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR TOTAL
Other³									
Woodland Creek Estates Sanitary Sewer Project	1-H(1)	REET/Grants/Loans/Other	\$200,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,800,000	\$900,000			\$6,100,000
Tanglewilde Sanitary Sewer	1-H(1)	Grants/Loans/Other						\$50,000	\$50,000
Grand Mound									
Grand Mound Biosolids Handling & Dewatering	1-I(1)	REET	\$900,000						\$900,000
Grand Mound Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion for Class A Reclamation	1-I(1)	REET	\$40,000		\$750,000	\$1,160,000			\$1,950,000
Grand Mound Sewer Collection System Upgrades	1-J(1)	Utility Revenue	\$22,000	\$17,000	\$14,000	\$13,000	\$11,000		\$77,000
Grand Mound Water System Upgrades	1-J(1)	Utility Revenue	\$5,500	\$15,000		\$7,000			\$27,500
Grand Mound Waste Water Treatment Plant Upgrades	1-I(1)	Utility Revenue	\$73,000	\$90,000	\$2,000		\$6,000		\$171,000
Hwy 99 Sewer Force Main/Lift Station/Wet Well	1-H(1)	REET	\$40,000						\$40,000
Utility Capital Planning WTR/SWR - Asset Management Plan Development	1-J(1), 1-I(1)	Other		\$60,000					\$60,000
Grand Mound Well and Pump # 3	1-J(1)	Utility Revenue	\$5,000					\$500,000	\$505,000
Grand Mound Well and Pump # 4	1-J(1)	Utility Revenue	\$5,000					\$500,000	\$505,000
Grand Mound Way Watermain Loop	1-J(1)	REET/Grant/Other		\$170,000	\$730,000				\$900,000
Grand Mound Waste Water Treatment Facility Expansion	1-I(1)	REET			\$1,760,000	\$540,000			\$2,300,000
Tamoshan									
Tamoshan Waste Water Treatment Plant Upgrades	1-J(1)	Utility Revenue	\$12,000	\$20,500	\$29,200	\$10,000			\$71,700
Tamoshan Beach Front Sewer System Collection Improvements	1-H(1)	REET	\$700,000						\$700,000
Tamoshan Water System Upgrades	1-J(1)	Utility Revenues	\$10,000	\$19,000			\$100,000		\$129,000
Tamoshan Secondary Watermain Replacement	1-J(1)	REET		\$160,000					\$160,000
Tamoshan Primary Water Main Replacement	1-J(1)	Loan/Grant		\$50,000	\$50,000				\$100,000
Olympic View									
Olympic View Sewer Collection and Sewage Treatment System Improvements	1-H(1)	Utility Revenue	\$10,000		\$7,000	\$8,000	\$54,000		\$79,000
EXPENDITURE TOTAL			\$2,022,500	\$1,801,500	\$7,142,200	\$2,638,000	\$171,000	\$1,050,000	\$14,825,200

DEBT SERVICE ON BONDS AND LOANS BY FUND	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR TOTAL
20YR LTGO Bond For Grand Mound	\$1,070,250	\$1,078,000	\$1,158,500	\$1,103,000	\$158,000	\$158,000	\$4,725,750
20YR LTGO Bond For Grand Mound	\$98,100	\$98,100	\$98,100	\$98,100	\$98,100	\$98,100	\$588,600
20YR PWTF LOAN Olympic View	\$7,658	\$7,277	\$6,986	\$6,695	\$6,404	\$6,113	\$41,133
20YR DOE ST REV Tamoshan/Bev Bch	\$78,282	\$78,282	\$78,282		\$78,282	\$78,282	\$391,410
20YR PWTF LOAN For Grand Mound	\$6,405	\$6,327	\$6,250	\$6,172	\$6,095	\$6,017	\$37,266
DEBT SERVICE TOTAL	\$1,260,695	\$1,267,986	\$1,348,118	\$1,213,967	\$346,881	\$346,512	\$5,784,159

Key: PWTF Public Works Trust Fund; DWSRF- Drinking Water State Revolving Fund

¹REET = 2nd quarter percent Real Estate Excise Tax

²A specific grant or loan is not identified. The county will seek revenues through a variety of federal and state grants and loans as funds become available.

³These projects are not part of an existing county-managed sewer utility. At the time of this writing, funding has not been secured, but is expected as part loan and grant. Additional funding is required but has not been secured.

Table 6-7 A
Thurston County
Boston Harbor Water and Sewer Capital Projects
2011-2016

REVENUE:	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR TOTAL
Utility Revenue (Bond Call) \$400,000 ⁽¹⁾	\$72,150	\$53,650	\$58,450	\$44,450	\$141,200	\$100,000	\$469,900
REVENUE TOTAL:	\$72,150	\$53,650	\$58,450	\$44,450	\$141,200	\$100,000	\$469,900

PROJECT EXPENDITURES	Policy No.	Funding Source	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR TOTAL
Sewer Collection System Upgrades	1-J(1)	Utility Revenue	\$33,950	\$33,950	\$33,950	\$33,950			\$135,800
Waste Water Treatment Plant Upgrades	1-J(1)	Utility Revenue	\$17,000	\$6,000	\$15,000	\$10,500	\$10,000		\$58,500
Water System Upgrades	1-J(1)	Utility Revenue	\$21,200	\$13,700	\$9,500		\$131,200		\$175,600
Water System Water Main Replacement	1-J(1)	Utility Revenue						\$100,000	\$100,000
EXPENDITURE TOTAL			\$72,150	\$53,650	\$58,450	\$44,450	\$141,200	\$100,000	\$469,900

(1) Due to early retirement of debt Boston Harbor realized a gain of \$400,000. These are projected for capital expenditure for the next six-years

E. Transportation:

Background:

Thurston County's Comprehensive Plan lays the groundwork for the County's Transportation Capital Facilities Program. Transportation policies are set forth in Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan and implemented through the Thurston Regional Transportation Plan and the Thurston County six-year Transportation Plan required by the Washington State Department of Transportation.

Chapter 5 lays out the following priorities for transportation projects:

- Safety
- Concurrency and regional network needs
- Mobility
- Level of service standards
- Multi-modal interstate transportation needs

This section of Thurston County's Capital Facilities Plan describes improvements or additions to transportation facilities such as roads, bridges, sidewalks, bike lanes, and other roadway features that are needed and have been prioritized in relation to the priorities described above. The County's six-year Transportation Plan is a subset of this section of the Capital Facilities Plan.

Safety improvements are those that assure roads conform to current road standards. They provide greater lane width, improve roadway curves, or increase load carrying capacity but typically do not add lanes except as needed for safety at certain intersections. They may provide for separation of pedestrian and bicycle traffic from vehicular traffic. "Spot"-type safety improvements include guardrails, spot roadway alignments, channelization, traffic signal installations or upgrades and railroad crossing signal installations. Safety projects are prioritized based on the amount of traffic at each location, weighted by the number of accidents, with those locations where three or more accidents have occurred during the last three years receiving the highest priority.

Concurrency improvements are those that assure transportation infrastructure is available to meet demand created by new development and that the County is therefore compliant with Growth Management Act requirements. County concurrency projects include those not addressed by developers themselves and primarily consist of projects identified as regional needs in the Thurston Regional Transportation Plan.

Mobility improvements are those that improve the capacity of County roadways to efficiently move traffic. This may include development of new corridors or improvements to existing corridors. For roads, mobility is measured by level of service standards. Level of service is evaluated on a system that grades conditions from A (free flow) to F (gridlock). Each type of road is given a

standard below which the grade should not fall. The following paragraph describes this in more detail.

Level of Service improvements are those that raise the level of service “grade” to meet the standard. The adopted standards, that are the minimum levels of service that are considered acceptable, are:

- Urban Growth Areas (UGAs):
 - Grand Mound Urban Growth Area: LOS D
 - For others, the standards are those adopted in joint plans with the cities. The standards are as follows:
 - Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater:
 - LOS D for highways and arterials
 - LOS E for high-density residential corridors
 - Yelm:
 - LOS C for residential areas
 - LOS D for commercial and light industrial zones
 - Tenino & Rainier:
 - LOS D for arterials (and for major collectors in Rainier)

Exception to UGA LOS standard: Yelm Highway (Henderson to Rich Road) may drop below LOS D in the short-term. The current approach is to not have roads including Yelm Highway widened to more than a 4/5 lane facility.
 - Rural Areas (outside UGA boundaries): LOS C
- Exceptions to Rural Area LOS standard because although they are located in rural areas, they function as links between urban areas and/or between an urban area and a freeway:
- Mud Bay Road (from Urban Growth boundary west to Highway 101) may operate at LOS D
 - Yelm Highway (from UGA boundary at BNRR east to Fair Oaks Rd. SW) may operate at LOS D

Other improvements relate to specific local needs, such as traffic calming devices; gravel road upgrades; bridge projects; culvert replacements.

