THURSTON COUNTY
CHAPTER 6, CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN
Annual Amendment

2018-2023

THURSTON COUNTY
WASHINGTON
SINCE 1852

Adopted December 12, 2017
Resolution No. 15550

Chapter 6, Capital Facilities Plan

Table of Contents

Table of Tables

CHAPTER SIX -- CAPITAL FACILITIES

I. Introduction

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

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

However, this plan covers a six-year period, the years 2017-2023. Transportation grants typically require a six-year plan, and this period is one in which the County can address its immediate capital needs. Thurston County's growth rates, and therefore the analysis of corresponding capital needs - and ability to fund those needs, may be unpredictable beyond the six-year period.

The Thurston County Comprehensive Plan projects that by the year 2035, the population of Thurston County is projected to grow to 378,000, an increase of 120,000 or 46.5% from the 2013 population of 258,000. Which means that within the next six years, the population is expected to grow by almost 14%.

The Revised Code of Washington 82.02.050 (2) authorizes Counties required to plan under the Growth Management Act (GMA) to "impose impact fees on development activity as part of the financing for public facilities…" In 2010, The Board of County Commissioners requested a study be performed to consider impact fees for transportation, recreation facilities (parks), and schools that: 1) equitably recovers the cost of transportation, recreation, and school infrastructure improvements as a result of new development; 2) is less of an administrative

burden to the county and school districts, and development community than the current SEPA mitigation process; and 3) provides the timely and equitable financing of public services and improvements to mitigate impacts from new development.

The study reviewed county and school capital facilities plans, developed service areas for transportation, school and park projects and produced a fee schedule applicable to the type of project based on its location in its related service area. The Board adopted impact fees in December 2012, effective April 2, 2013 for transportation, parks and some school districts.

The 2017-2023 CFP indicates what transportation and parks projects will be funded by impact fees. Additionally, the County will also adopt the Capital Facility Plans for those school districts that opt into the impact fee system. The Thurston County Code (TCC) enables the use of impact fees. The actual fees charged are subject to change based on the cost of projects contained with the annual CFP and will be adopted as part of the annual CFP and County budgeting process.

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

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

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

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

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

Capital facility planning is guided by goals, objectives, and policies. The first level of guidance is provided by the State Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A). In addition, there are countywide goals, objectives and policies that apply to capital facility planning. These are listed below. Additional programmatic or department-specific goals, objectives, and policies are listed within the subsequent relevant sections of this plan. Goals and policies specifically related to transportation can be found in Chapter 5, Transportation and specific goals and policies related to utilities in Chapter Seven 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 all possible adverse impacts and follow mitigation sequencing to mitigate any unavoidable 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 to the greatest extent possible and mitigate unavoidable adverse impacts.
2. Public facilities should be sited with the least disruption to 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.

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

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

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

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

Table 6-1

Level of Service Standards and Comparison to Previous CFP

Facility	**Level of Service (LOS) Units**	**This CFP LOS Standard** *(2018-2023)*	Existing Service Level *(2001 unless noted otherwise)*	**Previously Adopted LOS Standard** *(2004-2009)*
Coroner	**Gross Sq. Ft. (GSF)** "x" GSF for up to 200 autopsies per year (& medical exam. system)	1994 Space Planning Report: 6,656	6,950 (gross SF) (2003)	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
Courts--District	GSF per courtroom unit *(Ctrm., Judic. chamber, Conf. & Jury Rms.)*	1994 Space Plng. Report: 3320/jury ctrm. unit; 2346/non-jury unit 2000: 3 Ctrms.; 3 judicial positions 2014: 4 Ctrms. ; 3.5 judicial positions. 2015 Courthouse Study projected 1,800-2,500/jury	Net SF: 2284/jury ctrm. unit 1178/non-jury unit 4 ctrms.	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard *(2018-2023)*	Existing Service Level *(2001 unless noted otherwise)*	Previously Adopted LOS Standard *(2004-2009)*
		courtroom only. 1,500/non-jury courtroom only. 2015 Courthouse Study cited current need for 5 Courtrooms and 2045 need for 7 courtrooms.		
Courts--Superior	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. 2015 Courthouse Study projected 1,800-2,500/jury courtroom only. 1,500/non-jury courtroom only. 2015 Courthouse Study cited current need for 7 Courtrooms and 2045 need for 11 courtrooms.	Net SF: 3346/jury ctrm. unit 1390/non jury unit ctrms.	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
Courts--Juvenile & Family	GSF per courtroom unit *(Ctrm., Judic. chamber, Conf. Rms.)*	1994 Space 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.
Detention—Juvenile	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.
Jail—Adult *(incl. Satellite)*	Beds/inmates for target years *(based on peak population forecasts by Regional Jail Advisory. Committee [RJAC] 8/28/96*)	2005: 408 beds/487inmates 2015: 777 beds/653 inmates TCCF Population Project No. 2 – reviewed 7/3/2003	2004: 404 av. daily 408 beds operational capacity.	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP.
All Co. Gov't. Administration	"x" GSF per FTE employee	219 GSF—for new construction. For existing facilities & rental space: meet the new construction standards to the extent possible.	202 (1994)	Same as 2004 – 2009 CFP without the proposed new addition.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard *(2018-2023)*	Existing Service Level *(2001 unless noted otherwise)*	Previously Adopted LOS Standard *(2004-2009)*
GSF = Gross Square Feet *(includes internal office and external building circulation [hallways, stairwells and elevator shafts], mechanical, public restrooms, etc.)* **NSF = Net Square Feet** *(does not include the above items)*				
Parks & Trails **Parks & Trails (Continued)**	**LOS 1: Develop** all or part of previously acquired property, or complete development projects that are underway, focusing on those that fill deficiencies in priorities defined by the public, i.e., trails, water access, athletic facilities. Main emphasis is on development of existing undeveloped park properties. **LOS 2: Acquire** additional park lands to insure that a 3.5 acre/1,000 population of developed park and recreation facilities LOS can be maintained through 2021.	**LOS 1: Development (by 2014):** An additional 590 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**.** **LOS 2: Acquisition:** Acquire opportunity properties to insure an adequate land base in the future for maintaining the 3.5 acres/1,000 population LOS. Currently, the inventory of undeveloped land is adequate to meet this LOS.	6 of 34 park sites and 35 miles of 48 miles of trails have been developed. Acquired: 2,712 acres have been acquired.	Same as 2012-2017 CFP.
Roads	Letter designations based on motorist delays & traffic flow *(A=no delays to F=delays of over one minute)* Table 5-1 (p. 5-8) in Chapter 5 of the Comp. Plan describes the letter system.	**Urban:** *Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater UGAs*--D (E for high density residential corridors) *Yelm UGA*--C resid. zones; D commercial & Lt. Indus. zones; F urban core *Tenino & Rainier UGAs—D Grand Mnd. UGA*--D **Rural:** C For exceptions: see p. 6-39	**Urban:** Varies: A - E **Rural:** Varies: A - D	Standard only relates to LOS for roadway capacity – for overall roadway needs / priorities see supplement.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard *(2018-2023)*	Existing Service Level *(2001 unless noted otherwise)*	Previously Adopted LOS Standard *(2004-2009)*
Sewer Systems **Rural:** Boston Harbor, Tamoshan, Beverly Beach, and Olympic View; **Urban:** Grand Mound Woodland Creek Estates	Equivalent Residential Units (ERU): Cubic feet per month of sewerage discharge as measured at the source, based on the following minimums; Rural: ERU=900 cf/mo Urban: ERU=700 cf/mo	**Rural:** Capacity to provide sewer collection and wastewater treatment services for residential uses. **Urban:** Capacity to provide sewer collection and wastewater treatment services for residential, commercial, and industrial uses. In addition, Rural and Urban systems shall meet federal, state and local permit requirements for receiving water standards, whenever possible.	For both Rural and Urban systems, the number of ERUs varies by facility.	Same as 2015-2020 CFP.
Water Systems **Rural:** Boston Harbor and Tamoshan; **Urban:** Grand Mound	**Equivalent Residential Units (ERU):** Cubic feet per month of water consumed as measured at the source, based on the following minimums: **Rural:** ERU=900 cf/mo **Urban**: ERU-700 cf/mo	**Rural:** Capacity to provide domestic water and fire flow services for residential and limited commercial uses. **Urban:** Capacity to provide domestic water and fire flow services for residential, commercial, and industrial uses. In addition, Rural and Urban water systems shall meet current federal, state and local drinking water standards, whenever possible.	For both Rural and Urban systems, the number of ERUs varies by facility	Same as 2015 – 2020 CFP
Solid Waste	**LOS A –** Includes all 3 service level units; **LOS B –** Includes a combination of any 2 service level units. **LOS C –** Includes 1 or no service level units.			
	1. Regulatory	**New or Existing Facility:** Meets or exceeds federal, state, and/or local regulatory requirements.	Capacity to meet waste generated by users: Disposed of 172,000 tons per yr.	Last standards adopted 2001.

