

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



Thurston County Board of County Commissioners  
Adopted December 18, 2006

Thurston County Courthouse, Building 1, Room 280

## CHAPTER SIX -- CAPITAL FACILITIES

### I. Introduction

The Capital Facilities Plan is a six-year plan of capital projects for 2007-2012, with estimated dates and costs, and proposed methods of financing. The Plan is reviewed and updated annually.

Capital facilities are the facilities needed to support growth. They include roads, bridges, sewers, parks and open spaces, and facilities for drinking water, stormwater, garbage disposal and recycling, and all the government buildings, which house public services.

By the year 2030, the population of Thurston County is projected to grow to 373,000. This is an increase of 149,000 or 67% from the 2005 population of 224,000. Within the next six years, the population is expected to grow by 15-18%. Along with homes and workplaces, all of the new residents will need public facilities such as roads, schools, parks, and sewers.

The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) is one of the sections 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 make adjustments to the plan if funding is inadequate. Capital facilities are important because they support the growth envisioned in the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Planning for capital facilities is a complex task carried out by each department of the County. It requires an understanding of future needs, assessing various types of capital facilities that could be provided, identifying the most effective and efficient facilities to support the needed service, and lastly 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 type of facilities.

Financial planning and implementation of capital facilities cannot be effectively carried out on an annual basis, since financing often requires multi-year commitments of financial resources. Therefore, this plan is long-range in scope. The CFP assumes receipt of outside grant resources, and if grants are not received, projects may be delayed or removed. The CFP is a planning document; not a budget for expenditures, nor a guarantee that the projects will be implemented. Each capital project listed in the CFP will need to go through a separate approval process.

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

The CFP includes Goals, Objectives, and Policies to guide the development of capital facilities and implement the requirements of the Growth Management Act. General Goals, Objectives and Policies that apply to all capital facility planning are listed below. Additional goals, objectives, and policies are listed within the appropriate sections of this plan. (However, additional goals and policies 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.

## II. Level of Service Standards:

Level of Service Standards are quantifiable measures of the amount of public facility that is provided, such as acres of park land per capita, sanitary sewers capacity to meet users being served, or solid waste in tons disposed or percent diverted by recycling. Minimum standards are established at the local level. Factors that influence local standards are recommendations from citizens, County Commissioners, and the Planning Commission; also national, federal, and state standards and mandates.

This Capital Facilities Plan will enable Thurston County to accommodate 15 percent growth during the next six years (over 31,500 new people) while maintaining the levels of service standards in this table's column labeled "CFP LOS." In its last two columns, this table also shows how this standard compares to existing level of service 2001 or 2002 and previously adopted standards:

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

Resolution No. 13498 (12/19/05)

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2007-2012)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
<b>County Buildings:</b>				
<b>Coroner</b>	<b>Gross Sq. Ft. (GSF)</b> "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.
<b>Courts--District</b>	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.
<b>Courts--Superior</b>	GSF per courtroom unit (Ctrm., Judic. chamber, Conf. & Jury Rms.)	1994 Space Plng. 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.
<b>Courts--Juvenile &amp; Family</b>	GSF per courtroom unit (Ctrm., Judic. chamber, Conf. Rms.)	1994 Space Plng. 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.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2007-2012)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
<b>Detention—Juvenile</b>	Beds for target years (based on arrest-sentencing trend for juvenile population)	1994 Space Plng. 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.
<b>Jail—Adult (incl. Satellite)</b>	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.
<b>All Co. Gov't. Administration</b>	"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><b>GSF = Gross Square Feet</b> (includes internal office and external building circulation [hallways, stairwells and elevator shafts], mechanical, public restrooms, etc.)  <b>NSF = Net Square Feet</b> (does not include the above items)</p>				
Parks & Trails	<p><b>LOS 1: Develop</b> 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. Main emphasis is on development of existing undeveloped park properties.</p> <p><b>LOS 2: Acquire</b> 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><b>LOS 1: Development (by 2012):</b> 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.</p> <p><b>LOS 2: Acquisition:</b> 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>	<p>6 of 33 park sites and 29 miles of 42.5 miles of trails have been developed (as of 2006).</p> <p>Acquired: 2,709 acres have been acquired (as of 2005)</p>	<b>Same as 2006-2011 CFP.</b>

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2007-2012)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
<b>Roads</b>	<p>Letter designations based on motorist delays &amp; traffic flow (A=no delays to F=delays of over one minute)</p> <p>Table 5-1 (p. 5-8) in Chapter 5 of the Comp. Plan describes the letter system.</p>	<p><b>Urban:</b>  <i>Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater UGAs--D</i> (E for high density residential corridors)  <i>Yelm UGA--C</i> resid. zones; D commercial &amp; Lt. Indus. zones; F urban core  <i>Tenino &amp; Rainier UGAs—D Grand Mnd. UGA--D</i>  <b>Rural:</b> C  For exceptions: see p. 6-39</p>	<p><b>Urban:</b>  Varies: A - E</p> <p><b>Rural:</b>  Varies: A - D</p>	<p>Standard only relates to LOS for roadway capacity – for overall roadway needs / priorities see supplement.</p>
<p><b>Sewer Systems</b></p> <p><b>Rural:</b>  Boston Harbor, Tamoshan, Beverly Beach, and Olympic View;</p> <p><b>Urban:</b>  Grand Mound</p>	<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</p> <p>Urban: ERU=700 cf/mo</p>	<p><b>Rural:</b> Capacity to provide sewer collection and wastewater treatment services for residential uses.</p> <p><b>Urban:</b> 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>	<p>For both Rural and Urban systems, the number of ERUs varies by facility.</p>	<p>Same as 2005-2010 CFP.</p>
<p><b>Water Systems</b></p> <p><b>Rural:</b> Boston Harbor and Tamoshan;</p> <p><b>Urban:</b> Grand Mound</p>	<p><b>Equivalent Residential Units (ERU):</b> Cubic feet per month of water consumed as measured at the source, based on the following minimums:</p> <p><b>Rural:</b> ERU=900 cf/mo</p> <p>Urban: ERU-700 cf/mo</p>	<p><b>Rural:</b> Capacity to provide domestic water and fire flow services for residential and limited commercial uses.</p> <p><b>Urban:</b> Capacity to provide domestic water and fire flow services for residential, commercial, and industrial uses.</p> <p>In addition, Rural and Urban water systems shall meet current federal, state and local drinking water standards, whenever possible.</p>	<p>For both Rural and Urban systems, the number of ERUs varies by facility</p>	<p>Same as 2005 – 2010 CFP</p>

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2007-2012)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
<b>Solid Waste</b>	<p><b>LOS A</b> – Includes all 3 service level units;</p> <p><b>LOS B</b> – Includes a combination of any 2 service level units.</p> <p><b>LOS C</b> – Includes 1 or no service level units.</p>			
	1. Regulatory	<p><b>New or Existing Facility:</b> Meets or exceeds federal, state, and/or local regulatory requirements.</p>	<p>Capacity to meet waste generated by users: Disposed of 174,000(03) tons per yr.</p>	Last standards adopted 2001.
	2. Health/Safety:	<p><b>New or Existing Facility:</b> Meets or exceeds federal, state, and/or local health / safety issues for public or employees.  By 2010 – 50%</p>	<p>Capacity to meet waste generated by users:  Diverted (reduced or recycled 37% (03) of waste generated.</p>	Last standards adopted 2001.
	3. Policy:	<p><b>New or Existing Facility:</b> Addresses a solid waste comprehensive plan goal or policy.</p>		
<b>Stormwater</b>	<p><b>LOS A</b> - Includes all 3 service level units</p> <p><b>LOS B</b> - Includes a combination of any two service level units.</p> <p><b>LOS C</b> – Includes 1 or no service level unit.</p>			
	<p><b>Local Flood Control :</b> <b>Provide</b> capacity to store stormwater runoff volume and / or reduce peak flow from an "x" year storm event.</p>	<p><b>Facilities for new growth:</b> Meet 25 yr. storm event for public street conveyance and 100 yr. event for property protection.  <b>Facilities to improve existing deficiencies:</b> Meet the new growth standard wherever possible.</p>	<p><b>New facilities:</b> At the standards.  <b>Pre-existing facilities:</b> Varies</p>	Same as 2005-2010 CFP.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard (2007-2012)	Existing Service Level (2001 unless noted otherwise)	Previously Adopted LOS Standard (2004-2009)
Stormwater	<p><b>Water Quality:</b> Meet federal, state, or local water quality standards in streams, rivers, lakes, and Puget Sound</p>	<p><b>Facilities for new growth:</b> Meet 2-year release rate to minimize erosion and maintain water quality standards.</p> <p><b>Facilities to improve existing deficiencies:</b> Meet the new growth standards wherever possible.</p>	<p><b>Varies:</b> See 303D list, County Water Resources Profile, and Monitoring Reports</p>	<p>Same as 2005-2010 CFP.</p>
	<p><b>Habitat:</b> 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><b>In-stream Flow Goals at Basin Buildout Conditions</b></p> <p><b>Peak Flows:</b> Maintain, or where possible, reduce durations.</p> <p><b>Bank full Flows:</b> Maintain or where possible, reduce durations.</p> <p><b>Base Flows:</b> Maintain, or where possible, increase.</p>	<p><b>In- stream flows:</b> 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

[Resolution No. 13498 (12/19/05)]

III Effect on Local Taxes and Fees:

**Table 6-3**  
**Effect on Local Taxes and Fees**

[Resolutions No.13498 (12/19/05)]

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 for current major maintenance and repair costs. 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 a juvenile detention facility and adult jail.</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 and open space acquisition costs. This is a county-wide assessment outside the both the 106% &amp; Implicit Price Deflator (Ref. 47) lids.</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. Forest revenues and 30% of the gas tax that are deposited in the Road Fund and grants are the primary funding sources for road construction.</p>

<b>FACILITY</b>	<b>CURRENT FEE/TAX USED FOR THE FACILITY</b>	<b>PROPOSED CHANGE IN FEE/TAX FOR THE FACILITY IN THIS PLAN</b>
Water Facilities	Water utility rates and charges for each respective utility.	<p>No changes in the Water utility rates and charges, 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, 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): \$70.87 per ton, plus \$3.21 per trip transaction fee- <i>(This fee took effect 1/1/06).</i>	Tipping Fee increase is reviewed every 4 years to cover a 20-year period (to 2023). In 2003 the Board of County Commissioners elected to implement rate increases on an annual basis. Next projected increase – 2007 --to an estimated rate of \$72.47 per ton for all types of garbage, plus a \$3.28 per trip fee.