- **Traffic Calming** (Primarily pavement speed humps) for local access roads are prioritized for a limited annual amount initiated by requests from citizens and selection scoring considering speed, traffic volume, existence of schools, pedestrian generators, transit routes, pedestrian facilities, and driveway spacing.
- **Gravel Road Upgrades** budget amounts will only be considered if citizen petitions are received along with property owners donating

any additional right of way needed for the improvements including widening to a two lane paved roadway.

- **Asphalt Overlays (Maintenance/Protection or Preservation)** are selected by using the Lowest Life Cycle (LLC) computer program approach using an inventory of visual distress/cracking of the pavement condition and traffic volumes. Asphalt overlays are considered an upgrade to the load carrying capacity of the roadway versus a routine maintenance of patching or liquid asphalt sealing of the pavement surface.
- **Bridge** projects are typically selected by using the State of Washington Inventory of Bridges and Structures (SWIBS) database. This database analyzes the structural adequacy and safety of the bridge, its serviceability and functional obsolescence, and how essential it is for public use. The State Bridge Committee selects bridges based on the SWIB Criteria for available federal funding.
- **Culvert replacements** that are fish passage barriers or worn out culvert materials are ranked in their order of benefits to salmonids using the Salmon and Steelhead Enhancement and Restoration (SSHEAR) metrology developed by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW).

The County's funding is quite limited, and projects are therefore further prioritized based on whether or not grant funding is available.

Current Condition and Capacity of Inventory:

The County keeps the following inventories to help determine the transportation condition/capacity:

1. Capacity Statement
2. Roadway Upgrade Review Table (listing of traffic volumes, roadway widths, accident rates, and pavement condition)
3. Locations where three or more accidents have occurred during the last three years.
4. Bridge Index-Summary of Bridge Conditions
5. Pavement Management Program (pavement condition survey)
6. Thurston County Barrier Culvert Inventory (fish passage)

A summary of the current condition and capacity of the County's transportation system is as follows:

- All of the priority group inventories have many needed projects either not in the Capital Facilities Plan or listed in the Capital Facilities Plan but unfunded because no grant funds have yet been identified.

- Unmet capacity projects include roadways around the new Cabela's store and adjacent planned urban center and capacity projects needed in the Grand Mound UGA. The list of potential capacity projects is growing.
- Safety/Design Standard Upgrades of roads in rural and urban areas are not keeping up with the needs reflected by increased traffic.
- Safety issues are reflective of the need for Design Standard Upgrades. Many of the County's roads are narrow and crooked serving higher and faster traffic than the original farm to market construction.
- Many bridges with load carrying issues have been improved, but there are many remaining narrow bridges not serving our higher traffic volumes or our bike and pedestrian modes of travel. To allow for fish passage, replacing culverts typically results in a more expensive larger culvert or a bridge.

How Projects will be Financed:

The list of transportation projects identified in the Capital Facilities Plan Appendix and summarized in this section of the Plan identifies which funds are committed in each case. Given the present level of available funding, not all projects that make the Capital Facilities Project List are funded. The projects listed in the program provide other agencies with a clear indication of what the county would accomplish if additional funding were obtained. This way, if an unexpected source of funding for a particular project becomes available, that project could be moved forward in the programming process with only minor revisions to the work program. Grants are typically needed in order to enable the very limited road funds to complete as many projects as possible. Grants are becoming harder to obtain and/or paying for smaller percentages of the project.

The primary sources of funding for the Capital Facilities Transportation plan include:

- **30% County Portion of Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax (Gas Tax)** All Counties within the state receive their proportionate share of the state gas tax based on population, road miles and other factors.
- **Second Quarter Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)** is proportioned to different county capital facilities. The second quarter Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) is collected at the rate of one-quarter of one-percent of the selling price of real estate property in unincorporated Thurston County.
- **Developer Mitigation Fees** are charges on new developments to pay for impacts they create. These are negotiated for each

development based on State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) reviews.

- **Federal Funding Programs** through competition for limited funding at certain requested application times is available for specific programs.
- **State Funding Programs** through competition for limited funding at certain requested application times is available for specific programs.

Summary of Major Changes from Previous Capital Facilities Program:

Projects anticipated to be completed in 2010 have been removed from the 2011-2016 Capital Facilities Program. However, minor remaining funding allocations may be listed (such projects include Littlerock Road/93rd Ave Intersection Safety, Vail Road Upgrade, Old Hwy 99 from McCorkle to Rich Road Safety, and Hwy Safety-Rumble Strip & Guidepost Safety, .

Road upgrade projects were added to pursue state funding on Sargent, Bald Hills, Maytown and McCorkle roads. A curve safety improvement is proposed on Libby Road. .

OBJECTIVE 1-K: Coordinate with Budget and Related Documents – The County’s capital budget and six-year transportation program will be consistent with the Capital Facilities Plan.

POLICIES:

1. Thurston County’s annual capital budget and six year transportation program required under RCW 36.81.121 will be fully consistent with the intent and substance of this Capital Facilities Plan and the Transportation Chapter of this Comprehensive Plan.
2. The year in which a project is carried out, or the exact amounts of expenditures by year for individual facilities may vary from that stated in the Comprehensive Plan due to:
 - a. Unanticipated revenues or revenues that become available to the county with conditions about when they may be used, or
 - b. Change in the timing of a facility to serve new development that occurs in an earlier or later year than had been anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan.
3. Specific debt financing proposals may vary from that shown in the Comprehensive Plan due to changes in interest rates, other terms of financing, or other conditions which make the proposals in the plan not advantageous financially.

4. The addition of an entirely new facility, not anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan, will require formal amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
5. The transportation projects in the Capital Facilities Plan and Transportation Chapter of this Comprehensive Plan will be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Table 6-8
THURSTON COUNTY
PUBLIC WORKS CAPITAL PROJECTS
2011-2016
Numbers in the Thousands of dollars

PROPOSED REVENUE FOR PROJECTS	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR TOTAL
FUND SOURCE							
GRANTS	1,982.39	705.17	782.34	882.00	2,099.46	2,629.82	9,081.17
ROAD FUND AMOUNT FOR PROJECTS	9,515.45	3,384.79	3,755.23	4,233.60	10,077.41	12,623.11	43,589.59
OTHER (DEVELOPER, OTHER AGENCY, REET OR BOND)	1,718.07	611.14	678.03	764.40	1,819.53	2,279.17	7,870.34
TOTALS	100%	\$13,215.90	\$4,701.10	\$5,215.60	\$5,880.00	\$13,996.40	\$17,532.10
							\$60,541.10

DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR. TOTAL
From Road Fund on 10 Yr. Proceeds					\$743.00	\$743.00	\$1,486.00

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS	Fund Source	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR. TOTAL
PROJECT NAME & DESCRIPTION								

CITY OF OLYMPIA GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
CAPACITY								
Yelm Hwy Capacity Project Henderson to Rich	GC/L/O/REET	5,453.30	357.00					5,810.30
Chehalis Western Trail Bridging the Gap PH 3- Pacific Ave Crossing	GC/O	2,270.00	500.00					2,770.00
SAFETY								
OTHER								
Ellis Creek Fish Passage	GN/L/O/REET						1,000.00	1,000.00
CITY OF OLYMPIA GROWTH AREA TOTALS		\$7,723.30	\$857.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00	\$9,580.30

CITY OF LACEY GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
CAPACITY								
Carpenter Rd Capacity Project Widen to 4 Lanes Pacific Ave to Martin Way - Except City	GN/O/L/REET	100.00	1,400.00					1,500.00
DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS								
15th Ave/Draham NE Upgrade Sleater-Kinney to Carpenter Rd	GN/L/O				30.00	150.00	150.00	330.00
SAFETY								
BRIDGES								
Yelm Hwy Bridge O-12 Replacement at Burlington Northern RR Crossing	GN/L/O/REET				197.00	20.00	1,500.00	1,717.00
CITY OF LACEY GROWTH AREA TOTALS		\$100.00	\$1,400.00	\$0.00	\$227.00	\$170.00	\$1,650.00	\$3,547.00

CITY OF TUMWATER & GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS								
Henderson Blvd Upgrade Old Hwy 99 to Tumwater Blvd	GN/L/O/REET					63.00	100.00	163.00
Black Lake-Belmore Rd Upgrade 49th to Sapp Rd	GN/L/O						30.00	30.00