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard *(2018-2023)*	Existing Service Level *(2001 unless noted otherwise)*	Previously Adopted LOS Standard *(2004-2009)*
	2. Health/Safety:	**New or Existing Facility:** Meets or exceeds federal, state, and/or local health / safety issues for public or employees.	Capacity to meet waste generated by users: Diverted (reduced or recycled 38% of waste generated.	Last standards adopted 2009.
	3. Policy:	**New or Existing Facility:** Addresses a solid waste comprehensive plan goal or policy.		Last Standards adopted 2009
Stormwater	**LOS A -** Includes all 3 service level units **LOS B -** Includes a combination of any two service level units. **LOS C –** Includes 1 or no service level unit.			
	Local Flood Control: Provide **c**apacity to store stormwater runoff volume and / or reduce peak flow from an "x" year storm event.	**Facilities for new growth:** Conveyance meets 25-year 24-hour event for public and private street piped systems and 100-year, 24-hour event for open channels and property protection. Detention: Provide capacity to store stormwater runoff volume and reduce peak durations such that post-development stormwater discharge durations match pre-development durations for a range of pre-developed discharge rates from 50% of the 2-year peak flow up to the full 50-year peak flow. On-Site Mitigation (Low Impact Development) Meet the LID Performance Standard of 8% of the 2-year peak flow to 50% of the 2-year peak flow or use LID BMPs from a list, in preferential order, to meet the LID standard. **Facilities to improve existing deficiencies:**	**New facilities:** At the standards. **Pre-existing facilities:** Varies	Same as 2013-2018 CFP Standard adopted 2009 with New Drainage Manual effective December 31, 2016

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard *(2018-2023)*	Existing Service Level *(2001 unless noted otherwise)*	Previously Adopted LOS Standard *(2004-2009)*
Stormwater (continued)		Meet the new growth standard wherever possible.		
	Water Quality: Meet federal, state, or local water quality standards in streams, rivers, lakes**,** and Puget Sound	**Facilities for new growth:** Water Quality Design Storm Volume: The 91st percentile, 24-hour runoff volume estimated by an approved continuous runoff model. Water Quality Design Flow Rate: Preceding detention facilities: Flow rate at or below which 91 percent of runoff volume is routed through the facility as determined by a continuous runoff model. Downstream of detention facilities: Flow rate of 2-year recurrence interval release from detention facility designed to meet flow duration standard using an approved continuous runoff model. Provide basic treatment (80% TSS removal), enhanced treatment (50% metals removal), phosphorous, and/or oil treatment based on project type & size. **Facilities to improve existing deficiencies:** Meet the new growth standards wherever possible**.**	**Varies:** See 303D list, County Water Resources Profile, and Monitoring Reports	Same as 2013-2018 CFP Standard adopted 2009 with New Drainage Manual effective December 31, 2016

Facility	Level of Service (LOS) Units	This CFP LOS Standard *(2018-2023)*	Existing Service Level *(2001 unless noted otherwise)*	Previously Adopted LOS Standard *(2004-2009)*
	Habitat: Maintain or restore in-stream flows, reduce peaks, minimize bank full flow durations, improve water quality to address habitat related issues (e.g. salmonid, shellfish, etc)	**In-stream Flow Goals at Basin Build out Conditions** ***Peak Flows****:* Maintain, or where possible, reduce durations. ***Bank full Flows:*** Maintain or where possible, reduce durations. ***Base Flows:*** Maintain, or where possible, increase.	**In- stream flows:** Site development proposals may not exceed 2 year pre-developed release rate per Regional Drainage Manual**.**	Same as 2013-2018 CFP standard adopted in 2009 with adoption of new Drainage Manual effective December 31, 2016.

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 – Some existing facilities constructed prior to 2009 and some retrofitted facilities to improve existing deficiencies
- Parks Development

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

- Some Urban Roads

IV. Existing Conditions

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

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

Table 6-3
Thurston County Inventory of Public Facilities

Resource Stewardship Department– Water Resources

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
STORMWATER DRAINAGE FACILITIES (legend: cf = cubic feet, lf = lineal feel, ea = each)							
Detention Pond SSWU	Steilacoom Road	1992	$7,500	12,000 cf	Replace / rehab. pond	2020	$22,000
Fish Passage	Green Cove Creek	1996	$70,000	200 lf	Replace Facility	2046	$647,000
Mountain Aire	Mountain Aire Drive	1998	$118,300	5,333 cf Retention 2,400 gal. treatment	Facility Replacement	2018	$337,000
Tanglewilde East	Queets and Skykomish	1998	$237,325	12,182 cf Retention 6,000 gal treatment	Replace Infiltration Gallery	2018	$460,000
Forest Glen	Forest Glen Drive	1998	$163,820	3,600 gal treatment	Replace Gallery	2028	$587,000
Boulevard Road	Boulevard Road	1998	$318,250	503,200 cf Retention 294,700 cf treatment	Restore infiltration system.	2038	$567,000
Evergreen Terrace	Sitka Street	1998	$153,000	9,146 cf Retention 2,100 gal treatment	Replace Gallery	2023	$ $515,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
Hidden Forest	Hidden Forest Drive	1999	$728,800	6,740 cf Retention and treatment	Replace pump station, conveyance, outfall.	2019	$1,046,000
Carpenter Loop Phase 1 SSWU	Carpenter Loop	1999	$150,000	6,283 cf Retention	Replace gallery & treatment facility.	2029	$472,000
Carpenter Loop Phase 2	Carpenter Loop	2000	$175,500	12,436 cf Retention 2,400 gal treatment	Replace gallery & treatment facility.	2030	$479,000
Lake Forest	Walthew Dr., Harvard Dr. Lake Forest Dr.	2000	$201,800	9731 cf Retention 4,800 gal treatment	Replace treatment facility and gallery.	2030	$585,000
Tanglewilde South	5th Way SE	2000	$174,000	12,436 cf Retention 2,400 gal treatment	Replace treatment facility and gallery.	2030	$529,000
Tanglewilde South	6th Avenue and Bulldog Street	2001	$237,500	20,561 cf Retention 7,200 gal treatment	Replace treatment facility and gallery.	2031	$798,000
McAllister Treatment Upgrades	Wendy Dr SE; Planer St. SE; Northwood Dr. SE; Gem Dr. SE; Summerfield Ave. SE;	2001	$222,600	1272 cf Treatment	Replace facilities.	2051	$336,000
Timberlakes Location 1 -6	Sierra Drive SE, Mill Ct SE, Timberlake Dr. SE	2002/2003	$715,500	9,500 gal. treatment 25,000 cf retention	Replace facilities.	2032	$2,060,000
Thompson Place 1 – 3.	Along 14th Ave. NE from Merkel to Horne St. NE	2004	$895,000	11 cfs treatment, 52,000 cf retention	Thompson Place Phase 1 – 3 Regional Pond	2034	$2,726,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
Hawaiian Court	Cul de sac	2005	$172,000		Replace Treatment facility and gallery	2035	$687,000
Jim Court	Cul de sac	2005	$69,300	12 cfs treatment	Replace treatment facility	2045	$492,000
Mallard Pond	Mallard Dr. at Rockcress	2006	$543,000	25,000 cf retention	Replace facilities and profile pond	2026	$305,000
Athens Beach		2006	$21,600	Conveyance	Replace conveyance	2056	$179,000
Lakemont and 49th	Lakemont Ave. and 49th	2007	$235,000	8 cfs treatment	Treatment & conveyance.	2057	$1,777,000
Evergreen Terrace Phase I	9th Ave	2008	$365,000	Treatment retention	Replace facilities	2054	$1,095,000
Evergreen Terrace Phase II	8th Ave	2009	$126,000	Lf conveyance retention	Replace conveyance and profile pond	2049	$155,000
Evergreen Terrace Phase III	9th Ave. at Torrey	2011	$350,000		Treatment and Conveyance	2051	$430,000
Vactor Waste Decant Facility	WARC	2011	$400,000		Replace Facilities	2051	$1,229,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
Husky Way Infiltration Gallery	Husky Way and Carpenter Road	2012	$200,000	8 Drywells & 350 lf 12 in. perforated infiltration pipe	Replace Facilities	2032	$561,000
Meridian Heights Bluff Repair and Outfall	East Meridian Drive NE on Nisqually View Loop	2013	$150,000	Pipe and outfall on the beach	Replace Facilities	2043	$311,000
Swayne Road NE Outfall and Biofiltration Swales	6249 Swayne Rd NE	2016	$450,000	Pipe and outfall on the beach and filtration swales along road	Replace Facilities	2046	$900,000
Woodland Creek Estates	Woodland Creek Estates Subdivision located north of 15th Avenue NE	2017	$376,000	Pipes, catch basins, and storm-water treatment vaults	Replace Facilities	2047	$800,000