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><b>For residents within the current Storm and Surface Water Utility boundaries:</b></p> <p>Average Rural Residential rate = \$23/yr. Average Urban Rate = \$38/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>CONSERVATION FUTURES property tax levy for some current park and open space acquisition costs.</p>	<p>No change in the Storm and Surface Water Utility Rates and Charges as established by Thurston County Code 15.06.</p> <p>No changes in the CONSERVATION FUTURES property tax levy.</p>

IV. SUMMARY OF SIX-YEAR FINANCING PLAN

Table 6-4

SUMMARY OF 2007 – 2012 CAPITAL COSTS  
For Projects Owned or Managed by Thurston County  
(From Tables 6-6 through 6-11)

Project Category	2007 - 2012 Expenditure Total
CAPITAL	
Parks and Trails	\$ 30,050,000
Solid Waste	\$ 12,412,000
Stormwater	\$ 5,456,400
Water and Sewer	\$ 4,728,500
Roads, Bridges and Bike Lanes	\$ 67,931,700
County Buildings	\$ 70,101,896
Capital Total	<hr/> \$ 190,680,496
DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS	
Parks and Trails	\$ 5,622,601
Solid Waste	0
Stormwater	0
Water and Sewer	\$ 7,890,669
Roads, Bridges and Bike Lanes	\$1,486,000
County Buildings	\$ 47,092,951
Debt Service Total	<hr/> \$ 62,092,221

(Resolution, No. 13498 (12/19/05))

Table 6-5  
**SUMMARY SIX YEAR FINANCING PLAN**  
2007 - 2012

BLACKED OUT AREAS = Capital categories in which the revenue source is NOT APPLICABLE

Revenue Sources	Six Year Totals						Totals by Rev. Source
	Parks	Solid Waste	Stormwater	Water and Sewer	Transportation	Buildings	
Existing Revenues - Earmarked (May be used only for specific types of facilities)							
Property Tax - Cons. Futures (Cash)	\$950,000		\$130,000				\$1,080,000
Forest revenues (&reserves) to Rd. Fund for Capital					\$48,172,620		\$48,172,620
Utility Fees/Rates - w/o increases		\$11,547,000	\$3,052,769				\$14,599,769
Committed Developer & other Jurisdiction Financing							\$0
Sewer - Water Fees & Assessments							\$0
Utility Loans - to be repaid from existing fees				\$276,000			\$276,000
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from existing committed revenue sources					\$3,955,900		\$3,955,900
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from existing, general use revenue sources							\$0
Earmarked Carryover Funds (or cap. reserves)	\$90,000	\$865,000	\$1,032,724				\$1,987,724
Internal Department transfers from non-capital programs						\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,040,000</b>	<b>\$12,412,000</b>	<b>\$4,215,493</b>	<b>\$276,000</b>	<b>\$52,128,520</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>	<b>\$71,572,013</b>
Existing Revenues - General Use (May be used for more than one type of facility)							
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) / General Fund (cash)	\$140,000			\$77,500	\$5,500,000	\$11,961,304	\$17,678,804
REET. Gen. Fund, or owner assess. (to be determined)							\$0
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$140,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$77,500</b>	<b>\$5,500,000</b>	<b>\$11,961,304</b>	<b>\$17,678,804</b>
Proposed New Revenues or Increased Rates							
GRANTS	\$3,350,000		\$1,072,007	\$4,370,000	\$10,303,180		\$19,095,187
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				\$5,000			\$5,000
Trail Permit Fees	\$140,000						\$140,000
Other	\$13,530,000		\$168,900				\$13,698,900
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.	\$11,850,000					\$56,640,592	\$68,490,592
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$28,870,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,240,907</b>	<b>\$4,375,000</b>	<b>\$10,303,180</b>	<b>\$56,640,592</b>	<b>\$101,429,679</b>
<b>REVENUE TOTALS</b>	<b>\$30,050,000</b>	<b>\$12,412,000</b>	<b>\$5,456,400</b>	<b>\$4,728,500</b>	<b>\$67,931,700</b>	<b>\$70,101,896</b>	<b>\$190,680,496</b>

## 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:

Thurston County currently has 33 park sites, accounting for a total of 2709 acres. These sites include thirteen active parks (698 acres), only six of which are fully or partially developed, six preserves and three historic sites (1,158 acres) and 11 trails/trail properties, accounting for 42.5 miles of planned 52.7-mile recreational trail system. Approximately 29.0 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 2012 population data, creates a need for 1170 acres of operational park land.

Since Thurston County has 355 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 2012. 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 support parks operations and maintenance, however, not capital costs.

[Resolution No. 13498 (12/19/05)]

## **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 6-6  
**PARKS & RECREATION CAPITAL PROJECTS**  
**2007 - 2012**

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS Fund Source	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2006-12
Capital Balance Forward / from capital reserves		10,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	
Conservation Futures	950,000						
Federal Funds	1,000,000	3,000,000					
Future Councilmanic GO Bonds(Conservation Futures/other source) (1)	3,900,000	500,000	4,450,000	500,000		2,500,000	
Grants		400,000	850,000	500,000	900,000	700,000	
Other		30,000	620,000	220,000	880,000	680,000	
Public Facilities District	4,100,000						
REET (Real Estate Excise Tax)	15,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	
Trail Permit Fees	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000	50,000	
TRPC	300,000	700,000					
WSDOT	2,000,000						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$12,275,000</b>	<b>\$4,675,000</b>	<b>\$5,975,000</b>	<b>\$1,275,000</b>	<b>\$1,875,000</b>	<b>\$3,975,000</b>	

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS	Type	Fund Source	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	6 Y
Regional Athletic Complex (5)	Dev	PFD	4,100,000				500,000		
Regional Athletic Complex Property (PFD)	Acq	CFB	2,900,000						
Kenneydell Park (4)	Dev	G, O			300,000				
Major Maint./Repair	Dev	R, T, C	25,000	50,000	75,000	50,000	50,000	75,000	
Master Plans	MP	R, T, C		25,000		25,000	25,000		
Chehalis Western Trail	Dev	C, G, T, O, BF		400,000	700,000		600,000	200,000	
Chehalis Western Trail (Bridging the Gap Project)	Acq/Dev	L, G, B, O	3,300,000	3,700,000					
Yelm - Tenino Trail (2)	Dev	C, G, T, B, O			1,000,000			200,000	
Griffin Athletic Fields (3)	Dev	G			400,000		200,000		
Guerin Park	Dev	G, O, B				200,000		1,000,000	
Deschutes Falls Park (2)	Dev	B			2,500,000				
Cooper Point Park	Dev	CF, CFB, G, O						1,000,000	
Deschutes Falls Park	Acq	CF, CFB	250,000						
W.E. Allen Park	Dev	G, O			500,000		500,000		
Gull Harbor Conservation Project	Acq	CF, CFB	300,000						
Black River/Mima Creek Conservation Project	Acq	CF	400,000						
Reserve for Acq & Development	300A	CFB, G, O	1,000,000	500,000	500,000	1,000,000		1,500,000	
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>\$12,275,000</b>	<b>\$4,675,000</b>	<b>\$5,975,000</b>	<b>\$1,275,000</b>	<b>\$1,875,000</b>	<b>\$3,975,000</b>	

DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
Future Bonds	322,252	575,453	861,614	1,215,226	1,215,226	1,432,830	
<b>Total Debt Service</b>	<b>\$322,252</b>	<b>\$575,453</b>	<b>\$861,614</b>	<b>\$1,215,226</b>	<b>\$1,215,226</b>	<b>\$1,432,830</b>	

**LEGEND:**

- |     |  |    |                          |     |                            |
|-----|--|----|--------------------------|-----|----------------------------|
| B   | Bonds (See Note #1)  | L  | City of Lacey            | PFD | Public Facilities District |
| C   | County Budget Allocation/Capital Fund  | O  | Donations, Other Sources | D   | Donations                  |
| CFB | Conservation Futures Bond (nonvoter GO bond to be financed from existing Conservation. Futures Property Tax) | R  | Real Estate Excise Tax   | CF  | Conservation Futures       |
| G   | Grant  | T  | Trail Permit Fees        |     |                            |
|     |  | BF | Capital Balance Forward  |     |                            |

NOTE: (1) These are bonds paid for by outside revenue sources, either voter approved from the property tax, or councilmatic paid from existing revenue sources such as Conservation Futures or other sources.

(2) 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).

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

(4) Tumwater UGA

(5) Lacey UGA

## **B. Solid Waste:**

The Revised Code of Washington (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. 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, 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, 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 2004, 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, 2005. The ordinance also automatically increases the tipping rates by 2.25% annually on Jan 1 of each calendar year. The current tipping fees plus automatic annual increases appear sufficient to fund planned solid waste programs and capital facility projects for the next 20 years. 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 31<sup>st</sup> 2002. The post closure care period was subsequently initiated January 1, 2003. As of December 31<sup>st</sup> 2004, 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. Table 6-7 shows what projects are being funded through post closure funds and what projects are being funded through tipping fees.

Resolution No. 13498 (12/19/05)]

### **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 6-7  
THURSTON COUNTY  
**SOLID WASTE CAPITAL PROJECTS**  
2007-2012

[Resolution No. 13265 (12/20/04)]

REVENUE	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	6 YR TOTAL
<i>Solid Waste Tipping Fees, Rates and Charges</i>	\$3,481,000	\$1,345,000	\$1,521,000	\$2,700,000	\$300,000	\$2,200,000	\$11,547,000
<i>Post Closure Reserve</i>	\$65,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$250,000	\$865,000
<b>REVENUE TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$3,546,000</b>	<b>\$1,595,000</b>	<b>\$1,771,000</b>	<b>\$2,700,000</b>	<b>\$350,000</b>	<b>\$2,450,000</b>	<b>\$12,412,000</b>

PROJECT EXPENDITURES	Funding Sources <sup>1</sup>	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	6 YR TOTAL
WARC Process Controls and Alarms	Fees	\$410,000						\$410,000
WARC Industrial Wastewater Improvements	PCR	\$286,000						\$286,000
WARC Hazo House Phases 1-3	Fees	\$2,800,000	\$1,075,000					\$3,875,000
WARC Metal Material Recovery	Fees	\$50,000	\$250,000					\$300,000
WARC Gas System Expansion	PCR		\$50,000	\$250,000		\$50,000	\$250,000	\$600,000
WARC Old Flare Building Restroom	Fees		\$20,000					\$20,000
WARC Yard Waste Materials Recovery	Fees		\$50,000	\$150,000				\$200,000
WARC Service Access Road	Fees		\$75,000	\$396,000				\$471,000
WARC Self Haul Transfer Station Expansion	Fees			\$300,000	\$1,200,000			\$1,500,000
WARC Automotive and Equipment Storage	Fees			\$100,000	\$500,000			\$600,000
WARC Commercial Scale Plaza	Fees				\$200,000	\$300,000	\$2,200,000	\$2,700,000
WARC Maintenance Building	Fees		\$75,000	\$375,000				\$450,000
WARC Outbound Tollhouse- 3rd Scale	Fees			\$200,000	\$800,000			\$1,000,000
<b>EXPENDITURE TOTALS:</b>		<b>\$3,546,000</b>	<b>\$1,595,000</b>	<b>\$1,771,000</b>	<b>\$2,700,000</b>	<b>\$350,000</b>	<b>\$2,450,000</b>	<b>\$12,412,000</b>

Notes:

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

### **C. Stormwater Facilities:**

The Storm and Surface Water Utility, Basin Plans, 6 and 20 year Capital Facility Plans: In 1989 Thurston County instituted rates and charges for a stormwater utility in the northern part of the county pursuant to RCW 36.89. A capital facility rate and charge was established in December 1998 for the purpose of assessing existing and anticipated stormwater drainage problems, and identify possible corrective actions within north County.