CITY OF TUMWATER GROWTH AREA Cont...	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
SAFETY								
93rd/Lathrop Industrial Drive Intersection Channelization	GC/L/O	495.00						495.00
Henderson/Tumwater Boulevard Intersection Signalization	GN/L			100.00				100.00
BRIDGES								
Henderson Blvd Bridge H-2 Widening at the Deschutes River	GN/L/O/REET				74.00	10.00	1,500.00	1,584.00
CITY OF TUMWATER GROWTH AREA TOTALS		\$495.00	\$0.00	\$100.00	\$74.00	\$73.00	\$1,630.00	\$2,372.00

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS	Fund Source	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR. TOTAL
PROJECT NAME & DESCRIPTION								

GRAND MOUND GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
CAPACITY								
Old Hwy 99 Upgrade 201st St to SR 12	L/O/GN				100.00	130.00	2,420.00	2,650.00
Old Hwy 99 Upgrade 203rd to 201st St	L/O/GN				150.00	554.40	1,260.60	1,965.00
Elderberry Rd Upgrade SR 12 to 196th Ave	L/O/GN				60.00	102.00	557.00	719.00
Old Hwy 99 Upgrade Great Wolf S. Boundary to 203rd	L/O/GN/REET				379.00	1,200.00	2,755.00	4,334.00
Old Hwy 99 Turn Lane S. UGA To Great Wolf S. Boundary	L/O/REET/GN					50.00	450.00	500.00
Old Hwy 99 Upgrade S. UGA To Great Wolf S. Boundary	L/O/GN/REET				200.00	400.00	1,868.00	2,468.00
Old Hwy 99 SW Bridge O-6 Replacement at Prairie Creek & Old Hwy 99 Turn Lane N. of Great Wolf	GC/L/O/REET	20.00						20.00
SR12/Sargent Rd Intersection Channelization	GN/L/O/REET			150.00	100.00	1,187.00		1,437.00
SR12/New Road at Urban Growth Boundary Intersection Signalization	GN/L/O/REET				800.00		2,120.00	2,920.00
SR12/Old Hwy 99 Intersection Modifications	GN/L/O/REET					50.00	450.00	500.00
GRAND MOUND GROWTH AREA TOTALS		\$20.00	\$0.00	\$150.00	\$1,789.00	\$3,673.40	\$11,880.60	\$17,513.00

CITY OF YELM GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS								
Wilkenson Rd Upgrade Yelm City Limits to Ordway Rd	GC/L/O	12.30	345.70					358.00
CITY OF YELM GROWTH AREA TOTALS		\$12.30	\$345.70	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$358.00

RURAL THURSTON COUNTY	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS								
Vail Road Upgrade 138th to Bald Hill Rd	GC/L/O/REET	3,000.00						3,000.00
Vail Road Upgrade 138th to 153rd	GN/L/O						5.00	5.00
Delphi Road Upgrade 32nd to 62nd	GN/L/O/REET	200.00	308.00	200.00	2,626.00			3,334.00
Rich Rd Upgrade Deschutes River to 89th	GC/L/O	305.00	100.00	3,520.00				3,925.00
Delphi Road Upgrade McLane Creek to SR 101	GN/L/O	200.00	906.00					1,106.00
SAFETY								
Old Hwy 99/Tilley Rd Intersection Channelization Improvements	GN/L/O					40.00	314.50	354.50
Reservation Road/SR510/Yelm Hwy Intersections	G/N/L/O	10.00					10.00	20.00
Highway Safety - Rumble Strip & Guidepost	GL	20.00						20.00
High Risk Rural Road - Low \$ Run-Off-Road	GL	30.00						30.00
Yelm Hwy/Meridian Intersection Channelization Improvements	GN/L/O						45.00	45.00

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS	Fund Source	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 YR. TOTAL
PROJECT NAME & DESCRIPTION								
RURAL THURSTON COUNTY Cont...	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
Johnson Pt Rd Turn Lane at Hawks Prairie Rd	GN/L/O/REET					20.00	360.00	380.00
Littlerock Rd/113th Ave Intersection Improvements	GN/L/O/REET			10.00	165.00			175.00
Mullen Rd Upgrade Vicinity of 46th Ave SE	GN/L						10.00	10.00
Old Hwy 99/McCorkle Rd to Rich Rd	GC/L/O	100.00						100.00
Littlerock Rd/93rd Ave Intersection Channelization	GC/L/O	10.00						10.00
Meridian Rd/Mullen Rd Intersection Grade Change	GC/L/O	223.20						223.20
Sargent Rd Upgrade 183rd Ave SW to Littlerock Rd	GN/L/O		100.00	85.00	60.00	2,050.00		2,295.00
Bald Hill Rd Upgrade Smith Prairie to Longmire Rd SE	GN/L/O		100.00	180.00	150.00	3,100.00		3,530.00
Maytown Rd Upgrade SW Littlerock Rd to I-5	GN/L/O		100.00	152.00	60.00	2,800.00		3,112.00
Noschka Culvert	GC/L/O	292.00						292.00
McCorkle Rd SE 113th Ave to Old Hwy 99	GN/L/O		70.00	60.00	60.00	1,400.00		1,590.00
BRIDGES								
Old Hwy 99 Bridge O-7 Replacement at Scatter Creek	GN/L/O						57.00	57.00
Hawks Prairie Rd Bridge H-1 Widening at Woodland Creek	GN/L/O						275.00	275.00
Littlerock Rd Bridge L-5 Replacement at Bloom's Ditch	GN/L/O/REET			10.00	400.00	400.00		810.00
OTHER								
Independence River Protection N.	GC/L/O	10.00						10.00
Tilley Road Curve - Culvert *	GN/L/O	35.30	105.60					140.90
Munson Road - Swift Cr.-Culvert *	GN/L/O						10.00	10.00
Cedar Flats Road - Swift Cr.-Culvert *	GN/L/O						10.00	10.00
Piessner - Fish Passage Culverts	GN/L/O						5.00	5.00
Boston Harbor Rd NE N. of Woodard Bay Road - Fish Passage Culvert	GN/L/O	40.00		400.00				440.00
Waddell Creek Rd (Pants Creek) Fish Passage *	GN/L/O	39.80	39.80	79.60				159.20
Misc. Fish Passage Culverts	GN/L/O		100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	500.00
Traffic Safety and Enhancement	GN	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	600.00
Working Reserves (to cover projects where grants are not received or come in lower than anticipated, emergencies, and unanticipated safety upgrades)	GNL	250.00	69.00	69.00	69.00	70.00	70.00	597.00
RURAL THURSTON COUNTY TOTALS		\$4,865.30	\$2,098.40	\$4,965.60	\$3,790.00	\$10,080.00	\$1,371.50	\$27,170.80
TOTALS	100%	\$13,215.90	\$4,701.10	\$5,215.60	\$5,880.00	\$13,996.40	\$17,532.10	\$60,541.10

LEGEND:

- GC - State or Federal GRANTS have been COMMITTED
- GN - State or Federal GRANTS have NOT been COMMITTED
- L - County road fund LOCAL match
- O - OTHER developer or agency contributions
- B - Proposed county BOND
- REET - Real Estate Excise Tax

* JOINT PROJECT WITH STORMWATER UTILITY

REGARDING GRANT FUNDING FOR NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS: Not all grant funding for NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS during the first two years has been secured. These non-capacity projects that do not receive their grant funding during the first two-year period may have to be moved to a later year when local or grant funding becomes available.

REGARDING THE GRAND MOUND URBAN GROWTH AREA: The Transportation Element of the Capital Facilities Plan reflects the capital projects and funding strategies found in the 1997 Amended Grand Mound Subarea Plan.

REGARDING EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROJECTS: Due to past weather related and other unforeseen conditions (such as landslide repairs), emergency response projects have been part of the normal expectations.

F. County Buildings:

The previous chapters of the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan do not offer a great deal of guidance for development of County general government facilities. The population forecast suggests that additional services will be needed; but these do not translate directly into proportionate increases in general government staff or facility needs.

Several years ago, the County contracted with a consultant firm to provide a space analysis and courthouse campus master plan. That study confirmed that County government has outgrown the space available in the county buildings within the Courthouse campus. The study did establish space needs in terms of program and square footage for a ten-year horizon. The recent economic recession resulted in a reduction of both staff and service levels somewhat relieving the immediate space needs. The County continues to evaluate owned facilities as an alternative to leased space.

Planning and design of a new jail facility was conducted over the last few years, resulting in construction of the Accountability and Restitution Center completed in late 2010. The original jail population estimates have yet to be realized and initial operating cost estimates are prohibiting the immediate opening and use of the facility. County administration is in the process of evaluating alternative uses of this new space.