Public Works Department - Parks

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
PARKS Active Regional Parks							
Deschutes Falls	SE	1992		155 Acres	Develop trails, interpretive center, overlooks, picnic areas, caretaker facilities	2021	$150,000

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
Kenneydell	SW	1988 / 1997 1999		18 Acres 23 Acres Addition	Misc repairs as needed Parking trails, picnic areas, ball fields, restroom	2021	$100,000
Guerin	NW	1976		40 Acres	Develop trails, viewpoint, picnic shelters, picnic areas, playground, viewpoints /dock, parking areas	2020	$140,000
Rainier View Park	SE	1996		54 Acres	Picnic areas, trails, camping areas, restrooms.		
Ruth Prairie Park	SE	1996		35 Acres	Picnic areas, trails, camping areas, restrooms, picnic shelters		
Cooper Point	NW	2005		32 Acres	Develop trails, restroom facilities, and parking		
PRESERVES							
Lake Lawrence Park	SE	1988		15 Acres			
Glacial Heritage Preserve	SW	1989-90		1,020 Acres	.		
Woodland Creek Wetlands	NE	1987		75 Acres			
Johnson Point Wetlands	NE	1990		26 Acres			
Black River Natural Area	SW	1991		13 Acres	.		
Indian Road	NE	1940		5 Acres			
TRAILS							
Chehalis Western	NE-SE	1991		182 Acres	Pave, develop trailheads for parking & restrooms, benches, scenic overlooks.	–2018-2023	$900,000
Yelm – Tenino Trail	SE	1991		20 Acres	Deschutes Bridge Upgrades, develop parking area, restrooms, ball fields, picnic areas & shelters.	2018-2022	$725,000
Chehalis Western (Vail Loop Trailhead)	SE	1996		3 Acres	.		

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
67th Ave. Trailhead	NE	1991		Included in trail acreage			
Chambers Lake Trailhead	NE	1991		3 Acres			
Fir Tree Road Trailhead	SE	1991		2 Acres			
Yelm Center Trailhead	SE	1993		Included in trail acreage			
Tenino Park Trailhead	SW	1993		Included in trail acreage			
Rainier Trailhead	SE	1993		Included in trail acreage			
Yelm-Tenino	SE-SW	1993		400 Acres			
Gate-Belmore	NW-SW	1996		243 Acres	Pave, develop trailheads with parking & restrooms, viewpoints, and benches	2019	$25,000
Smith Lake	NE	2007		3 Acres			
HISTORIC SITES							
Mima Cemetery	SW	1869		2 Acres			
Ft. Eaton Monument	SE	1982		1 Acres			
George Washington Bush Monument	SE	1995		1 Acres			

Public Works - Utilities

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
SEWER SYSTEMS							

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
Grand Mound	Southwest	1998	$10,700,000	1,880 – 5,560 ERU	New Secondary Oxidation Plant, Treatment Plant Expansion for Class A water treatment Vacuum Stations System Program	2019 - 2020 2020 – 2021 2023	$2,050,000 $2,500,000 $50,000
Boston Harbor	North	1990	$3,000,000	254 ERU	Waste water treatment plant, electrical upgrades	2018	$30,000
Tamoshan / Beverly Beach	Cooper Point	1976	$500,000	116 ERU	Watermain upgrades and emergency generator	2017-2021	$655,000
Olympic View	NW	1977 Upgraded 1998	$210,000	27 ERU	Sewer collection and treatment improvements	2023	$60,000
WATER SYSTEMS							
Grand Mound	Southwest	1998	$3,500,000	2,400 – 4,800 ERU	Well and pumps #3 and #4. Grand Mound Way Loop	2020-2023	$1,970,000 $
Boston Harbor	North	1989	$1,500,000	300 ERU	Water main replacements and water treatment expansion	2018-2020	$90,000
Tamoshan	Cooper Point	1994	$300,000	94 ERU	Primary and secondary water main replacement	2018-2022	$765,000

Public Works – Solid Waste

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
SOLID WASTE							

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
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	Rainier Drop Box Improvements	2019-2022	$1,250,000
Rochester Drop Box	Rochester	1960 □	$900,000	5,000 tons per year	Rochester Drop Box Improvements	2018-2022	$1,250,000
WARC Process Controls and Alarms	WARC	Included in WARC above	$563,000				
WARC Industrial Wastewater Facilities	WARC	1990	$1,000,000	3.8 million gallons per year			
WARC Self Haul Recycle area	WARC	1988	$250,000	3,000 tons per year			
WARC HazoHouse	WARC	2010	$2,000,000	150 customers per day			
WARC Closed Loop Park	WARC	Included above in Thurston County Waste and Recovery Center (WARC).					
WARC Metal Material Recovery	WARC	2007	$300,000	20,000 sf	Site closed in 2012		
WARC Gas collection system	WARC	2001	$1,250,000	2,500 cfm	Construct and/or modify existing collection system	2016 – 2018	$2,500,000
WARC Equipment Storage Bldg.	WARC	1988	$50,000	500 SF	Construct new Automotive and Equipment Storage Building	2017	$1300,000
WARC Transfer Station	WARC	2000	$6,775,000	205,000 tons per year	Expansion to existing building	2018 – 2020	$3,100,000

Public Works Department - Roads

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size (miles)**	**Needed Capacity Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
TRANSPORTATION							
Rural Minor Arterial	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	14.467	Note 3	2018-2038	$2,000,000
Rural Major Collector	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	225.549	Note 3	2018-2038	$53,000,000
Rural Minor Collector	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	53.630	Note 3	2018-2038	$2,000,000
Urban Principal Arterial	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	7.308	Note 3	2018-2038	$37,000,000
Urban Minor Arterial	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	34.667	Note 3	2018-2038	$90,000,000
Urban Collector	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	17.901	Note 3	2018-2038	$8,000,000
Bridges	County-Wide	Note 1	Note 2	109	Note 3	2018-2038	$33,000,000

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

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

Note 2: No valuation for roadway classification exists. The estimated total value of the county road transportation system is about $750,000,000 based on information provided by the County Road Administration Board.

