



Memorandum

December 30, 2009

TO: Thurston County Planning Commission

FROM: Tim Smith, Planning Manager

SUBJECT: Tumwater 2025 Transportation Plan/Joint Plan Amendment Proposal

Tumwater planning staff made two revisions to the proposal to amend Chapter 8 of the Tumwater/Thurston County Joint Plan after your June 17th briefing. Tumwater staff will be available at your next meeting on January 6th to answer questions regarding these revisions in preparation for the public hearing scheduled for January 13, 2010. Revisions are summarized below.

1. Staff prepared Map 8-1 at the request of the Thurston County Planning Commission. The map shows existing and planned bicycle routes and multipurpose trails in the City and the unincorporated Urban Growth Area. Connections between bicycle routes and trails are identified. The map is described under note 1 on page 8-1 of the Joint Plan.
2. Planned improvements to the bridge on Henderson Boulevard are now specifically referenced under note 2 on page 8-1. This revision was requested by the Tumwater Planning Commission during their briefing in June.

8.0 TRANSPORTATION

8.1 Summary

The City of Tumwater 2025 Transportation Plan identifies the 20-year projected transportation needs in Tumwater and its urban growth area (UGA). The plan provides for an overall balanced transportation system including major roadway improvements as well as better transit and non-motorized alternatives.

Federal and state planning regulations require a coordinated planning program for regional transportation systems and facilities throughout the state. Regional transportation plans are required and have been developed by the Thurston Regional Planning Council. A City of Tumwater Transportation Plan is also required, which must be coordinated with and be consistent with the regional plan.

The Transportation Plan is consistent with the regional transportation plan. It presents a future, comprehensive transportation system for the City of Tumwater and its UGA that implements and is consistent with the other elements of this Joint Plan. The Transportation Plan, therefore, is hereby incorporated as the Transportation Plan Element of this Joint Plan by reference.

Notes:

1) The Thurston County Planning Commission requested Map 8-1 that identifies the connections between bicycle routes described in the Transportation Plan and multipurpose trails set forth in the City's Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan.

2) The Tumwater Planning Commission requested that the County's planned improvement to the Deschutes River bridge on Henderson Boulevard be referenced herein. According to the County's adopted six-year Transportation Improvement Plan, the bridge is planned for rehabilitation. This includes widening for shoulders.

~~The Black Hills Subarea Transportation Plan is adopted as component of the City of Tumwater Transportation Plan. The subarea plan provides a blueprint for the transportation system serving the area between 66th/70th Avenue to the north, and 81st Avenue to the south. Interstate 5 provides the east boundary, and Black Lake is the primary border to the west. The subarea plan also establishes potential new corridors in this area.~~

~~Note: The Thurston County Board of Commissioners adopted the Tumwater Transportation Plan into the Joint Plan with one modification: Project #27 in the UGA was moved from Table 6 (Phase 1 projects) to Table 7 (Phase 2 projects).~~

December 30, 2009

Jeremy Davis, Associate Planner
Thurston County Planning

Dear Jeremy:

This is to follow up on the information your Planning Commission had requested during the work-session on the Housing Element and the Utility Element. There were two specific items we needed to address as follows:

1. The reference for the statement under section C. Vacancy rates. This information came from the 2007 Profile table III-16 on page III-24. A statement has been added making reference to the 2007 Profile; see revised page attached.
2. The second statement was a question of why the gas line extended outside the growth boundary. As we discussed on the phone, this issue is not really relevant to GMA concerns. The prohibition on utilities outside the growth area is intended to limit density. This would apply to sewer and water utilities which will typically be a limiting factor in achieving urban density, but the same concern does not apply to electric or natural gas.

Because the question about the gas line was asked, I have put in a call to PSE requesting information regarding this and expect a statement before the next work-session. However, regardless of the reasoning for the location of the gas line it will not have any impact on the direction, goals or policies for the Utility Element and should not require any revision to the existing language. So, I have not proposed any changes to the text.

If you have any questions regarding the above please give me a call.

Sincerely,

David R. Burns, AICP
Principal Planner

Table 4 Sample of Housing Sales Activity for Lacey					
	Units Sold	Average List Price	Average Sale Price	Average Days to Sale	Average List Unsold Units
1990	191	\$79,387.00	\$78,622.00	70	\$88,209.00
1995	347	\$122,911.00	\$121,275.00	98	\$137,503.00
1996	312	\$126,356.00	\$125,314.00	95	\$132,707.00
1997	292	\$129,262.00	\$127,952.00	100	\$167,743.00
1998	404	\$130,418.00	\$129,245.00	103	\$127,558.00
1999	528	\$136,908.00	\$136,150.00	93	N/A
2000	489	\$143,607.00	\$142,209.00	95	N/A
2001	548	\$143,440.00	\$142,664.00	75	N/A
2005	751	\$236,482.00	\$238,647.00	40	N/A
2006	1252	\$264,243.00	\$266,082.00	56	N/A

Data provided by Olympic Multiple Listing Service. About 75-80 percent of sales activity in Thurston County occurs through Olympic Multiple Listing Service.

purchase a more affordable home in Lacey than it is in Olympia.

C. Vacancy Rates

~~The 2000 census also provides information on vacancy rates. According to this information, with an average rent of \$580, Lacey has a 2.6% vacancy rate in apartment rentals in the spring of 2001. Based on figures reported in The Profile October 2002, our vacancy rate in all housing units was approximately 5%. In 2007 the vacancy rate for 2 bedroom units was approximately 2.2% and for 3 bedroom units it was 3.4%; information from the 2007 Profile.~~

D. Housing Costs and Affordability

~~Census information is also available regarding cost of housing units. According to 2000 census information and information provided by Thurston Regional Planning, the average value of a single family home in Lacey in 1990 sold for \$78,662 compared with an average house in 2001-2006 that was priced at \$142,664 sold for \$266,082. Chart 3B shows the increase of home sale prices from 1990 through 2006. Table~~

4 shows the distribution of average prices for owner-occupied housing units.

Information is also available regarding average rent. ~~Charts from the 2000 census and Thurston Regional's data, reported in The Profile 2007, show the majority of rents for a home or duplex to be between \$605-\$783 for a two bedroom unit and \$899-\$1,061 for a three bedroom unit. Apartment units are renting for approximately \$588 per month. In 2007 a one bedroom (670 square feet) apartment unit was renting for approximately \$650 per month. A two bedroom (843 square feet) unit was renting for approximately \$725 per month. Chart 3C shows the increased cost of rents between 1990 and 2006. Considering rent estimates, property management range estimates are expected to be very accurate for what the actual cost is in the marketplace. In addition to rental and home ownership costs, household income is an important piece of the puzzle in looking at issues of affordability and planning for our community's housing needs. Unfortunately, between census years, estimates of income are only available at the County level. The most recent estimates at the local level for Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater~~