Planning and design of a new Public Works and Emergency Operations Center located on Tilley Rd is underway. Field staff is currently located at the proposed site and administrative and engineering staff leases a facility near the courthouse campus. Co-locating these functions will improve the efficiency of operations as well as allow the county to build equity in owned facilities.

Facilities that are in good condition and expected to last for more than a decade include the Juvenile Detention/Family & Juvenile Court building (opened in 1998), the Emergency Services Center (opened in 1998), the Public Health and Social Services building (opened in 2001), the Coroner building (opened in 2003), the Evaluation and Treatment (Triage) Center (opened in 2005), and the McLane Facility purchased in 2007. Major maintenance needs for these facilities are planned and funded through annual reserves set aside within a 20-year horizon.

Facilities for which additional planning is currently needed include the records storage replacement, for which the needs are changing as a result of digitizing records; Facilities maintenance supplies and workshops. The remaining County owned facilities have a 20 year major maintenance plan established and funding for these needs began in 2010.

The six-year plan contained in this Chapter includes the County building related projects scheduled at present (identified in Table 6-9). Immediate needs are being addressed by leasing and remodeling.

COUNTY BUILDINGS OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES: OBJECTIVE 1-L:

County Buildings - County government buildings should be located to provide convenient access to residents being served, where appropriate public facilities

and services are available or can be provided, and designed for efficient and frugal use of public monies.

POLICIES:

1. Standards for level of service must be realistic, attainable, and not excessive.
2. Level of Service standards for County Buildings should be based on:
 - a. Consideration of national, state and professional standards for the applicable space.
 - b. Applicable federal and state laws.
 - c. Cost effectiveness and consideration of the ability of the county to fund ongoing costs of operations and maintenance.
3. Efficiency in design and use should be a goal for new facility development. Building design and function must promote flexibility to accommodate a variety of uses and interior spatial changes. New facilities should be built for a 50-year life span.
4. Options to construction of new space should include such considerations as innovative use of alternative hours, telecommuting, night court, kiosks, distributed service locations, automation efficiencies, workload distribution, work at home opportunities, and drive-through service points.
5. Public-private partnerships should be examined for their potential to offset costs and improve efficiency.
6. A Capital Reserve fund should be established to provide funding for major maintenance projects.
7. Evaluation of capital costs and maintenance and operation costs should give priority to long-term energy efficiencies achieved through design and construction.
8. Charges for space in county buildings should recover full costs, including capital expenses, amortization, depreciation, and maintenance and operation cost.

**Table 6-9
THURSTON COUNTY BUILDINGS CAPITAL PROJECTS
2011-2016**

j/cfp.bldg02-07.xls

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2001-2016
<i>Fund Source</i>								6 Yr. Total
Central Services Fund Balance		100,000	120,000					220,000
Central Services Rates/Building Reserves		1,098,941	1,098,941	1,098,941	936,305	936,305	919,305	6,088,738
Future Bond (1)		8,852,536	8,361,791	4,570,000	3,505,344	1,976,450		27,266,121
REET/ General Fund		3,047,523	2,497,548	1,501,059	1,588,351	1,187,245	863,760	10,685,486
Roads and Transportation Services		1,000,000	2,000,000				216,935	3,216,935
TOTALS		14,099,000	14,078,280	7,170,000	6,030,000	4,100,000	2,000,000	47,477,280

EXPENDITURES--PROJECTS	Funding Source	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2009-2014
								6Yr. Total
ARC Phase II	DFB, RFB	1,500,000						1,500,000
Juvenile Detention and Family Court Bldg (Fire and CCTV Projects)	DFB, RFB	450,000						450,000
3400 Building Master Plan	GF,R,RFB	1,000,000	2,000,000					3,000,000
County Master Plan	RFB					500,000		500,000
Purchase Additional Campus Buildings	RFB	2,500,000	1,000,000					3,500,000
Sheriff Training Facility	GF,RFB,DFB	500,000	150,000	2,350,000				3,000,000
Special Projects (Major Maintenance/Repairs)	R, GF, CSPR	1,000,000	1,030,000	2,500,000	3,500,000	3,600,000	2,000,000	13,630,000
Building #5 Tenant Improvements	CSPR	300,000						300,000
Courthouse Security Projects	CSFB	100,000	120,000					220,000
High Speed Communication Link	GF,RT	250,000	300,000	100,000				650,000
HVAC Renovation/EECBG Projects- Buildings 1, 2, and 3	G, CS, CSPR	680,000	2,960,000	2,220,000	2,530,000			8,390,000
Mansard Roof Replacement	R, RFB	265,000	450,000					715,000
Tilley Master Plan Public Works and EOC buildings	RTB, RT,CS	7,000,000	5,950,280					12,950,280
Emergency Power Projects	GF	54,000	118,000					172,000
TOTALS		14,099,000	14,078,280	7,170,000	6,030,000	4,100,000	2,000,000	47,477,280

DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	6 Yr Total
Current Debt		3,885,403	3,882,037	3,893,349	3,893,930	3,799,863	3,799,041	23,153,622
Future Debt		4,684,082	5,000,964	5,040,800	5,136,829	5,136,829	5,136,829	30,136,332
TOTALS		8,569,485	8,883,000	8,934,148	9,030,759	8,936,692	8,935,870	53,289,954

LEGEND:

B Bonds (See Note #1)

CSB Central Service Future Bond

CS Central Service Internal Services Rates

CSFB Central Service Internal Services Fund Balance

DFB Detention Sales Tax Future Bond (nonvoter GO bond to be financed from Sales Tax).

CSPR Central Services Property Reserve Fund

GF General Fund

R Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)

RFB REET Future Bond (nonvoter GO bond to be financed from REET)

RT Roads and Transportation Services

RTB Roads and Transportation Services Future Bonds

G Grant

NOTE:

(1) These are bonds paid for by outside revenue sources, either voter approved from the property tax, or councilmanic paid from revenue sources such as Detention Sales Tax, REET or other sources.

G. Conservation Futures Program:

Conservation Futures is a land preservation program that protects, preserves, maintains, improves, restores, and limits the future use of threatened areas of open space, timberlands, wetlands, habitat areas, culturally significant sites, and agricultural farmlands within Thurston County. Conservation Futures funds, acquired through a property tax levy, are used to purchase the land or the rights to future development of the land.

The Washington State Legislature first granted the authority for a Conservation Futures tax levy in 1971 when RCW 84.34 was enacted and later amended in 1988. RCW 84.34.200 declares that the acquisition of interests or rights in real property for the preservation of open spaces and areas constitutes a public purpose for which public funds may properly be expended or advanced. RCW 84.34.230 declares the county may levy an amount not to exceed 6.25-cents per \$1,000 of assessed value of all taxable property within the county for the Conservation Futures Program.

The Legislature found that Conservation Futures are a useful tool for counties to preserve land of public interest for future generations and are encouraged to use some conservation futures as one tool for salmon preservation purposes. They also declare that up to fifteen percent of the Conservation Futures fund may be used for the maintenance and operation of any property acquired with conservation futures funds.

In 1989, Thurston County became the first county in the state to implement the tax levy and has been collecting it ever since. All property taxpayers pay up to 6.25-cents per \$1,000 of assessed value on each parcel. The funding, identified in the budget as Conservation Futures, is budgeted annually by the Thurston County Board of County Commissioners.

Project selection process:

Each year the Board of County Commissioners will have the opportunity to direct the Conservation Futures Program toward important types of property investments for protection.

The project selection process will include expertise as needed to help rank projects based on the following criteria:

1. How well does the acquisition of the property fit with the objective of the applicable plan(s)?
2. Is time of the essence for acquisition?
3. Does the property preserve?
 - A. Unique or critical habitat.

- B. Unique natural features and or natural resources.
 - C. Historic or culturally significant lands or markers.
 - D. Critical and/or sensitive lands.
 - E. Desirable agricultural and/or forest working-lands characteristics.
4. What is the certainty of project success?
 5. What is the amount of other financial contributions toward the project purchase?
 6. Does the project proposal address public access?
 7. How many partners and project supporters are there?
 8. How well does the project meet the program Goals and Objectives.

Conservation Futures Projects:

Acquisition of property is considered a capital project and needs to be included in the County’s Capital Facilities Plan, which is a six-year financial plan. Table 6-10 includes acquisition of properties proposed over the next six-years. Site-specific property acquisitions will be listed whenever possible. Identifying site-specific properties is complicated due to the sensitive nature of land-purchase negotiations, and the need to proceed when the opportunity to purchase arises. Since property acquisitions need to be identified in the Capital Facilities Plan, a placeholder will be used, unless there is a specific project being proposed.