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

Note 4: Costs based upon Traffic Impact Fee Rate Study by Fehr & Peers, 2012 except bridges. Bridges is based upon the 10 highest ranked bridges determined during the development of the 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program.

Central Services Department

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
COUNTY BUILDINGS							
McLane Facilities	Mud Bay	April 2, 2007	$1,112,300	16,225 sq. ft.	Interiors in poor condition and most building systems need renewal/replacement.	2018-31	$2.3 million
Tilley Block Building	Tilley Rd	1986	$237,471		Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Tilley Sand Shed	Tilley Rd	1995	$36,489	3,363 sq ft	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Tilley Bldg A-Administration	Tilley Rd	2012	$7,207,243	21,767 sq ft	Exterior & interior systems in good condition. Predictable renewals.	2020-35	$2.1 million
Tilley Bldg B-Traffic	Tilley Rd	2012	$2,086,177	12,619 sq ft	Exterior & interior systems in fair/good condition. Predictable renewals.	2020-35	$1.2 million
Tilley Bldg C-Public Works	Tilley Rd	2012	$7,578,933	24,070 sq ft	Exterior & interior systems in good condition. Predictable renewals.	2020-35	$2.3 million
Tilley Bldg D-Storage	Tilley Rd	2012	$1,423,442	11,400 sq ft	Exterior & interior systems in good condition. Predictable renewals.	2020-35	$700,000
Tilley Bldg E-EOC	Tilley Rd	2012	$4,541,977	11,619 sq ft	Exterior & interior systems in good condition. Predictable renewals.	2020-35	$2.2 million
Roads Littlerock Equip. Bldg.	Littlerock	1971	$45,623	936 sq. ft.	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Roads Rainier Equip. Bldg.	Rainier	1975	$102,360	2,100 sq. ft.	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Roads Rochester Equip. Bldg.	Rochester	1978	$102,360	2,100 sq. ft.	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Heritage Hall	Fairground	1941	$1,579,700	9,120 sq ft	Historic bldg. Portions in poor/fair condition. Some observed deficiencies and predictable renewals.	2018-34	$1.4 million

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
Benoschek Building	Fairground	1993	$329,400	4,392 sq. ft	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Deck Building	Fairground	1993	$137,728	2,560 sq. ft	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Fir Building	Fairground	1993	$136,006	2,528 sq. ft	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Sharp Building	Fairground	1993	$139,450	2,528 sq. ft	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Craft and Hobby	Fairground		$334,421	6,216 sq. ft	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Lake Building	Fairground	1992	$172,160	3,200 sq. ft	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Food Court	Fairground		$150,640	2,800 sq. ft	Fair physical condition		
Deschutes Grange	Fairground		$42,454	912 sq. ft	Fair physical condition		
Restroom Buildings	Fairground	1993	$228,229	1,702 sq. ft	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Caretakers Residence	Fairground	April 10, 1998	$42,000	840 sq. ft.	Condition Assessment still needs to be updated		
Exposition Hall	Fairground	2001	$777,100	7,000 sq. ft.	Exterior & interior systems in good condition. Predictable renewals.	2020-35	$600,000
All sheds and booths	Fairground	Various	$49,065	3,271 sq. ft.	Fair physical condition		
All Barns	Fairground	Various	$696,000	48,600 sq. ft.	Fair physical condition		
Courthouse Bldg. 1	Olympia	1978	$6,920,156	45,421 sq. ft.	Exterior and interior systems in poor/fair condition. Some observed deficiencies and predictable renewals.	2017-35	$10.5 million
Courthouse Bldg. 2	Olympia	1978	$8,885,329	35,914 sq. ft.	Exterior and interior systems in poor/fair condition. Some observed deficiencies	2017-35	$9.5 million

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
				Superior Ct.: 6 Ctrms.	and predictable renewals.		
Courthouse Bldg. 3	Olympia	1978	$24,192,649	74,471 sq. ft. Jail: 266 beds Dist. Ct.: 3 Ctrms	Exterior and interior systems in poor/fair condition. Some observed deficiencies and predictable renewals.	2017-35	$21.5 million
Courthouse Bldg. 4	Olympia	1987	$2,645,973	17,622 sq. ft.	Exterior and interior systems in fair/good condition. Some observed deficiencies and predictable renewals.	2017-35	$3.7 million
Bldg. 5	Olympia	2005	$4,120,769	22,000 sq. ft.	Exterior and interior systems in fair/good condition. Some observed deficiencies and predictable renewals.	2020-35	$3.7 million
Evaluation and Treatment Center	Olympia	2008	$5,612,875	20,050 sq. ft.	Exterior & interior systems in good condition. Predictable renewals.	2018-35	$3.2 million
3400 Building	Olympia	1998	$6,491,507	65,612 sq. ft.	Designated for surplus sale.	N/A	N/A
Ferguson-Triage	Tumwater	2006	$693,821	10,800 sq ft.	Currently being remodeled for mental health triage facility.	N/A	N/A
Ferguson-Work Release	Tumwater	2006	$4,126,006	10,945 sq ft.	Exterior & interior systems in good condition. Predictable renewals.	2020-35	$1.4 million
Juvenile Justice Center	Tumwater	1998 opened	$18,309,900	82,000 sq. ft. in 4 Ctrms.; Detention: 80 beds; Day Detention: 40-80.	Exterior & interior systems in fair/good condition. Some observed deficiencies and predictable renewals.	2018-35	$16.2 million
Emergency Services Center	Olympia	1997	$4,003,344	17,997 sq. ft	Exterior & interior systems in fair condition. Some observed deficiencies and predictable renewals.	2018-35	$9 million
Courthouse Jail Annex and	Olympia	1997	$766,303	3,810 sq. ft. (92 beds)	Exterior & interior systems in poor condition.	N/A	N/A

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FACILITIES					FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS		
Facility Name	**Location**	**Date Acquired**	**Estimated Current Value**	**Capacity or size**	**Needed Improvements**	**Year Needed**	**Estimated Cost**
Bathroom Facilities					Designated for surplus sale.		
Health and Social Service Building	Olympia	2000	$5,963,700	25,836 sq. ft.	Exterior & interior systems in good condition. Some observed deficiencies and predictable renewals.	2020-35	$3.3 million
Coroner Facility	Tumwater	2002	$1,045,000	6,950 sq. ft.	Exterior & interior systems in good condition. Predictable renewals.	2020-35	$1.4 million
Accountability and Restitution Center	Tumwater	2010	$43,648,712	100,000 sq. ft.	Exterior & interior systems in good condition. Some observed deficiencies and predictable renewals.	2018-35	$16.9 million
Elections 2905-29th Ave SW	Tumwater	1994	Leased	10,770 sq. ft.	N/A		
Records Center	Tumwater	1991	Leased	10,000 sq. ft.	N/A		
Drug Court / Bristol Court	Olympia	2005	Leased	5,008 sq. ft	N/A	N/A	N/A
Office of Assigned Counsel-Bldg #6	Olympia	2014	Leased	9,050 sq. ft	N/A	N/A	N/A
Weeds Lease at Millersylvania State Park	Olympia	2010	Leased	1,400 sq ft	N/A	N/A	N/A
Family Support Center	Olympia	1997	Leased	1,000 sq. ft.	N/A		
Sheriff Storage-New Market	Tumwater	2012	Leased	28,860	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thurston County currently has 33 park sites, accounting for a total of 2,645 acres. These sites include twelve active parks (631 acres), only five of which are fully or partially developed, six preserves and three historic sites (1,158 acres) and 12 trails/trail properties, accounting for 47.8 miles of planned 58-mile recreational trail system. Approximately 34.3 miles of the trail system have been developed. The rest of the trail system is currently undeveloped. The county focuses on providing parks, trails and preserves that contain special features intended to be used by all residents of, and visitors to, the county.