The county works cooperatively with Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater and other jurisdictional governments to coordinate activities and plan necessary improvements accordingly. This work is done largely through stormwater basin plans.

The stormwater utility has completed nine (9) basin plans to date, having partnered with the cities on two others and shared with the three cities the cost of constructing facilities within the Woodland, Chambers and Moxlie Basins. Planning for the peninsulas and more rural basins will be undertaken to complete basin planning efforts for all the north county drainage basins as funding and priorities allow.

The stormwater facilities in this Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) are for projects identified in the completed stormwater basin plans and 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 considers the ability to implement (e.g. availability of funding, effect on rates and charges, ongoing maintenance costs, etc.), level of environmental sustainability (e.g. level of protection of aquatic resources, water quality, shellfish protection, etc.), effectiveness in solving the problems and accommodating future growth, prevention of property damage, public safety, and compliance with the program's mission of approaching problems comprehensively, cooperating interjurisdictionally and meeting six year growth projections. Once ranked, each project is given additional consideration as it relates to drainage basin planning and utility needs.

#### **Types of Stormwater Facilities:**

There are three types of stormwater facilities.

Flood Control Facilities: New storage facilities, 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, sand filters, constructed wetlands, vaults, or other new technologies.

Habitat Facilities/Surveys: Install in-stream structures to improve fish passage and improve downgradient 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 downgradient 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 with the existing stream channel, which can inhibit fish passage and degrade shellfish areas.

Many 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 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 6-8 highlights specific capital facility projects, which will be designed and constructed with a dedicated stormwater capital facility rate. 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.

### **Stormwater Needs of South County:**

This plan includes no stormwater facilities for the area of Thurston County located outside of the present Storm and Surface Water Utility rate boundary (e.g. South County). South County has flooding and drainage problems, of which were highlighted during flood events in the winter of 1995-1996, and again in 1996-1997 and 1998-1999.

Beginning in 1997, the County met with citizens to seek ideas for the best way to address flooding in south Thurston County. 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.

[Resolutions No.13498 12/19/05]

### **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 6-8  
2007 - 2012 Stormwater Capital Facilities**

REVENUE	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	6 YR TOTAL
Captiol Carryover	\$374,289	\$236,247	\$59,782	\$50,000	\$145,703	\$166,703	\$1,032,724
Investment Earnings	\$18,211	\$11,253	\$10,218	\$5,493	\$4,297	\$3,297	\$52,769
Rates and Charges- Resolution 11860	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$3,000,000
Grants and loans	\$90,000	\$112,500	\$225,000	\$119,507	\$300,000	\$225,000	\$1,072,007
Conservation Futures	\$130,000						\$130,000
Other CLT	\$168,900						\$168,900
<b>REVENUE TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$1,281,400</b>	<b>\$860,000</b>	<b>\$795,000</b>	<b>\$675,000</b>	<b>\$950,000</b>	<b>\$895,000</b>	<b>\$5,456,400</b>

PROJECT EXPENDITURES	Funding Source <sup>1</sup>	Objective <sup>2</sup>	UGA <sup>3</sup>	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	6 YR TOTAL			
Mallard Pond	SSWU CFP	H/F/WQ	Lacey	\$120,000	CN					\$120,000			
Mallard Pond Phase II	SSWU CFP, GRANT	H/F/WQ	Lacey	\$50,000	PSE	\$150,000	LA/CN	\$150,000	PSE/CN	\$350,000			
Wesley Loop	SSWU CFP	F/WQ/H	NA	\$240,000	PSE/CN					\$240,000			
Pacific Avenue Wetland	SSWU CFP	H	Lacey	\$120,000	PSE/CN					\$120,000			
Lakemont and 49 <sup>th</sup>	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Lacey	\$352,500	CN	\$0				\$352,500			
Clearfield Court	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Oly	\$25,000	PSE	\$250,000	PSE/CN			\$275,000			
Delphi and 11th	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	NA	\$25,000	PSE	\$250,000	PSE/CN			\$275,000			
McClane Creek Basin Plan	SSWU/GRANT	F/WQ/H	Oly		\$125,000	PSE	\$125,000	LA/PSE		\$250,000			
Black Lake Basin Plan	SSWU CFP, GRANT	F/WQ/H	Tum				\$175,000	PSE	\$100,000	LA/PSE	\$275,000		
Limerick Detention Pond	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Oly		\$25,000	PSE	\$250,000	PSE/CN		\$275,000			
Evergreen Terrace	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Lacey				\$25,000	PSE	\$250,000	PSE/CN	\$525,000		
Ferndale Detention Pond	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	Oly			\$25,000	\$250,000	PSE		\$275,000			
Donnelly Drive	SSWU CP	F/WQ	Oly				\$25,000	PSE	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$525,000		
Love Joy Court	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	NA		\$10,000	LA/PSE	\$170,000	PSE/CN		\$180,000			
SCB- West Basin Alternative	SSWU CFP, GRANT	F/WQ	Tum				\$100,000		\$300,000	PSE/CN	\$300,000	CN	\$700,000
Thompson Place - Stormwater Pond	SSWU CFP	F/WQ	NA						\$45,000	PSE/LA	\$45,000		
Little McAllister Mouth	SSWU CFP	F/H	NA			\$25,000	PSE/CN			\$25,000			
Kaiser Road (GC8.3) <sup>4</sup>	SSWU CFP	F	Oly				\$50,000	CN		\$50,000			
Land Acquisition	SSWU CFP	F/WQ/H	N/A	\$50,000	LA	\$50,000	LA	\$50,000	LA	\$50,000	LA	\$300,000	
CLT Green Cove Creek Basin Project	Conserv/Other-CLT	F/WQ/H	N/A	\$298,900	LA						\$298,900		
<b>EXPENDITURE TOTALS:</b>				<b>\$1,281,400</b>		<b>\$860,000</b>	<b>\$795,000</b>	<b>\$675,000</b>	<b>\$950,000</b>	<b>\$895,000</b>	<b>\$5,456,400</b>		

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Funding sources include: Conserv= Conservation Futures Fund, CLT= Capital Land Trust and/or its other partners, and Grant=Grant funding.

<sup>2</sup> Project Objectives include: F=Flooding; WQ=Water Quality; and H=Habitat.

<sup>3</sup> UGA - Urban Growth Area. NA indicates the project is not within a current urban growth areas of Olympia, Lacey, or Tumwater.

<sup>4</sup> Other abbreviations used above include: PSE=Design plans, specifications and estimates, CN=Construction, RW=Right of Way, and LA= Land Acquisition.

## 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. 13498 (12/19/05)]

## **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 6-9  
Thurston County  
Water and Sewer Capital Projects  
2007-2012**

<b>REVENUE:</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>6 YR TOTAL</b>
REET <sup>1</sup> /Grants/Loans <sup>2</sup>	\$3,400,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	\$190,000	\$115,000	\$125,000	\$4,370,000
Public Works Trust Fund Loan							\$0
Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (Loan)	\$5,000						\$5,000
Utility Revenue	\$138,500	\$137,500					\$276,000
REET	\$77,500						\$77,500
<b>REVENUE TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$3,621,000</b>	<b>\$227,500</b>	<b>\$450,000</b>	<b>\$190,000</b>	<b>\$115,000</b>	<b>\$125,000</b>	<b>\$4,728,500</b>

<b>PROJECT EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>6 YR TOTAL</b>
Ground Mound HWY 99 Sewer Force Main & Lift Station	REET <sup>1</sup> /Loan/Grant	\$2,000,000						\$2,000,000
Grand Mound 203rd/ HWY 99 Gravity and Force Main Extension	REET <sup>1</sup> /Loan/Grant	\$600,000						\$600,000
Grand Mound 203rd/ HWY 99 Gravity and Force Main Extension	REET <sup>1</sup> /Loan/Grant	\$800,000						\$800,000
Corrosion Control - Grand Mound	DWSRF/PWTF <sup>3</sup>	\$5,000						\$5,000
South I-5 Water Main Crossing -Grand Mound	Utility Revenue	\$137,500	\$137,500					\$275,000
Utility Capital Planning WTR/SWR	REET	\$77,500						\$77,500
Secondary Water Main Replacement - Tamoshan	Loan/Grant		\$40,000					\$40,000
Primary Water Main Replacement - Tamoshan	Loan/Grant			\$50,000	\$50,000			\$100,000
Water Tank Security/Telemetry - Boston Harbor	Grant/Loan				\$50,000			\$50,000
Water main Replacement -Boston Harbor	Grant/Loan			\$50,000				\$50,000
Beach Front Sewer System Collection Improvements - Tamoshan	Grant/Loan	\$1,000	\$50,000	\$250,000				\$301,000
Sewer System Collection Improvements - Tamoshan	Grant/Loan			\$100,000		\$100,000		\$200,000
Sewer System Collection Improvements Boston Harbor	Grant/Loan				\$75,000		\$75,000	\$150,000
Sewer Collection Improvements - Olympic View	Grant/Loan				\$15,000	\$15,000		\$30,000
Wastewater Disposal Field Improvements - Olympic View	Grant/Loan						\$50,000	\$50,000
<b>EXPENDITURE TOTAL</b>		<b>\$3,621,000</b>	<b>\$227,500</b>	<b>\$450,000</b>	<b>\$190,000</b>	<b>\$115,000</b>	<b>\$125,000</b>	<b>\$4,728,500</b>