Conservation Futures Program Goal and Policies:

GOAL: Thurston County’s Conservation Futures Program will conserve the most important rural lands, regional parklands, areas of cultural significance, preserve and protect water quality and important habitats in perpetuity.

POLICIES:

1. Thurston County’s Conservation Futures Program will seek to create contiguous blocks of land to protect and preserve rural lands, regional parklands, areas of cultural significance and prevent the fragmentation of quality habitat.
2. The Conservation Futures Program will seek to maximize leverage and partnership opportunities.
3. The Conservation Futures Program will be responsive to opportunities.

4. Conservation Futures Program funded projects will be prioritized based upon the Board of County Commissioners' goals and rankings by the Conservation Futures Ranking Committee.
5. Conservation Futures Program funded projects will support the preservation and conservation of those lands with greatest ecological value especially if they are under imminent threat.
6. Conservation futures funded projects will seek to ensure that multiple plans, goals and objectives are satisfied
- 7.

Table 6-10

Conservation Futures Financial Plan 2007-2016, Fund #1380

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total Budget
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Budget	Projection	Projection	Projection	Projection	Projection	Projection	2007-2016
Revenue											
Beginning Fund Balance, January 1	3,921,672	1,942,786	2,901,522	3,217,742	3,960,876	1,680,070	1,604,245	1,538,472	1,483,053	1,442,241	
Property Taxes	989,436	1,044,068	1,082,315	1,389,656	1,155,259	1,166,812	1,178,480	1,190,265	1,202,167	1,214,189	11,612,646
Timber Harvest Tax -312100	9,120	8,141	5,978	7,000	7,000	7,500	8,000	8,500	9,000	9,500	79,739
State Forest Board Land/Forest Board Tax - 33502B	11,893	6,305	2,528	4,000	6,000	6,500	7,000	7,500	8,000	8,500	68,226
State Forest Board Timber sales	10,549	6,024	12,908	8,000	8,000	8,500	9,000	9,500	10,000	10,500	92,980
Interest income (1.25%)	138,909	102,881	90,643	77,885	62,375	20,118	18,993	18,309	17,805	17,401	569,775
Leasehold Excise tax	1,897	1,470	2,536	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	16,403
Total Revenue	5,083,477	3,111,675	4,098,430	4,705,783	5,201,010	2,890,999	2,827,218	2,774,046	2,731,526	2,703,832	12,435,003
Expenditure											
Debt Service											
Purchase of Development Rights #2180 (paid off in '07)	252,725	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	252,725
Cooper Point/Athletic Fields #2230 (pay off 2025)	58,196	55,213	59,071	59,508	59,314	59,130	58,830	58,430	54,030	56,330	578,052
Total Debt Service	310,921	55,213	59,071	59,508	59,314	59,130	58,830	58,430	54,030	56,330	830,777
Programs/Projects											
Prof. Services/appraisal & title (Capital Contingency)	400,000	0	0	0	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	900,000
O/T Parks M&O for Conservation Future Projects	276,014	149,608	83,487	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509,109
O/T Public Works M&O for Conservation Future Projects	0	0	40,614	166,347	208,448	173,289	175,022	176,772	178,540	180,325	1,299,357
Arbitrage Compliance	0	0	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
Indirect Costs	7,161	5,332	8,318	19,052	28,178	29,023	29,894	30,791	31,715	32,666	222,130
Total Programs/Projects	683,175	154,940	132,529	185,399	736,626	202,312	204,916	207,563	210,254	212,991	2,930,705
Capital											
Commissioners Challenge Projects	0	0	0	0	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	150,000
Land Acquisitions - Placeholder	2,146,595	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,146,595
City of Lacey - Woodland Creek Corridor	0	0	0	200,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	200,000
Tilley Road Wetlands Project (CLT) - 2 parcels	0	0	620,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	620,000
Black River Ranch (CLT) - Mima Creek	0	0	9,088	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,088
Tatrimima Trust (NLT)	0	0	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60,000
Gull Harbor Conservation - Habitat Restoration	0	0	0	300,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	300,000
Gate-Belmore Trail - 12 Miles	0	0	0	0	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	500,000
Joint County/Lacey Property Acquisition	0	0	0	0	200,000	0	0	0	0	0	200,000
Parks & Open Space Acquisition of Property	0	0	0	0	2,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	7,000,000
Total Capital	2,146,595	0	689,088	500,000	2,725,000	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000	11,185,683
Total Expenditures	3,140,691	210,153	880,687	744,907	3,520,940	1,286,442	1,288,746	1,290,993	1,289,284	1,294,321	14,947,165
Projected Fund Balance	1,942,786	2,901,522	3,217,742	3,960,876	1,680,070	1,604,245	1,538,472	1,483,053	1,442,241	1,409,510	-2,512,161

- NOTES:
- A. Conservation Futures tax began in 1990. Calculated at 6.25 cents per \$1,000 of assessed value. The tax was established to provide funding for parks and open space acquisitions. RCW 84.34.230
 - B. Department of Revenue change the interpretation that now treats the conservation futures as a regular levies subject to the limit factor limitation.
 - C. Parks M & O is 15% of prior year Property Taxes. Can only be used on property acquired with Conservation Futures.
 - D. Cannot be used for development.
 - E. Project needs to be in the CFP.

VI. Financing the County CFP

It is required that the CFP describe how each of the proposed capital projects will be financed. The funding sources for each of the capital projects listed in the tables above are included with the projects. These include a variety of taxes, bonds, fees and charges, loans and grants. Some are specific to the program for which the improvements are proposed; others are general sources of revenue from which allocations are proposed to cover the cost of specific projects.

Each of the enterprise funds referenced in this plan maintains a financial plan for its expenditures (e.g., Solid Waste, Utilities, and Transportation). In addition, there are financial plans maintained for dedicated funds, such as the Real Estate Excise Tax (1st and 2nd quarter) and the capital reserve fund set aside from the County's General Fund.

The effects of these funding proposals are summarized in Tables 6-11, 6-12 and 6-13, below.

SUMMARY OF SIX-YEAR FINANCING PLAN Table 6-11

SUMMARY OF 2011 – 2016 CAPITAL COSTS (From Tables 6 - 4 through 6 - 9)

Project Category	2011 – 2016 Expenditure Total
CAPITAL	
Parks and Open Space	\$ 23,143,000
Solid Waste	\$ 15,235,000
Stormwater	\$ 9,184,000
Water and Sewer	\$ 15,295,100
Roads, Bridges and Bike Lanes	\$ 60,541,100
County Buildings	\$ 47,477,280
Capital Total	\$ 170,875,480
DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS	
Parks and Trails	\$ 4,160,320
Solid Waste	0
Stormwater	0
Water and Sewer	\$ 5,784,159
Roads, Bridges and Bike Lanes	\$ 1,486,000
County Buildings	\$ 53,289,954
Conservation Futures	\$346,064
Debt Service Total	\$ 65,066,497

Table 6-12
SUMMARY SIX YEAR FINANCING PLAN
2011 - 2016

Revenue Sources	Six Year Totals						Totals by Revenue Source
	Parks and Open Space	Solid Waste	Stormwater	Water and Sewer	Roads	Buildings	
Existing Revenues - Earmarked (May be used only for specific types of facilities)							
Property Tax - Cons. Futures (Cash)	\$7,700,000						\$7,700,000
Forest revenues (&reserves) to Rd. Fund for Capital					\$43,589,590		\$43,589,590
Utility Fees/Rates - w/o increases		\$13,435,000	\$5,057,000	\$1,807,600			\$20,299,600
Committed Developer & other Jurisdiction Financing							\$0
Sewer - Water Fees & Assessments							\$0
Utility Loans - to be repaid from existing fees				\$6,387,500			\$6,387,500
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from existing committed revenue sources							\$0
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from existing, general use revenue sources							\$0
Earmarked Carryover Funds (or cap. reserves)	\$90,000	\$1,500,000	\$47,000			\$6,308,738	\$7,945,738
Internal Department transfers from non-capital programs						\$3,216,935	\$3,216,935
SUBTOTAL	\$7,790,000	\$14,935,000	\$5,104,000	\$8,195,100	\$43,589,590	\$9,525,673	\$89,139,363
Existing Revenues - General Use (May be used for more than one type of facility)							
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) / General Fund (cash)	\$2,203,000			\$6,050,000	\$7,870,340	\$10,685,486	\$26,808,826
REET. Gen. Fund, or owner assess. (to be determined)							\$0
SUBTOTAL	\$2,203,000	\$0	\$0	\$6,050,000	\$7,870,340	\$10,685,486	\$26,808,826
Proposed New Revenues or Increased Rates							
GRANTS	\$4,525,000		\$4,080,000	\$1,050,000	\$9,081,170		\$18,736,170
Emergency - FEMA, Applicable Co. Reserves, etc.							\$0
Utility Rates - portion from increased (or new) rates/assess.							\$0
Utility Loans - to be repaid from increase rates							\$0
Trail Permit Fees	\$140,000						\$140,000
Other	\$1,200,000	\$300,000					\$1,500,000
Not Committed Developer & other Jurisdiction Financing							\$0
Voter approved bond proceeds - repaid from property tax							\$0
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from new, not yet committed revenue sources.	\$7,285,000					\$27,266,121	\$34,551,121
SUBTOTAL	\$13,150,000	\$300,000	\$4,080,000	\$1,050,000	\$9,081,170	\$27,266,121	\$54,927,291
REVENUE TOTALS	\$23,143,000	\$15,235,000	\$9,184,000	\$15,295,100	\$60,541,100	\$47,477,280	\$170,875,480