In 2012, the Parks and Recreation Department and Board of County Commissioners adopted an updated Parks Plan and Level of Service

Standards (LOS). 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.

Thurston County Park's LOS is 3.5 acres per 1,000 resident population. This 3.5acre/1,000 residents LOS, based on projected 2017 population data, creates a need for 878 acres of operational park land.

Since Thurston County has 288 acres of parkland and trails developed and operational, the net increase of land dedicated for park and trail purposes that meets the LOS standard is 590 acres. This LOS standard amounts to a total of 406 acres of Urban/Regional Park land, 61acres of Public/Private Enterprise Park land, and 123 acres of Greenways/Trail lands. 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 LOS is maintained to address the needs and demands of an increasing population through 2018. To insure proper planning for specific needs through the 2023, 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, picnic sites and natural resource preserves.

User fees generated by special events are currently being utilized for county parks. The fees help to support parks operations and maintenance. [Resolution No. 14450 (12/17/10)]

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 and visitors 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. Regional parks should be provided by the county to serve all residents of the county 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 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 and visitors.
6. An intergovernmental funding system should be established to acquire, maintain and operate parks and to involve participation by school districts, city and county governments, and others. Such approaches should be explored as county-wide bond measures and a county-wide parks and recreation district.
7. A cooperative program with the cities and school districts should be established to acquire lands for new community and neighborhood parks in the unincorporated urban growth area, as new schools sites are established.
8. Existing schools should be considered as a resource to meet the needs for parks, and the county should help fund the use of school facilities for park and year-round recreational use by county residents.
9. In acquiring and developing parks, trails and other recreation facilities, the County should explore every opportunity to create revenue centers within the park system to generate funding for ongoing park maintenance and operation needs.

NOTE: See Natural Environment Chapter for other park policies.

Table 6-4

PARKS and OPEN SPACE CAPITAL PROJECTS
2018- 2023

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS Fund Source	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	6-Yr. Total
Bonds							
Grants			$140,000	$100,000			$240,000
Parks Impact Fees	$35,000	$735,000	$100,000	$450,000	$200,000		$1,520,000
REET (Real Estate Excise Tax)	$930,000	$550,000	$350,000	$350,000	$350,000		$2,530,000
Trail Permit Fees	$18,000	$0	$0	$0	$0		$18,000
TOTALS	**$983,000**	**$1,285,000**	**$590,000**	**$900,000**	**$550,000**	$0	**$4,308,000**

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS Project Name	Type	Fund Source	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	6 Yr. Total
Lacey / Olympia UGA									
Chehalis Western Trail Improvements	Dev	R/I	$375,000	$275,000		$150,000	$50,000		$850,000
Rainier / Yelm / Tenino UGA									
Yelm - Tenino Trail Improvements	Dev	R/I	$200,000	$325,000	$100,000	$50,000	$50,000		$725,000
Tenino - Bucoda Trail Extension	Dev/MP			$10,000					$10,000
Yelm - Tenino Trail Area Improvements	Dev	R	$150,000						$150,000
Tumwater UGA									
Guerin Park	Dev	GN			$140,000				$140,000
Gate - Belmore trail (1)	Dev	R/I	$25,000	$25,000					$50,000
Kenneydell Park	Dev	G				$100,000			$100,000
Rural Thurston County									
Facility Improvements	Dev	R	$18,000		$50,000	$150,000	$150,000		$368,000
Burfoot Park	Dev	R			$200,000				$200,000
Parks and Trails Master Plan	MP	I	$10,000						$10,000
Deschutes Falls Park	Dev	I				$150,000			$150,000
Trail & Park System-wide Programs									
Parks, Trails and Open Space Acquisition	AcQ	R/I/D/GN							$0
Culvert Replacement Program		R	$100,000						$100,000
Trail Surface Improvement Program		R	$105,000	$350,000	$100,000	$200,000	$200,000		$955,000
Parks & Trails Capacity Development Program	Dev	I		$300,000		$100,000	$100,000		$500,000
TOTALS			**$983,000**	**$1,285,000**	**$590,000**	**$900,000**	**$550,000**	**$0**	**$4,308,000**

DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
Future Bonds							
Total Debt Service							

LEGEND:

GC	Grant Committed	I	Impact Fees	DEV	Development
GN	Grant Noncommitted	R	Real Estate Excise Tax	AcQ	Acquisition
D	Donations	TP	Trail Permit Fees	MP	Master plan

(1) Gate Belmore Trail Funding is **also** located in the Roads CFP

Completed Projects

Acquired Additions BNSF ROW

New Projects:

Culvert Replacement Program
Trail Surface Improvement Program
Tenino - Bucoda Trail Extension
Yelm - Tenino Trail Area Improvements
Parks & Trails Capacity Development Program

Dropped Projects

Monarch Park (planning)

updated 07/21/17

B. Solid Waste:

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 plans of 2001 and 2009 and is currently revising the 2009 plan, which should be completed by December 2017.

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 2009 and Thurston County Comprehensive Plan; 2) comply with federal and state law; and 3) address facility safety, operational, capacity and obsolescence issues.

Prioritization and Scheduling

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

Any project that addresses multiple LOS units will score relatively high and is considered a priority project. For example, a project required by a solid waste regulation for handling municipal solid waste 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 charges and fees paid by the self-haul (public) and commercial customers that use Thurston County's solid waste facilities. In 2009, the Board of County

Commissioners adopted an ordinance establishing solid waste tipping fees for the Waste and Recovery Center and drop box facilities effective January 1, 2010. Tipping fees may be modified at the Board's discretion in the future in order to ensure sufficient funding for solid waste operations and infrastructure repair and replacement.

WAC 173-350-600 requires that municipal corporations establish a financial surety known as a Post Closure Reserve to fund environmental monitoring and maintenance at a closed landfill for a period of thirty years. Thurston County established this reserve for its Hawks Prairie Landfill by dedicating a portion of tipping fees to the Post Closure Reserve from the early 1990s through December 31, 2002. The post closure care period was subsequently initiated on January 1, 2003, and is anticipated to run through at least 2033.

Capital projects required to maintain the closed landfill cells are funded from the post closure reserve. The following table shows what projects are being funded through post closure funds and what projects are being funded through tipping fees.

Solid Waste Goals and Policies

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

POLICIES:

1. The county should require that handling and disposal of solid and hazardous waste be done in ways that minimize land, air and water pollution and protect public health.

2. The county should undertake strategies for dealing with solid wastes in the following order: waste reduction; reuse; recycling; energy recovery; and proper, safe disposal.

3. The county should continually explore new approaches for waste reduction, reuse, recycling, energy recovery, and disposal.

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 (i.e., "moderate risk wastes") outside of landfilling.

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 a 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 that 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 its Moderate Risk Waste Plan.