<b>DEBT SERVICE ON BONDS AND LOANS BY FUND</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>6 YR TOTAL</b>
20YR LTGO Bond For Grand Mound	\$362,750	\$362,750	\$362,750	\$1,112,750	\$1,070,250	\$1,078,000	\$4,349,250
20YR LTGO Bond For Grand Mound	\$629,100	\$631,600	\$827,850	\$98,100	\$98,100	\$98,100	\$2,382,850
20YR PWTF LOAN Boston Harbor	\$136,002	\$135,778	\$135,315	\$204,555	\$0		\$611,650
20YR PWTF LOAN Olympic View	\$8,732	\$8,441	\$8,150	\$7,859	\$7,568	\$7,277	\$48,028
20YR PWTF LOAN Tamoshan-1	\$9,827	\$9,732	\$9,637	\$0	\$0		\$29,196
20YR DOE ST REV Tamoshan/Bev Bch	\$78,282	\$78,282	\$78,282	\$78,282	\$78,282	\$78,282	\$469,694
5YR PWTF LOAN For Grand Mound	\$9,582	\$9,405	\$9,227	\$9,050	\$0		\$37,264
20YR DWSRF Loan For Grand Mound <sup>2</sup>	\$8,898	\$8,868	8,763	\$8,658	\$8,554	\$8,449	\$52,190
<b>DEBT SERVICE TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,224,694</b>	<b>\$1,226,584</b>	<b>\$1,421,984</b>	<b>\$1,501,547</b>	<b>\$1,254,201</b>	<b>\$1,261,659</b>	<b>\$7,890,669</b>

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

<sup>1</sup>REET = 2 quarter percent Real Estate Excise Tax

<sup>2</sup>A 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.

<sup>3</sup> A formal debt repayment schedule has not been published for this loan. Figures shown are estimates based on county projections.

## E. Transportation:

This section of the Capital Facilities Plan includes those transportation facilities that Thurston County government is responsible for providing (roads, bridges, bike paths and sidewalks). It does not include facilities provided by other entities such as, transit or park and ride lots. Intercity Transit provides transit; and Intercity Transit and the State Department of Transportation provide park-and-ride lots. Road maintenance is not included as part of the capital program; maintenance costs are met from funds earmarked for maintenance.

Safety improvements reflect current road safety standards applied by county engineers. The projects are for "spot"-type improvements to improve safety. They include such things as guardrails, spot roadway alignments, channelization, traffic signal installations or upgrades and railroad crossing signal installations.

Design Standard improvements are upgrades to the existing roadway system to address current design standards. These improvements do not add additional lanes except sometimes at intersections. The needed improvements provide greater lane width, improve roadway curves, or load carrying capacity. They may include safety features and add paved shoulders for multiple uses. Other separate facilities may also be provided for pedestrians and bicycles.

Capacity improvements provide new roads, new lanes, or other improvements that provide greater traffic carrying capacity of existing roads to meet the needs of new growth. The capacity road needs in this Thurston County plan are those identified in the 2004 adopted Regional Transportation Plan, or those approved by Thurston Regional Planning Council as consistent with the plan and which they consider candidates for inclusion in the next update of the Regional Transportation Plan.

The Thurston Regional Transportation Plan 2025 Guiding our Future dated May 2004 calls for an analysis for long range rural mobility strategy, which should include review of Level of Service (LOS) Standards.

(LOS): The adopted standards for urban and rural unincorporated areas are:

- Urban Growth Areas:
  - Grand Mound Urban Growth Area: D
  - For urban growth areas around cities and towns, the standards are those adopted in joint plans with the cities.

The standards are as follows:

Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater: D for highways and arterials  
E for high-density residential corridors

Yelm:	C for residential areas D for commercial and light industrial zones
Tenino & Rainier:	D for arterials (and major collectors in Rainier)

Exception: 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 Urban Growth Area boundaries): C

Exceptions -- to operate at D:

1. Mud Bay Road (from Urban Growth boundary west to Highway 101)
2. Yelm Highway (from Urban Growth boundary at BNRR east to Fair Oaks Rd. SW)

The reason the latter two roadways are allowed to operate at LOS D is that they function differently than most other rural roadways. The Mud Bay Road section is a primary link between the Olympia westside urban area and Highway 101. The Yelm Highway section operates as a primary link between the Olympia southeast urban area and the Lacey southeast urban area. In effect, though outside urban boundaries, they function as urban roadways, providing links between urban areas, or between an urban area and a freeway.

Improvements in this Plan:

Safety: The proposed safety improvements include those that could receive matching funds from state and federal grant programs. There is considerable competition for limited grant funding. In addition to the availability of grant funds, there is the question of difference in priority between the County and the granting agency. It is not unusual for the County's second choice project to be the first choice of the granting agency. Therefore, the County typically submits more projects than there is a likelihood of receiving grant funding. This Capital Facilities Plan, particularly in the later years, reflects more projects than are anticipated to be funded.

The County has eliminated its limited funds budgeted for making some spot improvements that are not eligible to receive grant funds.

Capacity: All improvements needed to provide for increased traffic capacity to meet current and future population growth at adopted Level of Service Standards are included in this plan, with the exception of the Yelm Highway segment in the Olympia Urban Growth Area between Henderson

to Rich Road as noted on pages 6-34 to 6-35 of the CFP Supplement. Congestion on this portion of the highway may drop below LOS D in the short. The South Connector Corridor study completed in late 1998 recommended that a new corridor not be pursued in the south urban area until such time as traffic conditions warrant a new corridor. Furthermore, it recommended that Yelm Highway be widened to include four through lanes, two in each direction, and other road standards that may be incorporated without undue impacts to adjacent property owners. Design is scheduled for completion in 2006 with environmental review completed in 2006. Grant funding is necessary to complete the construction.

Working Reserves: To compensate for not receiving grants or lower percentage of grant participation than anticipated, and for emergencies or unanticipated safety upgrades not specifically listed by name in the plan, a "working reserves" category is included in the plan. This project list includes more projects (of the non-capacity types) than are expected to receive grant funding, so that those projects that are on the granting agencies' high priority list will appear in our Capital Facilities Plan and can be constructed if funding is received. Non-capacity projects in this plan that are not carried out (or delayed) because the needed grant is not received will not affect concurrency and level of service standards because these apply to capacity projects, not safety and design standard improvements.

Design Standard Improvements - Bonds: There still remains a long list of road safety upgrade needs that have been accumulating over the years because they are ineligible or are a low priority for state-federal transportation grants, and they exceed the amount of money available through the county's road fund. This plan proposes the use of more county road funds and continues the policy established in the 1994-1999 Capital Facilities Plan of beginning to reduce this list by funding a portion of the improvements through councilmanic bonds, with the debt service paid from a portion of the county's existing road fund revenues.

(Resolution No. 13498 (12/19/05)]

**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 6-10  
 THURSTON COUNTY  
**ROADS and TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL PROJECTS**  
 2007-2012  
 Numbers in the Thousands of dollars

PROPOSED REVENUE FOR PROJECTS FUND SOURCE	% of Total	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	6 YR TOTAL
GRANTS	Total Progr-15%	1,000.00	1,119.10	1,792.00	822.20	2,072.28	3,497.60	10,303.18
ROAD FUND AMOUNT FOR PROJECTS	72%	4,870.85	11,170.67	8,480.40	3,042.14	7,667.44	12,941.12	48,172.62
OTHER (DEVELOPER, OTHER AGENCY OR BOND)	7%	444.95	905.73	687.60	246.66	621.68	1,049.28	3,955.90
REET	6%	3,100.00	1,900.00	500.00				5,500.00
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$9,415.80</b>	<b>\$15,095.50</b>	<b>\$11,460.00</b>	<b>\$4,111.00</b>	<b>\$10,361.40</b>	<b>\$17,488.00</b>	<b>\$67,931.70</b>

DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	6 YR. TOTAL
From Road Fund on 10 Yr. Proceeds					\$743.00	\$743.00	\$1,486.00

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS	Fund Source	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	6 YR. TOTAL
PROJECT NAME & DESCRIPTION								

CITY OF OLYMPIA GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
<b>CAPACITY</b>								
Mud Bay Rd/Kaiser Rd Intersection Widen 4/5 lanes and signalization	GC/O	195.00						195.00
Yelm Hwy Capacity Project Henderson to Rich	GN/L	460.00	1,000.00	5,600.00				7,060.00
Chehalis Western Trail Bridging the Gap	GN/O	200.00	1,500.00	2,000.00	1,000.00	1,100.00		5,800.00
<b>SAFETY</b>								
26th Ave Upgrade Intersection (West leg) at South Bay	GN/L				20.00	20.00	230.00	270.00
<b>CITY OF OLYMPIA GROWTH AREA TOTALS</b>		<b>\$855.00</b>	<b>\$2,500.00</b>	<b>\$7,600.00</b>	<b>\$1,020.00</b>	<b>\$1,120.00</b>	<b>\$230.00</b>	<b>\$13,325.00</b>

CITY OF LACEY GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
<b>CAPACITY</b>								
Carpenter Rd Capacity Project Widen to 4 Lanes Pacific Ave to Martin Way - Except City	GN/O/L	135.00	900.00	900.00				1,935.00
<b>DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS</b>								
15th Ave Upgrade Sleater-Kinney to Carpenter Rd	GN/L				30.00	150.00	150.00	330.00
Duterrow Rd Upgrade Steilacoom Rd to Martin Way	GC/L	685.00						685.00
Meridian Rd Upgrade Martin Way to Lacey City Limits	GN/L						30.00	30.00
<b>SAFETY</b>								
Carpenter/Shady Ln/20th Ave Intersection Left Turn Channelization	GN/L						25.00	25.00
<b>BRIDGES</b>								
Yelm Hwy Bridge O-12 Replacement at Burlington Northern RR Crossing	GN/L				197.00	20.00	1,288.00	1,505.00
<b>CITY OF LACEY GROWTH AREA TOTALS</b>		<b>\$820.00</b>	<b>\$900.00</b>	<b>\$900.00</b>	<b>\$227.00</b>	<b>\$170.00</b>	<b>\$1,493.00</b>	<b>\$4,510.00</b>