EFFECT ON LOCAL TAXES AND FEES:

Table 6-13
Effect on Local Taxes and Fees

FACILITY	CURRENT FEE/TAX USED FOR THE FACILITY	PROPOSED CHANGE IN FEE/TAX FOR THE FACILITY IN THIS PLAN
County Buildings	<p>REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX must be spent for Capital Projects specified in the Capital Facilities Plan. This is a tax of ½ of 1% paid by sellers upon the sale of real property in the unincorporated county.</p> <p>SALES TAX - 1/10 of a cent. The voters approved this tax in September 1995 for construction, maintenance and operation of juvenile detention facilities and adult jails.</p>	<p>No change in the real estate excise tax.</p> <p>No change in the Sales tax.</p>
County Parks	<p>REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX for some current park development and major maintenance costs.</p> <p>CONSERVATION FUTURES PROPERTY TAX LEVY for some current park land and open space acquisition costs. This is a county-wide property tax. The current rate is \$0.036.</p>	<p>No change in either the REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX or the CONSERVATION FUTURES property tax levy.</p>
Roads Construction (and Major Maintenance and Repair)	FOREST REVENUES	<p>NOTE: Revenues the county receives from the property tax road levy are used for road maintenance, not construction. Grants, forest revenues and a portion of the gas tax that are deposited in the Road Fund are the primary funding sources for road construction.</p>

FACILITY	CURRENT FEE/TAX USED FOR THE FACILITY	PROPOSED CHANGE IN FEE/TAX FOR THE FACILITY IN THIS PLAN
Water Facilities	Water utility rates and charges for each respective utility.	<p>Annual changes in the Water utility rates and charges are expected, as established by Thurston County Code 15.12.</p> <p>If authorized by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC), Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) may be used to fund efforts associated with new capital facilities or portions thereof, when necessary.</p> <p>Upon vote approval and/or BOCC action, Utility Local Improvement District (ULID) assessments may be established to fund capital facilities or portions thereof, when necessary.</p>
Sewer Facilities	Sewer utility rates and charges for each respective utility.	<p>No changes in the Sewer utility rates and charges are expected, as established by Thurston Code 15.12.</p> <p>If authorized by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC), Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) may be used to fund efforts associated with new capital facilities or portions thereof, when necessary.</p> <p>Upon voter approval and/or BOCC action, Utility Local Improvement District (ULID) assessments may be established to fund capital facilities or portions thereof, when necessary.</p>
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling Facilities	TIPPING FEES (landfill disposal fee): \$110.00 per ton. <i>(This fee took effect 1/1/10).</i>	Tipping Fee increase is reviewed every 4 years to cover a 20-year period (to 2030). In 2010 the Board of County Commissioners elected to implement rate increases on an annual basis. Next projected increase – 2012 --to an estimated rate of \$118.00 per ton for all types of garbage.

FACILITY	CURRENT FEE/TAX USED FOR THE FACILITY	PROPOSED CHANGE IN FEE/TAX FOR THE FACILITY IN THIS PLAN
Stormwater	<p>STORMWATER AND SURFACE UTILITY RATES AND CHARGES</p> <p>Average Rural Residential rate = \$36/yr. Average Urban Rate = \$51/yr.</p> <p>Note: There are exemptions and reductions available for senior citizens, residents of lake management and drainage districts, wetlands, tidelands, lands underwater, and lands enrolled under the “Open Space” designation, plus other rates for multifamily residential, commercial, public roads, and agricultural and vacant property.</p>	<p>No change in the Storm and Surface Water Utility Rates and Charges as established by Thurston County Code 15.06. Rates adjusted beginning in 2008.</p>
Conservation Futures Program	<p>Conservation Futures property tax levy for some parks, open space, salmon habitat, and agricultural lands.</p>	<p>No changes in the Conservation Futures property tax levy.</p>

VII. Summary of 2011-2031 Project Projections

As noted in the introduction to this Plan, the emphasis here is on a six-year forecast of capital needs, costs and revenues. However, this is in the context of a broad summary of anticipated 20-year project needs. This summary is presented in Table 6-13, below.

Table 6-14
2011 - 2031 Twenty-year Generalized Project Projections

Program	Project Categories	Estimated 20-Year Costs
Parks and Recreation	Development	\$52,000,000
	Major Improvements	\$4,000,000
	Acquisition	\$18,000,000
	Master Planning	\$180,000
Parks Subtotal		\$74,180,000
Solid Waste	Land Acquisition	\$5,000,000
	Capital Planning	\$1,500,000
	Construction	\$60,000,000
Solid Waste Subtotal		\$66,500,000
Stormwater	Land Acquisition	\$2,900,000
	Capital Planning	\$3,500,000
	Construction	\$44,000,000
Stormwater Subtotal		\$50,400,000
Water and Sewer	Water Rights Acquisition	\$5,000,000
	Capital Planning	\$500,000
	Construction	\$33,000,000
Water and Sewer Subtotal		\$38,500,000
Transportation	Capacity	\$132,500,000
	Design Improvements	\$52,200,000
	Safety	\$11,600,000
	Bridges	\$14,100,000
	Other	\$10,000,000
Transportation Subtotal		\$220,400,000
County Buildings	New Construction	\$80,000,000
	Major Improvements	\$37,900,000
	Acquisition	\$3,000,000
County Buildings Subtotal		\$120,900,000
Total		\$570,880,000

VIII. PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS

- A. Facilities of Other Public Entities. Inclusion of public facilities of other public entities in this section is for information only, in compliance with the Growth Management Act, which says the capital facilities element is to include summary information on "capital facilities owned by public entities." Table 6 - 14 includes the major public facility improvements planned by those public entities that responded to Thurston County's request for information to include in this Comprehensive Plan.

The following public entities either declined to apprise the County of their Capital Facilities Plans or responded that they do not have any capital facilities planned for the coming six-year period:

- Fire Districts not listed in Table 6-14
- School districts not listed in Table 6-14
- Grand Mound/Rochester Park & Recreation District
- Tanglewilde Park and Recreation District
- Public Utility District
- Cemetery Districts #1 and #2
- Other special districts not listed above

Thurston County cannot control the planning or construction of capital facilities by other public entities within its borders, such as school districts, fire districts, port districts and transit entities. However, the capital facilities planned by these other entities must, under the Growth Management Act, be part of the County's Capital Facilities Plan. Inclusion of the capital facilities planning by these other entities will promote consistent and unified capital facilities planning throughout the County. However, the inclusion of their plans does not imply County approval or disapproval of the plans or the levels of service, which they adopt. Rather, their inclusion insures compliance with the GMA and enables a consistent approach to capital facilities planning throughout the County, taking into consideration the Capital Facilities Plans of all public entities in the County. Most of the public entities referenced in table 6-14 have adopted their own 6 and 20 year Capital Facilities Plans. For more information, please refer to those adopted Capital Facilities Plans. For goals and policies related to schools and coordinated planning with other public entities, see below.