9. The county should maintain and update its Solid Waste Management Plan.

10. The county should support and enhance waste reduction, reuse 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.

Table 6-5
Public Works - Solid Waste
2018- 2023

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS **Fund Source**	Project	Fund	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**6-Yr. Total**
Solid Waste Tipping Fees, Rates and Charges[1]			$2,170,000	$4,050,000	$3,075,000	$3,000,000	$300,000		$12,595,000
Post Closure Reserve (PCR)[2]			$600,000	$100,000		$0	$100,000		$800,000
Other[3]									
TOTALS			**$2,770,000**	**$4,150,000**	**$3,075,000**	**$3,000,000**	**$400,000**	**$0**	**$13,395,000**

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS **Project Name**	**Fund Source**			**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**6 Yr. Total**
City of Lacey Urban Growth Area										
WARC Transfer Station Expansion	Fees				$100,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000			$3,100,000
WARC Automotive, Equipment Storage Area and Field Office	Fees	91064	4030	$200,000	$1,400,000	$1,400,000		$200,000		$3,200,000
WARC Closure of 70 Acre Cell (steep bank north of Lakeside RAP)	Fees					$150,000	$1,500,000			$1,650,000
WARC Ground Water Monitoring Wells	PCR	91082	4040	$100,000						$100,000
WARC Beneficial Re-use of Closed Landfill	Fees				$50,000					$50,000
WARC Landfill Settlement and Repairs	PCR				$100,000			$100,000		$200,000
WARC Flare Upgrade	PCR	91075	4040	$500,000						$500,000
WARC Public Tipping Storm Water Conveyance Line	Fees	91077	4030	$70,000						$70,000
WARC Access Road Phase II	Fees	91081	4030	$1,500,000	$500,000					$2,000,000
WARC Water Reservoir	Fees					$25,000				$25,000
Rural Thurston County										
Rainier Drop Box Improvements	Fees	91078	4030	$200,000	$1,000,000			$50,000		$1,250,000
Rochester Drop Box Improvements	Fees	91079	4030	$200,000	$1,000,000			$50,000		$1,250,000
TOTALS				**$2,770,000**	**$4,150,000**	**$3,075,000**	**$3,000,000**	**$400,000**	**$0**	**$13,395,000**

Notes:

Funding sources include: Fees= Solid Waste Tipping fees, rates and charges.

PCR= Post-Closure reserve funds.

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

The Solid Waste Capital Facility Assessment may require significant revisions of current planned projects.

No Dropped Projects **No New Projects** **No Completed Projects**

C. Stormwater Facilities:

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

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

In 2008[1], the Stormwater Management Utility was expanded countywide to address NPDES permitting and countywide basin planning. Projects for the expanded area will be generated by the basin characterization and GIS inventory mentioned above. The stormwater facilities in this Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) are placed on the 6-year and 20-year stormwater CFP, as well as for capital projects intended to address emerging environmental or regulatory issues relating to flooding, water quality and/or habitat degradation. Annually, projects are comprehensively reviewed and prioritized according to a ranking system. This ranking system was first established in 2002. The ranking system was revised in 2008, 2010, and most recently, in 2013 and considers:

1. *Location*
    a. UGA and NPDES Permit boundaries
    b. Fish bearing waters, BIBI monitoring points
    c. Proximity to water body, stream size
    d. Well head protection areas
    e. High ADT roadway or high use sites

[1] Board of County Commissioners action on August 6 , 2007

f. Number of projects previously completed in the are

2. *Project Feasibility*
    a. Ease of permitting
    b. Potential utility or site constraints
    c. Parcel ownership and number of parcels involved
    d. Community acceptance of the project
    e. Access for construction and maintenance
    f. Project impact on site use and operations (mainly commercial and industrial considerations)
    g. Sufficiency of space
    h. Existing grading and drainage and infrastructure configuration
    i. Level of existing treatment and flow control

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

4. *Protection of People and Property*
    a. Project reduces threat to human safety, health or welfare.
    b. Frequency of reoccurrences
    c. Existing drainage problem
    d. Detrimental impact to public facilities
    e. Problem Frequency
    f. Provides maximum benefit to ratepayers
    g. Protects water Quality
    h. Enhances environmental protection to sensitive resources

5. *Water Quality and Quantity*
    a. Total area treated or project size for restoration projects
    b. % impervious in the tributary area
    c. Closed conveyance vs. open conveyance
    d. Land use
    e. Amount and degree of treatment provided
    f. Pollutant removal effectiveness
    g. Degree and amount of flow control provided
    h. Overall efficiency of project

6. *Environment, Habitat & Ecology*
    a. Environmental enhancement and benefits
    b. Habitat enhancement for fish
    c. Habitat enhancement for other species

d. Priority habitats in the vicinity
e. Forest, native vegetation, or soils restoration
f. Recreational, open space, and connectivity considerations

7. Public Stewardship
a. Cost per treated area and cost to stormwater utility
b. Special opportunity for high priority project may be lost
c. Significant reduction in maintenance and operations costs
d. Support economic development by solving regional stormwater problem
e. Urgent problem
f. Supports interjurisdictional solutions
g. Increases public education and citizen involvement

8. Discretionary Rating
a. Best professional judgement of evaluator to take in consideration other project factors not captured above

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

The following projects were ranked using the system described:

Capital Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Woodland Creek Estates – Retrofit	**Priority #1** Water quality treatment retrofit to address bacterial pollutants to Woodland Creek.	Feasibility analysis and concept design completed in 2013. Preliminary design and 90% design in 2014 under Ecology Capacity Grant. Split into two phases due to easement issues. Majority of the construction will occur in 2016 with Phase II construction in 2017.

Capital Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Rochester Stormwater Pond	**Priority #2** – Water Resources staff has gone out on several technical assists to investigate localized flooding in the area. Pipes are very shallow and connections don't meet current standards.	Property acquisition completed in 2017. Design in 2017 and construction in 2018.
Woodard Retrofit Study – Site 3	**Priority #3** Runoff treatment for roadway and adjacent property runoff. Roadside bioretention and enhanced roadside ditch. Treats 6.0 acres. 96% of runoff treated.	Pre-Design completed. Design in 2016 and construction in 2017.
Woodard Retrofit Study – Site 5	**Priority #4** Runoff treatment for roadway and adjacent property runoff. Enhanced roadside ditches and filter vault. Treats 12.3 acres. 91% of runoff treated.	Pre-Design completed. Design in 2016 and construction in 2017.
92nd Court SE Retrofit	**Priority #5** Stormwater from the adjacent subdivision flows untreated into the Deschutes. Project will install a biofiltration swale to treat stormwater before discharge to the river.	Design and construction in 2018

Capital Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Rochester Vicinity Drainage Study	**Priority #6** Flooding occurs regularly on Boston Harbor Rd caused by runoff from an area roughly bounded by 72nd Ave to 77th Way. This project will study the existing drainage structures and provide possible solutions for future CFP projects.	Study in 2018
Boston Harbor Vicinity Drainage Study	**Priority #7** The area south of Highway 12 from Gresham Street to Leon Street to 187th Ave has experienced flooding which have resulted in some claims against the County. This project will study the existing drainage structures and provide possible solutions for future CFP projects.	Study in 2018
Boston Harbor Road NE Outfall Replacement	**Priority #8** The outfall located at 7325 Boston Harbor Rd is failing and needs to be repaired or replaced. Other drainage problems in the area cause flooding of the driveway and erosion which washes sediment directly into the Puget Sound. This project will add a culvert under Boston Harbor Rd and replace the outfall.	Design in 2018 and construction in 2019

Capital Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Madrona Beach Road NW Vic. Retrofits	**Priority #9** There are five locations along Madrona Beach Road where stormwater infrastructure is failing or inadequate and causing flooding and erosion of the road and driveways. This project will fix the infrastructure.	Design in 2019 and construction in 2020
Woodard Retrofit Study – Site 1	**Priority #10** Runoff treatment for roadway and adjacent property runoff. Roadside bioretention and filter vault. Treats 9.1 acres. 91% of runoff treated.	Pre-Design completed. Design in 2018 and construction in 2019.
Meadows Subdivision Pond 4C Retrofit	**Priority #11** The pond in this subdivision was built in the mid-1980's and does not meet current standards. The project will excavate the pond and retrofit the outlet to meet current stormwater quality and flow control standards.	Design in 2019 and construction in 2020
Woodard Retrofit Study – Site 2	**Priority #12** Runoff treatment for roadway and adjacent property runoff. Enhanced roadside ditch and filter vault. Treats 12.4 acres. 91% of runoff treated.	Pre-Design completed. Design in 2018 and construction in 2019.