CITY OF TUMWATER & GROWTH AREA	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
<b>DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS</b>								
Henderson Blvd Upgrade Old Hwy 99 to Tumwater Blvd	GN/L					63.00	100.00	163.00
54th Ave Upgrade Trosper Rd to Tumwater City Limits	GN/L					30.00	30.00	60.00
70th Ave Upgrade Kirsop Rd to Tumwater City Limits	GN/L					60.00	200.00	260.00
Trosper Rd Upgrade 49th Ave to 54th Ave	GN/L					10.00	10.00	20.00
Black Lake-Belmore Rd Upgrade 66th to Sapp Rd	GN/L					30.00	30.00	60.00
New Primary Connectors Black Hills Subarea Plan	GN/L/O				300.00	3,500.00	3,847.00	7,647.00
Accountability Restitution Center Road Extension	REET	2,000.00						2,000.00

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS								
PROJECT NAME & DESCRIPTION	Fund Source	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	6 YR. TOTAL
<b>CITY OF TUMWATER GROWTH AREA Cont...</b>	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
<b>SAFETY</b>								
93rd/Lathrop Industrial Drive Intersection Channelization	GN/L/O	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	210.00		218.00
Henderson/Tumwater Boulevard Intersection Signalization	GN/L	5.00	440.00					445.00
<b>BRIDGES</b>								
Henderson Blvd Bridge H-2 Widening at the Deschutes River	GN/L				74.00	10.00	761.00	845.00
<b>CITY OF TUMWATER GROWTH AREA TOTALS</b>		<b>\$2,007.00</b>	<b>\$442.00</b>	<b>\$2.00</b>	<b>\$376.00</b>	<b>\$3,913.00</b>	<b>\$4,978.00</b>	<b>\$11,718.00</b>

GRAND MOUND GROWTH AREA								
	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
<b>CAPACITY</b>								
Old Hwy 99 Upgrade 201st St to SR 12	L/O/GN				100.00	130.00	2,072.30	2,302.30
Old Hwy 99 Turn Lane 203rd to 201st	L/O/REET/GN		500.00					500.00
Old Hwy 99 Upgrade 203rd to 201st St	L/O/GN				150.00	554.40	1,004.80	1,709.20
Elderberry Rd Upgrade SR 12 to 196th Ave	L/O/GN				60.00	102.00	462.90	624.90
Old Hwy 99 Turn Lane Great Wolf S. Boundary to 203rd	L/O/REET/GN	1,000.00						1,000.00
Old Hwy 99 Upgrade Great Wolf S. Boundary to 203rd	L/O/GN				379.00	1,200.00	2,190.00	3,769.00
Old Hwy 99 Turn Lane S. UGA To Great Wolf S. Boundary	L/O/REET/GN			500.00				500.00
Old Hwy 99 Upgrade S. UGA To Great Wolf S. Boundary	L/O/GN				200.00	400.00	1,546.00	2,146.00
Old Hwy 99/US 12 Intersection/Co Portion	L/O/GN		500.00					500.00
Old Hwy 99 SW Bridge O-6 Replacement at Prairie Creek	GN/L/O/REET	100.00	900.00					1,000.00
SR12/Sargent Rd Intersection Channelization	GN/L/O				100.00	150.00	1,000.00	1,250.00
Sr12/New Road at Urban Growth Boundary Intersection Signalization	GN/L/O				200.00	900.00	1,700.00	2,800.00
<b>GRAND MOUND GROWTH AREA TOTALS</b>		<b>\$1,100.00</b>	<b>\$1,900.00</b>	<b>\$500.00</b>	<b>\$1,189.00</b>	<b>\$3,436.40</b>	<b>\$9,976.00</b>	<b>\$18,101.40</b>

CITY OF YELM GROWTH AREA								
	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
<b>DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS</b>								
Wilkinson Rd Upgrade Yelm City Limits to Ordway Rd	B						40.00	40.00
<b>CITY OF YELM GROWTH AREA TOTALS</b>		<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$40.00</b>	<b>\$40.00</b>

RURAL THURSTON COUNTY								
	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
<b>DESIGN STANDARD IMPROVEMENTS</b>								
Bald Hill Rd Upgrade 4 Corners to Smith Prairie	GC/O	385.00	2,970.00					3,355.00
Skookumchuck Rd Upgrade Coal to Whitefish	GC/O	100.00	1,000.00	1,105.00				2,205.00
Hawks Prairie Rd Upgrade Carpenter Rd to Woodland Ck	GC/L	1,760.00						1,760.00
Zangle Rd Upgrade Boston Harbor to Elementary School	B						40.00	40.00
Carper Rd Upgrade James Rd to Old Hwy 9	B						70.00	70.00
Vail Road Upgrade 153rd to Bald Hill Rd	GC/L	230.00	1,580.00	1,034.00				2,844.00
Delphi Road Upgrade 62nd to Mud Bay Rd	GN/L						10.00	10.00
Rich Rd Upgrade Deschutes River to 89th	GC/L	75.00	100.00	150.00	1,100.00	735.00		2,160.00
Vail Road Upgrade Bald Hill Rd to SR507	GC/L	135.00	685.70					820.70
<b>SAFETY</b>								
Old Hwy 99/Tilley Rd Intersection Channelization Improvements	GN/L					7.00	10.00	17.00
Yelm Hwy/Meridian Intersection Channelization Improvements	GN/L						45.00	45.00

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS								
PROJECT NAME & DESCRIPTION	Fund Source	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	6 YR. TOTAL
<b>RURAL THURSTON COUNTY Cont...</b>	See Legend at end of table	Numbers in thousands of dollars						
Johnson Pt Rd Turn Lane at Hawks Prairie Rd	GN/L				20.00	360.00		380.00
Morris Rd Curve Realign Curve in Vicinity of 115th Ln	GC/L	60.00						60.00
Littlerock Rd/113th Ave Intersection Improvements	GN/L/O				10.00	165.00		175.00
Mullen Rd Upgrade Vicinity of 46th Ave SE	GN/L						10.00	10.00
Mud Bay/Delphi Road Intersection Signalization	L	270.00						270.00
Old Hwy 99/McCorkle Rd to Rich Rd	GC	91.70	663.10					754.80
Littlerock Rd/93rd Ave Intersection Channelization	GC	24.30	202.60					226.90
Meridian Rd/Mullen Rd Intersection Grade Change	GC	44.80	368.10					412.90
<b>BRIDGES</b>								
Old Hwy 99 Bridge O-7 Replacement at Scatter Creek	GN/L						57.00	57.00
Hawks Prairie Rd Bridge H-1 Widening at Woodland Creek	GN/L					275.00		275.00
Littlerock Rd Bridge L-5 Replacement at Bloom's Ditch	GN/L					10.00	298.00	308.00
Old Hwy 99 Bridge O-9 Replacement at Scatter Creek North of Tenino	GC/L	313.00						313.00
Old Hwy 99 Bridge O-8 Replacement at Scatter Creek West of Tenino	GN/L						61.00	61.00
Independence Rd Bridge I-3 at Independence Creek South of 201st	GN/L	69.00	984.00					1,053.00
<b>OTHER</b>								
Independence River Bank Protection	GN/L	36.00	406.00					442.00
Case Rd Extension Fish Passage	GN/L	113.00						113.00
128th Ave Fish Passage	GN/L	102.00						102.00
Rural Two Lane Safety Project	GC	225.00	225.00					450.00
ER&R Above Ground Fuel Tank Project	L	250.00						250.00
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)	GN/L	250.00	69.00	69.00	69.00	70.00	70.00	597.00
<b>RURAL THURSTON COUNTY TOTALS</b>		<b>\$4,633.80</b>	<b>\$9,353.50</b>	<b>\$2,458.00</b>	<b>\$1,299.00</b>	<b>\$1,722.00</b>	<b>\$771.00</b>	<b>\$20,237.30</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$9,415.80</b>	<b>\$15,095.50</b>	<b>\$11,460.00</b>	<b>\$4,111.00</b>	<b>\$10,361.40</b>	<b>\$17,488.00</b>	<b>\$67,931.70</b>

**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

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 GRANT FUNDING FOR CAPACITY PROJECTS: There are four capacity projects in the first two years that do NOT have grant funding secured -- three in the Olympia Growth Area: (1) Mud Bay Road from Evergreen Parkway to Kaiser Road; and (2) & (3) Yelm Highway in two sections -- between Henderson and Boulevard and from Boulevard to Rich Road. (4) The Grand Mound Growth Area Old Highway 99 Bridge over Prairie Creek.

REGARDING BONDS PROPOSED TO BE ISSUED: The financing of the bond-financed projects begins in the year 2005 because this is the earliest it looks like the county has enough in the Road Fund to begin to pay debt service. This situation will be further evaluated later in the six-year period. Intent is to begin to fund via bonds some of the road safety needs that has been accumulating but never funded because they are ineligible for grants and they exceed the capacity of money available in the Road Fund.

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:**

County government has outgrown the space available in the county buildings located in the vicinity of the Courthouse campus. For the last few years, the County has been evaluating space needs for government services. In the mid 1990s the County initiated a development program for its first priority needs: a Jail Work Release Annex (completed in 1997), a Juvenile Detention/Family & Juvenile Court building (opened in 1998), an Emergency Services Center (opened in 1998), a new Public Health and Social Services building (opened in 2001), a new Coroner building (opened in 2003), and a new Evaluation and Treatment (Triage) Center (opened in 2005). Work continues to develop the needed additions to Adult Corrections in the form of the Accountability and Restitution Center.

In 2004-05 the County commissioned an Architect to evaluate primarily General Government (GG) space requirements and to start developing options. A list of ten (10) planning principals guided the process. Utilizing the results of their analysis as well as the recommended Level of Service (LOS) standards for county government as noted on Table 6-2, a range of General Government square footage needs evolved. The calculations do not address the continuing need to find space for the growth in Law and Justice Services. Nor does it address the storage needs for areas such as records center activities. In the campus area, building 1 and Build 4 present the greatest opportunity for General Government housing. The calculated space available does not include common areas. Buildings 2 and 3 are currently used for Law and Justice activities. Building 5 is available for remodel and occupancy but has not been added to the numbers noted below.

**Area Needed for General Government (GG)**

69,997 sq.ft.	Per 2004-05 Architectural Programming Study
<u>47,148 sq.ft.</u>	County owned space available for above functions
22,849 sq.ft.	Space required based on concept planning
88,256 sq.ft.	Per County LOS standard of 219 GSF per FTE
<u>47,148 sq.ft.</u>	County owned space available for above functions
41,108 sq.ft.	Space required based on LOS

Several options are being explored for consideration in 2007. Options include Expansion on the Courthouse Campus,, Conversion of other existing properties to GG use, Renovation of the 3400 Building, Acquisition and conversion of additional capacity in the vicinity of the Courthouse, or Maintenance of the status quo (continued leasing). It is anticipated that a decision will be reached in 2006.