**Table 6-15
Facilities of Other Public Entities**

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	Location		
Rainier School District #307			
High School Modernization	308 Second St. W	\$ 2,700,000	Secured Bond and State Matching Funds
Rainier School District Total		\$ 2,700,000	
North Thurston School District #3			
Temporary Classrooms purchase (5 per year) and relocation		\$ 2,000,000	Secured and Unsecured Bonds (Voluntary mitigation)
Primary School Addition and Modernization	Varies	\$ 49,750,000	Secured and Unsecured Bonds, matching funds.
High School Addition and Modernization	North Thurston H.S.	\$43,500,000	Secured Bonds and matching funds
New Schools		\$64,242,000	Secured and Unsecured Bonds, matching funds.
Facility Upgrades	RRHS, KMS, HZ, ,	\$ 16,500,000	Unsecured Bonds
Land Acquisition		\$3,500,000	Unsecured Bond, Mitigation fees
New Middle School		\$46,742,000	Unsecured Bond, matching funds.
New Elementary School		\$17,500,000	Unsecured Bond, matching funds.
Support Facility		\$3,000,000	Unsecured Bond

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	Location		
Emergent Needs		\$41,125,000	Unsecured Bond
North Thurston School District Total		\$287,859,000	
Olympia School District			
Various small works projects (incl. Re-roofing, HVAC replacement, rebuild old restrooms, replace walk-in coolers, reconfigure Drop-off/ pick up area, controls upgrades.)	Various school sites	\$7,600,000	Levy
Pioneer Elementary School New Classroom Addition, Phase 2	1655 Carlyon Ave. SE	\$2,000,000	Secured local bonds and impact fees.
Jefferson Middle School Modernization	2200 Conger Ave.	\$916,000	Levy
Capital High School – Long term structural repairs and upgrades	2707 Conger Ave.	\$10,000,000	Levy and insurance coverage
Olympia School District Total		\$20,516,000	
Tumwater School District #33			
Site Acquisition & Development	Various sites	\$ 8,000,000	Mitigation fees and impact fees and secured local bond funds
Temporary Classrooms	Various sites	\$ 900,000	Mitigation and impact fees and secured local bond funds
P/G Schmidt Elem. Replacement	225 Dennis Street SE	\$ 22,763,000	Unsecured local bonds and state match

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	Location		
Littlerock Elem. Bldg. "A", "C", & "E" Remodel	12710 Littlerock Rd SW	\$ 6,952,500	Unsecured local bonds and state match
Tumwater Hill Elem. Remodel	3120 Ridgeview Ct. SW	\$ 11,227,000	Unsecured local bonds and state match
East Olympia Elem. Remodel	8700 Rich Rd. SE	\$ 10,609,000	Unsecured local bonds and state match
New Market Skills Center Capital Improvements	7299 New Market St. SW	\$20,200,000	State grants
New Elementary No. 7 Building	To be determined	\$22,000,000	Unsecured local bonds and state match
Technology and infrastructure projects	Various	\$ 5,400,000	Secured and unsecured local bond funds
Health, Safety & Security Projects	Various	\$ 2,600,000	Secured and unsecured local bond funds
Buildings & Grounds Enhancements	Various	\$ 1,295,000	Secured and unsecured local bond funds
Other Misc. Capital Projects	Various	\$ 2,000,000	Secured and unsecured local bond funds
Tumwater School District Total		\$113,946,500	
Yelm Community Schools District #2			
Construct 2 New Elementary Schools	Yelm UGA	\$32,000,000	Proposed Bond

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	Location		
Southworth Elementary – HVAC Upgrades	13849 Yelm Hwy. SE	\$300,000	Secured local funds
Prairie Elementary – Bus Loop and Parking	16535 110 th Ave. SE	\$88,000	Secured local funds
New Warehouse and Office	16525 100 th Way SE	\$3,000,000	Secured local funds
New Bus Garage	No address	\$5,000,000	Secured local funds
Misc. Capital Projects		\$1,500,000	Secured local funds
Yelm Community Schools Total		\$41,888,000	
West Thurston Regional Fire Authority			
Rebuild/enlarge Station #11-4	2640 Trevue Ave SW	\$ 800,000	Local bond funds
Total West Thurston Regional Fire Authority		\$ 800,000	
South East Thurston Fire Authority			
Station #21 Remodel	708 Mill Road	\$300,000	Unsecured Bond
Station #22 Rebuild	17213 153 rd Ave. SE	\$2,000,000	Unsecured Bond
New Station	Thurston Highlands	\$2,500,000	Unsecured Bond
Station #41 Upgrade	12506 133 rd St. Rainier	\$1,500,000	Unsecured Bond
South East Thurston Fire Authority Total		\$6,300,000	

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	Location		
Fire District #5, McLane/Black Lake Fire Department			
No Capital Projects			
Fire District #8, South Bay			
District Fire Training Center Phase II	3349 South Bay Rd. NE	\$ 300,000	To be determined
New North- end Fire Station	7804 Henderson Rd. NE	\$3,000,000	UTGO Bonds
Fire District #8, South Bay Total		\$3,300,000	
Fire District #9, McLane/Black Lake Fire Department			
No New Capital Projects			
(West Thurston Regional Fire Authority)			
No New Capital Projects			
Fire District #17, Bald Hills			
Station 17-1 Remodel	16306 Bald Hill Rd. SE	\$ 300,000	To be Determined
Station 17-2 Upgrades	17701 Lawrence Lake Rd. SE	To be Determined	To be Determined
New Station	To be Determined	\$ 2,500,000	To be Determined
Fire District #17 Total		\$ 2,800,000	
Port of Olympia (2011 - 2012)			
Airport Projects	Airport	\$ 3,000,000	Federal and State grants and local funds

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	Location		
Marina and Boatworks Projects	Marina and Boatworks	\$ 1,300,000	Federal and State grants and Local funds
Marine Terminal Projects	Marine Terminal	\$ 3,500,000	Federal and State grants & third party reimbursements
General Projects	Various Properties	\$ 3,500,000	Local funds and third party reimbursements
Cascade Pole Water Treatment Plant	Cascade Pole Site	\$ 3,000,000	Federal and State grants and local funds
Cascade Pole Phase 3 Capping	Cascade Pole Site	\$ 1,500,000	State grants and local funds
Port of Olympia Total		\$ 15,500,000	
Intercity Transit (2010 – 2015)			
Facilities & Transit Centers	Service District	\$ 4,850,000	Federal and Local Funding
Park and Rides	Service District	\$12, 800,000	State and Local Funding
Intercity Transit Total		\$17,650,000	

B. Public purpose lands and essential public facilities.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that comprehensive plans address both lands for public purposes and siting essential public facilities. The GMA states that the county:

- Shall identify lands useful for public purposes;
- Will work with the state and cities within its borders to identify areas of shared need for public facilities;

- Shall prepare with other jurisdictions a prioritized list of lands necessary for the identified public uses;
- Include a process for identifying and siting essential public facilities; and
- No local comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude siting essential public facilities in their jurisdiction.

Confusion often arises as to the distinction between lands for public purposes and essential public facilities. Essential public facilities can be thought of as a subset of public purpose lands. The following table illustrates the distinctions.

Table 6-16

Distinguishing Public Purpose Lands From Essential Public Facilities

PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS	ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES
<p>FOCUS: Lands needed to accommodate public facilities.</p>	<p>FOCUS: Facilities needed to provide public services and functions that are typically difficult to site.</p>
<p>Lands needed to provide the full range of services to the public provided by government, substantially funded by government, contracted for by government, or provided by private entities subject to public service obligations.</p>	<p>Those public facilities that are usually unwanted by neighborhoods have unusual site requirements or other features that complicate the siting process.</p>
<p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility Corridors¹ • Transportation Corridors² • Sewage Treatment Facilities • Stormwater Management Facilities • Recreation • Schools • Other Public Uses <p><i>Note: See Chapter 2, Land Use, for an inventory map of public purpose lands.</i></p> <p>1. Addressed in the Utilities Chapter. 2. Addressed in the Transportation Chapter.</p>	<p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large-scale Transportation Facilities • State Educational Facilities • State and Local Correctional Facilities • Solid Waste Handling Facilities • Airports • Inpatient Facilities Such As: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Substance Abuse Facilities ➤ Mental Health Facilities ➤ Group Homes ➤ Secure Community Transition Facilities

C. Coordinated Public Purpose Lands:

The GMA calls for coordination among the cities, the State and the County, to identify and prioritize lands needed for public facilities. This provides the opportunity to also identify areas of shared need, and possibly, shared use or other efficiencies. The County is currently coordinating public facility needs (including land needs) with the cities and towns through the joint planning process. Additional coordination and prioritization should be pursued through a regional consultation process. A partial list of shared needs identified to date is presented in Table 6-16.