Capital Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
Woodard Retrofit Study – Site 4	**Priority #13** Runoff treatment for roadway and adjacent property runoff. Roadside bioretention swales. Treats 159 acres. 40-47% of runoff treated.	Pre-Design completed. Design in 2018 and construction in 2019.
Littlerock Area Stormwater Retrofit	**Priority #14** The area around Littlerock Elementary School, 127th Ave, and 128th Ave discharge untreated stormwater runoff directly to tributaries of the Black River and Beaver Creek. This project will add biofiltration swales to treat the water before discharging to the river and creek.	Design in 2019 and construction in 2020
Fairground LID Demonstration Project	**Priority #15** Low Impact Development (LID) is now required by the Thurston County Drainage Manual. This project will retrofit portions of the fairgrounds with various LID best management practices to treat and infiltrate the stormwater and provide a high visibility area for citizens and contractors to see how LID BMPs can be used in their projects.	Design in 2019 and construction in 2020
Manzanita Rd.	**Priority # 16** Reduce marine shoreline erosion at outfall	Feasibility analysis and concept design in 2014. Final design

Capital Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
		begins 2018 with construction 2019.
Cedar Shores Subdivision Pond Retrofit	**Priority # 17** Upgrade existing stormwater pond to provide water quality treatment and reduce gulley erosion.	Feasibility analysis and concept design in 2014. Final design in 2018 and construction in 2019.
Donnelly Drive	**Priority # 18** Reduce urban street flooding, reduce peak flows to Chambers Ditch and treat stormwater before discharge to ground water and Chambers Ditch	Feasibility analysis and concept design in 2016. Final design begins 2019. Construction begins in 2020.
Boston Harbor Boat Launch	**Priority #19** Stormwater from a parking lot and streets drain directly to Puget Sound without treatment. This project will construct a biofiltration swale and treatment vault to remove pollutants before discharging to the Sound.	Design in 2019 and construction in 2020
Sherwood Firs	**Priority # 20** Reduce local flooding and provide WQ treatment	Feasibility analysis and concept design in 2015. Final design begins 2020 with construction in 2021.
Stuart Place	**Priority # 21** Reduce local flooding and provide WQ treatment	Feasibility analysis and concept design in 2014. Final design begins 2020 with construction in 2021.

Capital Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
SR 507 & Connor Road SE Retrofit	**Priority #22** Stormwater from Connor Road discharges directly to the Skookumchuck River without treatment. This project will construct a biofiltration area to treat the water and infiltrate it prior to discharge.	Design in 2019 and construction in 2020
Waddell Creek Rd. @ Pants Creek	Culvert replacement to reduce local flooding and improve fish passage	Continued monitoring required prior to start of design. Design in 2018 with construction in 2018. Joint project with Public Works.
Cedar Flats Road at Swift Creek	Culvert replacement to reduce local flooding and provide fish passage	Planning and design begins 2022. Construction in 2022. Joint project with Public Works.
Stormwater Retrofit Studies	Using similar methodology to study completed for Woodard Creek Basin additional basins within Thurston County will be studied to identify at least 5 retrofit projects for further programming and construction.	Complete one study approximately every 2 years. Need to prioritize basins for studies. Eld/McLane and Lower Deschutes are potential candidates during this 6-year plan.
Future Retrofit Projects	Projects identified in additional basin retrofit studies, drainage studies, citizen input, and through other means such as	Specific project identification will result from the stormwater retrofit studies proposed for

Capital Project	Priority/Why Needed	Status
	technical assists, will be programmed for design and construction.	basins throughout the county.
Land Acquisition	**Opportunity** Land acquisition is executed as opportunities supported by the Board of County Commissioners are authorized.	Land acquisition is executed as opportunities supported by the Board of County Commissioners are authorized.
Reserve For Future Capital replacement	Built facilities depreciate annually, a future replacement fund preserves the Utility's infrastructure.	Annual contributions began in 2011.
Emergency Reserve	Reserve to repair existing infrastructure damage due to natural disaster or pay for emergency response.	Lump sum contribution in 2016

Types of Stormwater Facilities:

There are three types of stormwater facilities.

Flood Control Facilities: Retrofit of stormwater storage facilities to add storage capacity or increase infiltration such as additional dry well disposal systems; and enlarged conveyances with new collection and detention systems within existing developed areas.

Water Quality Facilities: Install or retrofit treatment devices to existing dry well, detention, infiltration and conveyance systems discharging to surface or ground water. Treatment devices might include wet ponds, constructed wetlands, bioretention (rain gardens), grit separators, filters in vaults, bio-swales or other best management practices or new technologies.

Habitat Facilities/Surveys: Install in-stream structures to improve fish passage and improve down-gradient shellfish habitat. (Placement of large woody debris,

riparian cover, bank stabilization projects are not included in the CFP, but in the stormwater base budget.) Conduct habitat surveys to identify and quantify stream health and down-gradient shellfish areas in association with capital facility planning efforts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Resolution No.13265 12/20/04]

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

[Resolution No.13876 8/06/07]

STORMWATER OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES:

OBJECTIVE 1-G: ***Stormwater Facilities*** **-** Thurston County will coordinate with jurisdictions that share stormwater drainage basins to provide stormwater facilities and related management programs that protect surface and ground water quality and habitat, prevent chronic flooding from stormwater, maintain natural stream hydrology and protect aquatic resources.

POLICIES:

1. Thurston County will work with local governments within the same drainage basins to develop common standards and design requirements for stormwater facilities. The County will also plan together with the other jurisdictions for major regional stormwater facilities. Maintenance of stormwater facilities, such as retention ponds and street drainage systems, could be handled by each jurisdiction separately or together with other jurisdictions.
2. Stormwater utility rates should recognize and implement other Comprehensive Plan recommendations such as providing incentives to preserve agriculture and forestry lands through reduced rates.
3. Comprehensive Drainage Basin Plans, retrofit studies and restoration studies will be used to identify and prioritize necessary stormwater services and capital facilities. As new Basin Plans are adopted and retrofit and restoration studies completed, 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.

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS Fund Source	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	6-Yr. Total
Rates - Resolution 11860 + Ending Fund Bal[6]	$3,163,293	$1,816,616	$1,816,616	$1,816,616	$1,816,616	$1,816,616	**$12,246,373**
Grants/Loans[1]	$90,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$90,000**
TOTALS	**$3,253,293**	**$1,816,616**	**$1,816,616**	**$1,816,616**	**$1,816,616**	**$1,816,616**	**$12,336,373**