The six-year plan includes the County building related projects scheduled in

this planning horizon (identified in Table 6-11). Immediate needs are being addressed by leasing and remodeling.

Future Space Needs: Other space needs (i.e. Law and Justice) for county government, or intergovernmental facilities that the county shares, are not listed here because planning has yet to progress to the point where needs, costs and timing are clearly identified. For example, not yet scheduled in this planning horizon is an analysis of the space needs to retrofit buildings two and three at the main County Courthouse campus on Lakeridge Drive. The retrofit project may be influenced by the Accountability and Restitution Center (ARC) in the Mottman Industrial Area.

[Resolution No. 13498 (12/19/05)]

### **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 6-11  
THURSTON COUNTY BUILDINGS CAPITAL PROJECTS  
2007 - 2012**

j:\cfp:\bldg02-07.xls

<b>REVENUES FOR PROJECTS</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2007-2012 6 Yr. Total</b>	<b>2006</b>
<i>Fund Source</i>								
Bond (1)							-	350,000
Future Bond (1)	31,790,368	20,112,242	3,291,996	1,445,986			56,640,592	
REET/ General Fund	3,542,284	2,043,804	1,593,804	1,593,804	1,593,804	1,593,804	11,961,304	
Roads and Transportation Services	1,500,000						1,500,000	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>36,832,652</b>	<b>22,156,046</b>	<b>4,885,800</b>	<b>3,039,790</b>	<b>1,593,804</b>	<b>1,593,804</b>	<b>70,101,896</b>	<b>350,000</b>

<b>EXPENDITURES--PROJECTS</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2007-2012 6Yr. Total</b>	<b>2006</b>
Accountability and Restitution Center	DFB	18,047,544	12,452,456					30,500,000	
Juvenile Detention and Family Court Bldg	DFB, RFB	1,200,000						1,200,000	
County Master Plan	RFB	6,642,824	6,709,786	3,291,996	1,445,986			18,090,592	
Purchase Additional Campus Buildings	RFB, GF	1,250,000						1,250,000	
Parks Office and Shop Relocation	GF	248,726						248,726	
Information Technology	R, GF	443,804	443,804	443,804	443,804	443,804	443,804	2,662,824	
Business Applications Information Systems	R, GF, RFB	637,218	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	1,387,218	
Sheriff Training Facility	RT	500,000						500,000	
Jail and FJC Security Electronics Replacement	DFB, RFB	350,000						350,000	350,000
Special Capital Projects (Major Maintenance/Repairs)	R, GF	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	6,000,000	
Courthouse Security Projects	GF	947,810						947,810	
High Speed Communication Link	GF, RT, B	350,000	500,000					850,000	
HVAC Renovation - Buildings 1, 2, and 3	RFB, GF	500,000	450,000					950,000	
Mansard Roof Replacement	GF	264,726	450,000					714,726	
Bldg. A Tilley Road Facility Expansion and Roof Repair	RT	1,000,000						1,000,000	
Tilley Road Facility Addition	RTB	3,450,000						3,450,000	
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>36,832,652</b>	<b>22,156,046</b>	<b>4,885,800</b>	<b>3,039,790</b>	<b>1,593,804</b>	<b>1,593,804</b>	<b>70,101,896</b>	<b>350,000</b>

<b>DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>6 Yr Total</b>
Current Debt	3,972,784	3,883,411	3,877,938	3,882,773	3,885,403	3,882,037	23,384,346
Future Debt	3,241,821	3,973,962	4,093,998	4,214,035	4,214,035	3,970,754	23,708,605
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>7,214,605</b>	<b>7,857,373</b>	<b>7,971,936</b>	<b>8,096,808</b>	<b>8,099,438</b>	<b>7,852,791</b>	<b>47,092,951</b>

**LEGEND:**

B Bonds (See Note #1)

R Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)

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

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

GF General Fund

RT Roads and Transportation Services

**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.

**Table 6-12**  
**Thurston County Inventory of Public Facilities**

[Resolution No. 13498 (12/19/05)]

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size		Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
<b>PARKS</b>								
<b>Active Regional Parks</b>								
Regional Athletic Complex	SE	1999		67 AC		Phase II - Develop remaining two soccer, softball and other athletic fields, restrooms, parking, trails, picnic areas, concession stand, and other support facilities	2007-2012	\$4,600,000
Deschutes Falls	SE	1992		155 AC		Develop trails, interpretive center, overlooks, picnic areas, caretaker facilities	2008-2010	\$2,500,000
Burfoot	NE	1973		60 AC		Misc-renovation of trails, bridges, restroom	2007-2008	\$100,000
Frye Cove	NW	1973		86 AC		Develop trails, picnic areas, playfields, restroom, picnic shelters, playground	2012	\$500,000
Kenneydell	SW	1988/1997 1999		18 AC 23 AC Addition		Misc repairs as needed  Parking trails, picnic areas, ballfields, restroom	2009	\$300,000
Deschutes River	SW	1991		50 AC		Develop parking areas, picnic areas, restrooms, viewpoints, trails, camping areas	2009	\$500,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size		Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
<b>Active Regional Parks (Continued)</b>								
Guerin	NW	1976		40 AC		Develop trails, viewpoint, picnic shelters, picnic areas, playground, viewpoints /dock, parking areas	2010-2012	\$1,200,000
Griffin Athletic Fields	NW	Not acquired. Griffin School District property developed as partnership with County.		40AC		One baseball /softball and two soccer fields developed in 2000. Additional fields to be developed as funds become available over the next 3 years.	2009-2011	\$600,000
Louise H. Meyers	NW	1988		38 AC		Develop trails, picnic areas, parking & restroom facilities, playfields /ballfields.	2012	\$300,000
Rainier View Park	SE	1996		54AC		Picnic areas, trails, camping areas, restrooms.	2010	\$300,000
Ruth Prairie Park	SE	1996		35AC		Picnic areas, trails, camping areas, restrooms, picnic shelters	2010	\$300,000
Cooper Point	NW	2005		32 AC		Develop trails, restroom facilities, and parking	2009	\$1,000,000
Boston Harbor Boat Ramp	NE	1980		1 AC				
Total Sites: 13				Total acres: 698				
<b>PRESERVES</b>								
Lake Lawrence Park	SE	1988		15 AC		Develop trails, parking areas, elevated boardwalk, viewpoints, and restroom.	2011	\$300,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size		Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
<b>Preserve (continued)</b>								
Glacial Heritage Preserve	SW	1989-90		1,020 AC		Develop interpretive trails, interpretive center, and basic support facilities.	2012	\$1,500,000
Woodland Creek Wetlands	NE	1987		75 AC		Develop interpretive trails, viewpoints, parking area.	2012	\$300,000
Johnson Point Wetlands	NE	1990		26 AC		Develop interpretive trails, parking.		\$100,000
Black River Natural Area	SW	1991		13 AC		Develop trails, parking, picnic sites.	2012	\$50,000
Indian Road	NE	1940		5 AC		Under consideration for disposal /trade /sale.		
Total sites: 6				Total acres: 1,154				
<b>TRAILS</b>								
Chehalis Western	NE-SE	1991		182 AC		Pave, develop trailheads for parking & restrooms, benches, scenic overlooks.	2008-2012	\$700,000
Chehalis Western Trailhead 89 <sup>th</sup> Ave.	SE	1991		20 AC		Develop parking area, restrooms, ballfields, picnic areas & shelters.	2008-2009	\$800,000
Chehalis Western (Vail Loop Trailhead)	SE	1996		3 AC		Develop parking areas, picnic sites.	2012	\$250,000
67 <sup>th</sup> Ave. Trailhead	NE	1991		Included in trail acreage		Misc. repairs, renovations		\$150,000
Chambers Lake Trailhead	NE	1991		3 acres		Misc. repairs, renovations	2013	

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size		Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
<b>Trails (continued)</b>								
Fir Tree Road Trailhead	SE	1991		2 acres		Add benches, signage, repairs, and renovations	2011	
Yelm Center Trailhead	SE	1993		Included in trail acreage		Misc. repairs, renovations	2012	\$25,000
Tenino Park Trailhead	SW	1993		Included in trail acreage		Add kiosk, signage, benches, misc. repairs, renovations	2009	\$75,000
Rainier Trailhead	SE	1993		Included in trail acreage		Add kiosk, plantings, signage, benches, misc. repairs, renovations	2009	\$75,000
Yelm-Tenino	SE-SW	1993		400 AC		Pave, develop trailheads with parking & restrooms, scenic overlooks, benches.	2008-2011	\$1,200,000
Gate-Belmore	NW-SW	1996		243 AC		Pave, develop trailheads with parking & restrooms, viewpoints, and benches	2012	\$2,500,000
Total sites: 11				Total acres: 853				
<b>HISTORIC SITES</b>								
Mima Cemetery	SW	1869		2 AC				
Ft. Eaton Monument	SE	1982		1 AC		Misc repairs, renovations		
George Washington Bush Monument	SE	1995		1 AC		Misc. repair		
Total sites: 3				Total acres: 4				