Table 6-17

Interjurisdictional Shared Needs for Public Purpose Lands

Projects Serving Shared Needs	Sharing Jurisdictions or Districts				
	Thurston County	Cities or Towns	School Districts	Port of Olympia	State
Beneficial Re-Use of Closed Landfill (Park & Ride Facility)	Public Works	Lacey			WDOT
Mallard Pond Phase II	RS – SWU	Lacey			
CLT Green Cove Creek Basin Project-Land Acquisition	RS-SWU - Parks	Olympia			
Grand Mound – WSDOT SRA Sewer Connection	Public Works				WSDOT Ecology
WARC HazoHouse Replacement	Public Works	Lacey			Ecology
WARC Closed Loop Park	Public Works	Lacey			WSU Master Growers
Chehalis Western Trail (coordinated recreation use/ stormwater retention/utility corridor)	Public Works	Lacey and Olympia			WDFW WSDOT DNR TRPC
Yelm – Tenino Trail (coordinated recreation use/ stormwater retention/utility corridor/highway access/ potential future rail use)	Public Works	Yelm, Rainier, and Tenino			WSDOT TRPC

Projects Serving Shared Needs	Sharing Jurisdictions or Districts				
	Thurston County	Cities or Towns	School Districts	Port of Olympia	State
Gate to Belmore Trail (coordinated recreation use/ potential future rail use)	Public Works	Tumwater		Rail Transit (future)	Parks RCO WDFW Ecology TRPC
Griffin Athletic Fields	Public Works		Griffin		
Park Acquisitions	Public Works	Lacey Olympia Tumwater, Yelm, Tenino, and Rainier			DNR, WSDOT, and Parks
Glacial Heritage Preserve	Public Works				DNR
Boston Harbor Boat Ramp	Public Works				Fish and Wildlife
Lake Lawrence Park (coordinated recreation use)	Public Works				Fish and Wildlife; and DNR

D. Siting Essential Public Facilities:

The County-Wide Planning Policies for Thurston County provide the following requirements for siting essential public facilities (refer to Appendix C for a description of County-Wide Planning Policies):

Each city and town will:

- Cooperatively establish a process for identifying and siting county and state-wide public capital facilities having a potential impact beyond jurisdictional boundaries;
- Include public involvement at early stages; and

- Base siting decisions on the jurisdiction's adopted plans, zoning and environmental regulations, particularly as they affect critical areas, resource lands, and transportation facilities.

The Thurston Regional Planning Council provided the Interjurisdictional forum for developing the required process for identifying and siting essential public facilities. A process endorsed by the Thurston Regional Planning Council in January 1994 is included in the Special Use Chapter of the Thurston County Zoning Ordinance and below:

DESIGNATION OF ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES:

Essential public facilities are public facilities and privately owned or operated facilities serving a public purpose that are typically difficult to site. They include:

1. State education facilities; state or regional transportation facilities; prisons, jails and other correctional facilities; solid waste handling facilities; airports; and inpatient facilities such as group homes, mental health facilities and substance abuse facilities; sewage treatment facilities; and communication towers and antennas.
2. Facilities identified by the State Office of Financial Management as essential public facilities, consistent with RCW 36.70A.200; and
3. Facilities identified as essential public facilities in the county's zoning ordinance.

SITING ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES:

Essential public facilities may be allowed as permitted or conditional special uses in the zoning ordinance. Essential public facilities identified as special uses in the applicable zoning district shall be subject, at a minimum, to the following requirements.

1. Classify essential public facilities as follows:
 - a. Type One: Multi-county facilities. These are major facilities serving or potentially affecting more than one county. These facilities include, but are not limited to, regional transportation facilities, such as regional airports; state correction facilities; and state educational facilities.
 - b. Type Two: These are local or inter-local facilities serving or potentially affecting residents or property in more than one jurisdiction. They could include, but are not limited to, county jails, county landfills, community colleges, sewage treatment facilities, communication towers, and inpatient facilities (e.g., substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, and group

homes). [NOTE: Such facilities which would not have impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which they are proposed to be located would be Type Three facilities.]

- c. Type Three: These are facilities serving or potentially affecting only the jurisdiction in which they are proposed to be located.

In order to enable the county to determine the project's classification, the applicant shall identify the approximate area within which the proposed project could potentially have adverse impacts, such as increased traffic, public safety risks, noise, glare, emissions, or other environmental impacts.

- 2. Provide early notification and involvement of affected citizens and jurisdictions as follows:

- a. Type One and Two facilities. At least 90 days before submitting an application for a Type One or Type Two essential public facility, the prospective applicant shall notify the affected public and jurisdictions of the general type and nature of the proposal, identify sites under consideration for accommodating the proposed facility, and identify opportunities to comment on the proposal. Applications for specific projects shall not be considered complete in the absence of proof of a published notice regarding the proposed project in a newspaper of general circulation in the affected area. This notice shall include the information described above and shall be published at least 90 days prior to the submission of the application.

The Thurston Regional Planning Council may provide the project sponsor and affected jurisdiction(s) with their comments or recommendations regarding alternative project locations during this 90-day period.

(The purpose of this provision is to enable potentially affected jurisdictions and the public to collectively review and comment on alternative sites for major facilities before the project sponsor has made their siting decision.)

- b. Type Three facilities. Type Three essential public facilities are subject to the county's standard notification requirements for special uses.
- 3. Essential public facilities shall not have any probable significant adverse impact on critical areas or resource lands, except for lineal

facilities, such as highways, where no feasible alternative exists (adapted from County-Wide Policy 4.2(a)).

4. Major public facilities which generate substantial traffic should be sited near major transportation corridors (adapted from County-Wide Policy 4.2(b)).
5. Applicants for Type One essential public facilities shall provide an analysis of the alternative sites considered for the proposed facility. This analysis shall include the following:
 - a. An evaluation of the sites' capability to meet basic siting criteria for the proposed facility, such as size, physical characteristics, access, and availability of necessary utilities and support services;
 - b. An explanation of the need for the proposed facility in the proposed location;
 - c. The sites' relationship to the service area and the distribution of other similar public facilities within the service area or jurisdiction, whichever is larger; and
 - d. A general description of the relative environmental, traffic, and social impacts associated with locating the proposed facility at the alternative sites that meet the applicant's basic siting criteria. The applicant shall also identify proposed mitigation measures to alleviate or minimize significant potential impacts.
 - e. The applicant shall also briefly describe the process used to identify and evaluate the alternative sites.
6. The proposed project shall comply with all applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, zoning ordinance, and other county regulations.
7. In acquiring and developing parks, trails and other recreation facilities, the County should explore every opportunity to create revenue centers within the park system to generate funding for ongoing park maintenance and operation needs.

PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS SECTION:

GOAL 2: EVERY CITIZEN SHOULD HAVE SAFE AND CONVENIENT ACCESS TO EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES.

OBJECTIVE 2-A: *Schools* - Mechanisms and procedures should be established and maintained to ensure that new school facilities are coordinated with growth and their impacts on roads and neighboring uses are considered.

POLICIES:

1. All development proposals should consider enrollment impacts on schools.
2. Where the size of a single proposed development warrants, the developer should identify at the first stage of project review proposed school sites meeting school district standards such as topography, acreage requirements, location, and soil quality. Such sites should be dedicated for school use under terms negotiated by the developer and the school district.
3. Schools should be sited to consider transportation and health needs as follows:
 - a. Where practical, schools should be located along non-arterial roads in order to minimize potential conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Where the school district finds that siting on arterials is the most practical, school development should include frontage and off-site improvements needed to mitigate the impacts of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.
 - b. Availability of sewer and water facilities should also be considered in siting schools, as well as location in areas not subject to exposure from hazardous/dangerous materials, poor air quality or safety hazards.
4. School siting and expansion should avoid prime agricultural land.
5. The County should notify affected school districts of new subdivision proposals, and new schools should be reviewed by the county through a site plan review zoning process where impacts on roads and neighboring uses are considered.

OBJECTIVE 2-B: *Shared Facility Use with Schools*-The County, school districts, and other governmental agencies should coordinate the use of facilities and operation of programs in order to use facilities efficiently and avoid duplication of public expenditures.

POLICIES:

1. Shared use of school facilities by the general public should be encouraged.
2. The county and the school district should cooperate in the planning and utilization of school and recreational facilities.

GOAL 3: TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE, WELL-LOCATED PUBLIC LANDS AND FACILITIES.

OBJECTIVE 3-A: Identify, in advance of development, appropriately sited lands needed for public purposes, including essential public facilities.

POLICIES:

1. The County should obtain or secure (e.g., by obtaining a right of first refusal for desired property) sites needed for County public facilities as early as possible in the development of an area, to ensure that the facilities are well located to serve the area and to minimize acquisition costs.
2. The County should support regional coordination efforts in identifying shared needs for lands for public purposes to maximize the efficient use of public capital resources.
3. The County should ensure that its development regulations do not preclude the siting of essential public facilities, subject to reasonable development standards and mitigation measures, within Thurston County.
4. The County should identify and site essential public facilities in accordance with the County-wide Planning Policies.

Staff Note: We do this at the long range planning level.