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size		Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
<b>STORMWATER DRAINAGE FACILITIES</b>								
(legend: cf = cubic feet, lf = lineal feel, ea = each)								
Detention Pond SSWU	Steilacoom Road	1992	\$7,500	12,000 cf		None	N/A	
Fish Passage	Green Cove Creek	1996	\$70,000	200 lf		None	N/A	
Mountain Aire	Mountain Aire Drive	1998	\$118,300	5,333 cf Retention 2,400 gal. treatment		None	N/A	
Tanglewilde East	Queets and Skykomish	1998	\$237,325	12,182 cf Retention 6,000 gal treatment		None	N/A	
Forest Glen	Forest Glen Drive	1998	\$163,820	3,600 gal treatment		None	N/A	
Boulevard Road	Boulevard Road	1998	\$318,250	503,200cf Retention 294,700 cf treatment		None	N/A	
Evergreen Terrace	Sitka Street	1998	\$153,000	9,146 cf Retention 2,100 gal treatment		None	N/A	
Hidden Forest	Hidden Forest Drive	1999	\$728,800	6,740 cf Retention and treatment		None	N/A	
Carpenter Loop Phase 1 SSWU	Carpenter Loop	1999	\$150,000	6,283 cf Retention		None	N/A	
Carpenter Loop Phase 2	Carpenter Loop	2000	\$175,500	12,436 cf Retention 2,400 gal treatment		None	N/A	
Lake Forest	Walthew Dr., Harvard Dr. Lake Forest Dr.	2000	\$201,800	9731 cf Retention 4,800 gal treatment		None	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
<b>Stormwater (continued)</b>								
Tanglewilde South	5 <sup>th</sup> Way SE	2000	\$174,000	12,436 cf Retention 2,400 gal treatment		None	N/A	
Tnglewilde South	6 <sup>th</sup> Avenue and Bulldog Street	2001	\$237,500	20,561 cf Retention 7,200 gal treatment		None	N/A	
McAllister Treatment Upgrades	Wendy Dr SE; Planer St. SE; Northwood Dr. SE; Gem Dr. SE; Summerfield Ave. SE;	2001	\$222,600	1272 cf Treatment		None	N/A	
Timberlakes Location 1 -6	Sierra Drive SE, Mill Ct SE, Timberlake Dr. SE	2002/2003	\$715,500			None	N/A	
Thompson Place 1 – 3.	Along 14 <sup>th</sup> Ave. NE from Merkel to Horne St. NE	2004	\$895,000			Thompson Place Phase 1 – Regional Pond	2007	\$220,000
<b>SEWER SYSTEMS</b>								
Grand Mound	Southwest	1998	\$10,700,000	1,880 - 5,560 ERU		Sewer main extension.	2006 – 2009	\$200,000
Boston Harbor	North	1990	\$3,000,000	254 ERU		Sewer Collection	2009 – 2011	\$150,000
Tamoshan / Beverly Beach	Cooper Point	1976	\$500,000	116 ERU		Sewer collection and WWTP outfall.	2008 – 2010	\$350,000
Olympic View	NW	1977 Upgraded 1998	\$210,000	27 ERU		None Scheduled	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
<b>WATER SYSTEMS</b>								
Grand Mound	Southwest	1998	\$3,500,000	2,400-4,800 ERU		Corrosion Control and South I-5 Water Main Crossing	2006 - 2009	\$707,000
Boston Harbor	North	1989	\$1,500,000	300 ERU		Water tank security and water main replacement.	2007 – 2011	\$150,000
Tamoshan	Cooper Point	1994	\$300,000	94 ERU		Water main replacement	2007 – 2011	\$140,000
<b>SOLID WASTE</b>								
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		Install fence protection	2006	\$25,000
Rochester Drop Box	Rochester	1960	\$900,000	5,000 tons per year		Construction site improvements, expand tipping and recycling areas.	2006	\$75,000
Summit Lake Drop Box	Summit Lake	1987	\$100,000	1,000 tons per year		None		
WARC Public Tipping Area – Fall Protection and Loading Dock	WARC	Included above in Thurston County Waste and Recovery Center (WARC).				Install fall protection and new loading dock	2006	\$70,000
WARC Process Controls and Alarms	WARC	Included above in Thurston County Waste and Recovery Center (WARC).				Install new controls for process equipment and alarms	2006 – 2007	\$300,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size		Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
<b>Solid Waste (continued)</b>								
WARC Industrial Wastewater Facilities	WARC	1990	\$1,000,000	3.8 million gallons per year		Enhance industrial wastewater treatment processes	2006 – 2008	\$260,000
WARC Self Haul Recycle area	WARC	1988	\$250,000	3,000 tons per year		Relocate existing facility	2006-2007	\$1,000,000
WARC HazoHouse	WARC	1991	\$160,000	150 customers per day		Construct new facility.	2006-2008	\$4,250,000
WARC Closed Loop Park	WARC	Included above in Thurston County Waste and Recovery Center (WARC).				Relocate parking facility and construct other site improvements	2006 – 2007	\$200,000
WARC Metal Material Recovery	WARC	Included above in Thurston County Waste and Recovery Center (WARC).				Construct new facility	2007 – 2008	\$300,000
WARC Gas collection system	WARC	2001	\$1,250,000	2,500 cfm		Construct and modify existing collection system	2007 – 2011	\$600,000
WARC Old Flare Bldg.	WARC	Included above in Thurston County Waste and Recovery Center (WARC).				Construct new employee restroom	2008 – 2009	\$120,000
WARC Yard Waste Recovery Area	WARC	1993	\$600,000	4,400 tons per year		Construct necessary site improvements	2008 – 2009	\$200,000
WARC Storage Bldg.	WARC	1988	\$50,000	500 SF		Construct new Automotive and Equipment Storage Building	2009 – 2010	\$600,000
WARC Maintenance Building	WARC	1994	\$500,000	2,700 SF		Construct new Maintenance Building	2007 – 2008	\$450,000
WARC Inbound and Outbound Tollhouse Plazas	WARC	1999	\$800,000	1,000 SF		Install 3 <sup>rd</sup> Outbound Scale and related improvements	2009 – 2010	\$625,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size		Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
<b>Solid Waste (continued)</b>								
WARC Self-haul Transfer Station	WARC	2000	\$6,775,000	205,000 tons per year		Add public restroom, additional bays and recycle pick-line	2009 – 2010	\$1,575,000
WARC Stormwater Facilities	WARC	1990	\$750,000	25 million gallons		Drainage correction due to settlement	2004-2009	\$59,000
<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>								
Rural Minor Arterial	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	14.467		Note 3	2007-2020	\$7,578,000
Rural Major Collector	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	225.549		Note 3	2007-2020	\$120,117,000
Rural Minor Collector	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	53.630		Note 3	2007-2020	\$31,573,000
Rural Local Access	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	483.313		Note 3	2007-2020	\$30,834,000
Urban Principal Arterial	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	7.308		Note 3	2007-2020	\$4,369,000
Urban Minor Arterial	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	34.667		Note 3	2007-2020	\$26,795,000
Urban Collector	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	17.901		Note 3	2007-2020	\$8,535,000
Urban Local Access	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	184.717		Note 3	2007-2020	\$5,582,000
Bridges	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	107		Note 3	2007-2020	unknown
<p>Bike Lanes--As upgrades are made to any road above local access, paved shoulders are added which provide space for pedestrian and bicycle use.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Note 3: See Capital Facilities Plan Supplement "Basis for Selecting Projects For the CFP".</p>								

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size		Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
<b>COUNTY BUILDINGS</b>								
Parks Mud Bay Shop	Mud Bay		\$136,800	1,824 sq. ft.				
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.		Sell	2004	
Roads Mud Bay Equip. Bldg.	Mud Bay		\$45,623	936 sq. ft.				
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	Fairgrounds		\$1,030,925	9,120 sq. ft.		Major Remodel Poor Physical condition	2005	\$800,000
Benoschek Building	Fairgrounds		\$329,400	4,392 sq. ft.		Fair physical condition		
Deck Building	Fairgrounds		\$137,728	2,560 sq. ft.				
Fir Building	Fairgrounds		\$136,006	2,528 sq. ft.				
Sharp Building	Fairgrounds		\$139,450	2,528 sq. ft.				
Craft and Hobby	Fairgrounds		\$334,421	6,216 sq. ft.				
Lake Building	Fairgrounds		\$172,160	3,200 sq. ft.				
Food Court	Fairgrounds		\$150,640	2,800 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
<b>County Building (continued)</b>								
Deschutes Grange	Fairgrounds		\$42,454	912 sq. ft.		Fair physical condition		
Restroom Buildings	Fairgrounds		\$228,229	1,702 sq. ft.				
Caretakers Residence	Fairgrounds		\$42,000	840 sq. ft.				
Exposition Hall	Fairgrounds		\$942,000	7,000 sq. ft.				
All sheds and booths	Fairgrounds		\$49,065	3,271 sq. ft.		Fair physical condition		
All Barns	Fairgrounds		\$696,000	48,600 sq. ft.		Fair physical condition		
Courthouse Bldg. 1	Olympia	1978	\$4,786,496	45,421 sq. ft.		HVAC, ADA, MMR		
Courthouse Bldg. 2	Olympia	1978	\$4,949,940	35,914 sq. ft. Superior Ct.: 6 Ctrms.		HVAC, ADA, MMR		
Courthouse Bldg. 3	Olympia	1978	\$12,899,284	74,471 sq. ft. Jail: 266 beds Dist. Ct.: 3 Ctrms		HVAC, ADA, MMR		
Courthouse Bldg. 4	Olympia	1987	\$1,849,432	17,622 sq. ft.				
Social Services BHR	Lacey	Leased	\$791,750			By tenant per lease agreement		
Heritage Court	Olympia	1992	Leased	17,850 sq. ft.		N/A		
Parkmont	Olympia	1992	Leased	2,825 sq. ft.		N/A		
Elections 2905-29th Ave SW	Tumwater	1994	Leased	3,900 sq. ft.		N/A		
Elections 2905-29th Ave SW	Tumwater	1995	Leased	4,200 sq. ft.		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
<b>County Buildings (continued)</b>								
PAO Civil 2415 Evergreen Park Dr.	Olympia	1996	Leased	5,500 sq. ft.		N/A		
Pacific Mtn. Capital Financial Center	Lacey	1994	Leased	9,294 sq. ft.		N/A		
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	?	\$168,050 Leased  Out to tenant	House		By Tenant per Lease Agreement		
Courthouse Jail Annex and Bathroom Facilities	Olympia	1997	\$850,000	3,752 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		
Records Center Annex	Tumwater	1997	Leased	3,900 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	<u>N/A</u>

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS			
Facility Name	Location	Date Acquired	Estimated Current Value	Capacity or size		Needed Improvements	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
<b>County Buildings (continued)</b>								
Social Services	Lacey	Vacant	\$163,600 Lease Out to Tenant	unknown		Roof, Floor Coverings	2004	<u>\$40,000</u>
Market Square Cooperative Extension	Lacey	1999	Lease	3,766 sq. ft.		N/A	N/A	N/A
Market Square Cooperative Extension	Lacey	1999	Lease	3,766 sq.ft.		N/A	N/A	N/A
Drug Court / Bristol Court	Olympia	2005	Lease	2,504 sq. ft		N/A	N/A	N/A
Office of Assigned Counsel / Irving Street Station	Tumwater	2005	Lease	5,872 sq.ft.		N/A	N/A	N/A
PAO Civil Division / Glenn Building	Olympia	2005	Lease / Purchase Option	4,337 sq. ft.		N/A	N/A	N/A

## VI. 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 - 13 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 6-13
- School districts not listed in Table 6-13
- Grand Mound/Rochester Park & Recreation District
- Tanglewilde Park and Recreation District
- Public Utility District
- Cemetery Districts #1 and #2
- Intercity Transit
- 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 6-13 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 6-13  
Facilities of Other Public Entities**

Resolution No. 13498 (12/19/05)

<b>Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)</b>		<b>6 Year Costs</b>	<b>Funding Source (For 6 year projects)</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Location</b>		
<b>Rainier School District #307</b>			
Primary School Addition	600 Third St. W	\$5,000,000	Secured Bond and State Matching Funds
Middle School Modernization	202 Second St. W	\$7,000,000	Secured Bond and State Matching Funds
High School Modernization	308 Second St. W	\$4,000,000	Secured Bond and State Matching Funds
<b>Rainier School District Total</b>		<b>\$16,000,000</b>	
<b>North Thurston School District</b>			
Construction to preserve and maintain existing facilities	Varies	\$7,000,000	Secured Local Funds
Temporary Classrooms Purchase (5 per year) and Relocation		\$1,500,000	Secured and Unsecured Funds (Voluntary Mitigation)
Site acquisitions for future schools		\$1,200,000	Mitigation fees
<b>North Thurston School District TOTAL</b>		<b>\$9,700,000</b>	
<b>Olympia School District</b>			
Reeves Middle School Addn's/Modernization	2200 N. Quince St. Olympia	\$13,700,000	Secured local bonds.

<b>Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)</b>		<b>6 Year Costs</b>	<b>Funding Source (For 6 year projects)</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Location</b>		
<b>Olympia School District (continued)</b>			
Pioneer Elementary School New Classroom Wing and Improvements, Phase IV	1655 Carlyon Ave. SE, Olympia	\$6,800,000	Secured local bonds, impact and mitigation fees.
Various small works projects (incl. asbestos abatement, facility improvements, playfield improvements)	Various school sites	\$9,500,000	Secured local bonds
<b>Olympia School District TOTAL</b>		<b>\$30,000,000</b>	
<b>Tumwater School District #33</b>			
Site Acquisition & Development	Various sites	\$3,000,000	Mitigation fees and impact fees and secured local bond funds
Portables	Various sites	\$1,750,000	Mitigation and impact fees and secured local bond funds
District Office Remodel and Addition	419 Linwood Ave. SW	\$3,908,617	Secured local bond funds
M.T. Simmons Elem. Remodel	1205 S 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street	\$5,280,051	Secured local bond funds and state match
P/G Schmidt Elem. Replacement	225 Dennis Street SE	\$11,083,299	Unsecured local bonds and state match
Littlerock Elem. Bldg. "B" Remodel	12710 Littlerock Rd SW	\$767,100	Secured local bond funds and state match

<b>Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)</b>		<b>6 Year Costs</b>	<b>Funding Source (For 6 year projects)</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Location</b>		
<b>Tumwater School District #33 (continued)</b>			
Tumwater M.S. Bldg. 'A' Remodel	6335 Littlerock Rd SW	\$418,882	Secured local bond funds and state match
THS Bldg. 'E' Classroom Remodel	700 Israel Rd. SW	\$655,576	Secured local bond funds and state match
Tumwater Hill Elem. Remodel	3120 Ridgeview Ct. SW	\$7,979,914	Unsecured local bonds and state match
East Olympia Elem. Remodel	8700 Rich Rd. SE	\$7,972,134	Unsecured local bonds and state match
New Market Skills Center Capital Improvements	7299 New Market St. SW	\$675,000	State grants
New Market Skills Center New Lab Tech. Bldg.	7299 New Market St. SW	\$4,464,492	State grants
THS Vocational Ed. Facility Upgrade	700 Israel Rd. Sw	\$100,000	Secured local bond funds
Elementary No. 7 Site Development		\$2,230,887	Mitigation and impact fees and secured local bond funds
New Elementary No. 7 Building		\$12,437,533	Unsecured local bonds and state match
Technology and infrastructure projects	Various	\$5,767,081	Secured and unsecured local bond funds

<b>Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)</b>		<b>6 Year Costs</b>	<b>Funding Source (For 6 year projects)</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Location</b>		
<b>Tumwater School District #33 (continued)</b>			
Health, Safety & Security Projects	Various	\$2,031,091	Secured and unsecured local bond funds
Buildings & Grounds Enhancements	Various	\$1,300,000	Secured and unsecured local bond funds
Other Misc. Capital Projects	Various	\$1,979,833	Secured and unsecured local bond funds
<b>Tumwater School District Total</b>		<b>\$73,801,490</b>	
<b>Yelm Community Schools District #2</b>			
Yelm High School Addition and Modernization (2006)	1315 Yelm Ave. West	\$29,386,622	Secured local funds and unsecured state match funds
Construct New Junior High School (To be completed in 2006)	10605 Carter St. SE	\$19,662,266	Secured local funds and unsecured state match funds
Addition to Prairie Elementary School (2007)	16535 110th Ave SE	\$730,000	Secured local funds
Construct New Elementary	Yelm UGA	\$13,000,000	Secured local funds and unsecured state match funds and mitigation funds
Addition to Fort Stevens Elementary School (2007)	16525 100th Way SE	690,000	Secured local funds
Misc. Capital Projects		\$21,601,660	Secured local funds
<b>Yelm Community Schools TOTALS</b>		<b>\$85,070,548</b>	

<b>Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)</b>		<b>6 Year Costs</b>	<b>Funding Source (For 6 year projects)</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Location</b>		
<b>Fire District #1</b>			
Headquarters Facility	187 <sup>th</sup> and Sargent Rd. SW	\$3.5 million	Capital Facilities Bond
<b>Fire District #8</b>			
District Fire Training Center	3349 South Bay Rd. NE	\$1 million	To be determined
<b>Fire District #9</b>			
Replace fire stations #91, 95		\$ 4,300,000	Secured bond funds
Remodel and enlarge station #94	Cooper Point Road at 66 <sup>th</sup> Ave NW	\$250,000	Unsecured local bond funds
<b>Fire District #9 Total</b>		<b>\$ 4,550,000</b>	
<b>Fire District #11</b>			
Rebuild/relocate Station # 11-3	3131 Maytown Rd SW	\$1,400,000	Unsecured local bond funds
Rebuild/enlarge Station #11-4	2640 Trevue Ave SW	\$800,000	Unsecured local bond funds
<b>Fire District #11 Total</b>		<b>\$2,200,000</b>	
<b>Port of Olympia (2006 – 2007)</b>			
KGY Tower Relocation	Peninsula	\$70,000	Local funds
North Point Sewer force main	Peninsula	\$184,252	Local funds
Maintenance Dredge	Marine Terminal	\$874,825	Local funds
Underground power	Marine Terminal	\$100,000	Local funds
Backflow Prevention	Marine Terminal	\$143,490	Local funds
Line-of-Sight Correction and Rehabilitation	Airport	\$6,500,000	Federal grant (95%) and local funds

<b>Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)</b>		<b>6 Year Costs</b>	<b>Funding Source (For 6 year projects)</b>
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Location</b>		
<b>Port of Olympia (2006 – 2007)</b>			
Annual Taxilane Rehabilitation	Airport	\$300,000	Local funds
Rehab Taxiway 2 (Echo) & Apron	Airport	\$1,300,000	Federal grant (95%) and local funds
Relocate Taxiway F	Airport	\$1,500,000	Federal grant (95%) and local funds
Rehabilitate Taxiway C & North W	Airport	\$1,500,000	Federal grant (95%) and local funds
Acquire Land Runway 35 RPZ and RW 17 Easement	Airport	\$1,250,000	Federal grant (95%) and local funds
Relocate Taxiway G	Airport	\$2,000,000	Federal grant (95%) and local funds
Construct Southeast GA Vehicle Access Road	Airport	\$2,000,000	Federal grant (95%) and local funds
Boatyard Expansion	Marina & Boatworks	\$127,730	Local funds
Backflow Prevention	Marine & Boatworks	\$24,840	Local funds
<b>Port of Olympia Total</b>		<b>\$17,875,137</b>	

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 6-14

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"> <li>• Utility Corridors<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• Transportation Corridors<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Sewage Treatment Facilities</li> <li>• Stormwater Management Facilities</li> <li>• Recreation</li> <li>• Schools</li> <li>• Other Public Uses</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: See Chapter 2, Land Use, for an inventory map of public purpose lands.</i></p>	<p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large-scale Transportation Facilities</li> <li>• State Educational Facilities</li> <li>• State and Local Correctional Facilities</li> <li>• Solid Waste Handling Facilities</li> <li>• Airports</li> <li>• Inpatient Facilities Such As: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Substance Abuse Facilities</li> <li>➤ Mental Health Facilities</li> <li>➤ Group Homes</li> <li>➤ Secure Community Transition Facilities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

1. Addressed in the Utilities Chapter.

2. Addressed in the Transportation Chapter.

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 6-15.

Table 6-15

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
Pacific Avenue Wetland (Stormwater retentions/ parks/school facility)	WWM	Lacey			
Mallard Pond Phase II	WWM	Lacey			
CLT Green Cove Creek Basin Project-Land Acquisition	WWM-	Olympia			
Grand Mound – WSDOT SRA Sewer Connection	WWM				WSDOT
WARC HazoHouse Replacement	WWM				Ecology
Salmon Creek Basin Plan – West Basin Alternative	WWM	Tumwater			
WARC Closed Loop Park	WWM				WSU Master Growers

Projects Serving Shared Needs	Sharing Jurisdictions or Districts				
	Thurston County	Cities or Towns	School Districts	Port of Olympia	State
Chehalis Western Trail (coordinated recreation use/ stormwater retention/utility corridor)	Parks	Lacey Parks and Public Works, Olympia Parks and Public Works			Fish and Wildlife
Yelm – Tenino Trail (coordinated recreation use/ stormwater retention/utility corridor/highway access/ potential future rail use)	Parks	Yelm Parks and Public Works, Rainier Parks and Public Works, Tenino Parks and Public Works			WDOT
Gate to Belmore Trail (coordinated recreation use/ potential future rail use)	Parks	Tumwater Parks		Rail Transit (future)	Parks
Regional Athletic Complex Property (coordinated development)	Parks	Lacey Parks			WDOT
Griffin Athletic Fields	Parks		Griffin		
Park Acquisitions	Parks	Lacey Olympia Tumwater, Yelm, Rainier			WDNR, WDOT, Parks
Glacial Heritage Preserve	Parks				WDNR
Boston Harbor Boat Ramp	Parks				Fish and Wildlife
Lake Lawrence Park (coordinated recreation use)	Parks				Fish and Wildlife, Natural Resources

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 alterative 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.*