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS Project Name	Fund Source	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	6 Yr. Total
City of Olympia Urban Growth Area								
Donelly Drive - Infiltration Gallery	SW Rates		$67,000	$150,000	$250,000			**$467,000**
Stuart Place - Conveyance & Treatment	SW Rates			$55,000	$280,000			**$335,000**
Woodard Creek Retrofit - Site 1[1]	SW Rates/Grant	$145,000	$330,000					**$475,000**
City of Lacey Urban Growth Area								
Woodland Creek Estates Retrofit[1]	SW Rates/Grant	$40,000						**$40,000**
Sherwood Fires - Phase II	SW Rates			$58,000	$370,000			**$428,000**
City of Tumwater Urban Growth Area								
None								**$0**
City of Yelm Urban Growth Area								
None								**$0**
Grand Mound Urban Growth Area								
None								**$0**
Rural Thurston County and/or Not Limited to one UGA								
Albany Street Stormwater Pond Retrofit	SW Rates	$215,000						**$215,000**
92nd Court SE Retrofit	SW Rates	$80,000						**$80,000**
Rochester Vicinity Drainage Study	SW Rates	$100,000						**$100,000**
Boston Harbor Vicinity Drainage Study	SW Rates	$100,000						**$100,000**
Boston Harbor Road NE Outfall Replacement	SW Rates	$33,000	$82,000					**$115,000**
Madrona Beach Road NW Vic. Retrofits	SW Rates		$86,000	$209,000				**$295,000**
Meadows Subdivision Pond 4C Retrofit	SW Rates		$141,000	$232,000				**$373,000**
Woodard Creek Retrofit - Site 2	SW Rates/Grant	$62,000	$250,000					**$312,000**
Woodard Creek Retrofit - Site 4	SW Rates/Grant	$278,000	$441,000					**$719,000**
Littlerock Area Stormwater Retrofit	SW Rates		$59,000	$135,000				**$194,000**
Fairground LID Demonstration Project	SW Rates		$81,000	$191,000				**$272,000**
Woodard Creek Retrofit - Site 5	SW Rates/Grant	$10,000						**$10,000**
Woodard Creek Retrofit - Site 3	SW Rates/Grant	$10,000						**$10,000**
Cedar Shores Retrofitt[2]	SW Rates/Grants		$45,000	$107,000				**$152,000**
Manzanita Road Conveyance	SW Rates	$55,000	$280,000					**$335,000**
Boston Harbor Boat Launch	SW Rates		$96,000	$229,000				**$325,000**
SR 507 & Connor Road SE Retrofit	SW Rates		$15,000	$34,000				**$49,000**
Waddell Creek @ Pants Creek - Culvert[3]	SW Rates	$128,000						**$128,000**
Cedar Flats Rd. @ Swift Creek - Culvert[3]	SW Rates						$284,000	**$284,000**
Stormwater Retrofit Studies	SW Rates/Grants	$300,000		$300,000		$300,000		**$900,000**
Future Retrofit Projects	SW Rates/Grants				$1,075,000	$1,050,000	$1,007,292	**$3,132,292**
Land Acquisition/Conservation	SSWU/Non Profit	$0	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	**$250,000**
Emergency Capital Projects[4]	SW Rates		$250,000					**$250,000**
Reserve for Future Capital Replacement	SW Rates	$298,088	$312,993	$330,000	$350,000	$350,000	$350,000	**$1,991,081**
TOTALS		**$1,854,088**	**$2,585,993**	**$2,080,000**	**$2,375,000**	**$1,750,000**	**$1,691,292**	**$12,336,373**

NOTES:

[1] Includes grants currently awarded or a reasonable assurance of award.

[2] This project may be contingent on negotiated cost sharing between the county and local Homeowners Association.

[3] Joint Stormwater Utility & Public Works Project - Only SSWU costs shown.

[4] This reserve established for emergent projects associated with flooding or other stormwater emergency. Identified in rating setting process for 2015-2019 Stormwater Utility rates as adopted by the

[5] Projects not associated with a retrofit study that are identified and programmed into the CFP in future years.

[6] Assumes that the rates now in effect for 2019 will remain the same for years 2020 through 2022.
New - 92nd Ct SE Retrofit, Boston Harbor Drainage Study, Boston Harbor Rd NE Outfall Replacement, Rochester Vic. Drainage Study, Madrona Beach Rd NW Vic. Retrofits

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 3 water systems (Boston Harbor, Grand Mound, and Tamoshan), and 3 rural sewer systems (Boston Harbor, Tamoshan/Beverly Beach, and Olympic View), and one sewer line system in the Lacey Urban Growth Area (Woodland Creek Sanitary Sewer).

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 risk to 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. The Woodland Creek sewer line is operated and maintained by the City of Lacey by agreement between the city and the county. The county will own the system until the construction loan is paid off at which time the system will come under the ownership of the City of Lacey.

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.

Lacey UGA: An urban growth area was established in the Lacey area in the early 1990s. The UGA boundaries and zoning were updated in compliance with City and County Joint Planning for the Lacey UGA. Thurston County has received loan and grant funding from the Washington State Department of

Ecology to convert 131 septic systems in the Woodland Creek and Covington Place developments to a STEP sewer system that connects to the City of Lacey sewer collection system. The County will own this STEP system until the loan is payed-off, when ownership will be turned over to the City of Lacey. Until then by mutual agreement with the City of Lacey, they will operate and maintain the system. The system was completed and has been operational since March 2014.

Criteria or Basis for Setting Priorities:

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

1. Address existing or emerging public health and/or safety issues;
2. Address compliance with local, state and federal regulatory requirements;

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

PROJECT LIST IN ORDER OF PRIORITY

The following projects were ranked using the criteria above:

Priority	Project	Priority / Why Needed	Status
		Grand Mound Sewer and Water Utilities	
1	Biosolids Management Program Implement	Implementation of Plan necessary to ensure a reliable disposal system in compliance with regulatory requirements	Planning
2	Water and Sewer SCADA Radio Replacement	To upgrade telemetry in the sewer and water systems to provide reliable communication between system components for optimum operations.	Design
3	Second Water Reservoir	To increase the capacity of the water system to supply domestic and fire flow.	Design
4	Grand Mound Vacuum Stations (North and South) Cooling Systems	Both vacuum sewer stations were built without adequate cooling/ventilation and heat up to the point they shut off	Design
5	Land Acquisition for Wells #3 and #4	To lock up land for future wells needed to supply the growing community	Site analysis underway
6	Manhole Rehabilitation	To preserve the manholes and increase the efficiency of flow through the system	Planning
7	Grand Mound Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion & Class A Reclaimed Water	To improve the class of wastewater produced to allow recharging of groundwater/creeks in exchange for maintaining allocation of water rights.	Planning-must be completed by 2025
8	Grand Mound Waste Water Treatment Plant, Second Oxidation Ditch	Project will Expand the wastewater treatment plant by constructing a second oxidation ditch at the Grand Mound Wastewater Treatment Facility. The need is driven by development in GM.	Planning
9	Grand Mound Way Watermain Loop	Project will provide water service to land not yet served within the UGA and will add to system redundancy and reliability to maintain water service and fire flow in event of damage or repairs to existing main.	Planning
10	Vacuum System Program	Upgrades to the sewer vacuum system in order to maintain proper sewage collection and disposal	Planning
11	Grand Mound Well and Pumps Program	To add water supply to the water system to meet increased demand as Grand Mound grows	Planning

		Tamoshan Sewer and Water Utilities	
1	Tamoshan WWTP and Collection Repairs-Plant and Pump	Upgrade components of the WWTP and collection system so that the sewage can be collected and treated effectively and reliably to meet environmental and regulatory requirements	Design
2	Tamoshan Water Reservoir System/Outlet Filter Screen	To improve water quality.	Design
3	Water Treatment System Upgrades	To improve water quality and comply with regulatory requirements.	Construction
4	Tamoshan Watermain Improvements	To keep pipes in good repair and to provide redundancy and good water flow through the system.	Planning
5	Sewer I&I Repair/Upgrades	Repair and/or replace leaking pipes so that the collection system and the treatment plant are not processing storm and groundwater	Planning
6	Tamoshan generators-Replacements; a) Water system; b) Sewer system (Beverly Beach)	Replace the generators to provide reliability during power outages	Planning
		Boston Harbor Water and Sewer System	
1	Boston Harbor Water System - Generator Auto Switch	To allow automatic engagement of the generator when power fails	Design
2	Boston Harbor Water System - Green Sand Filter and Meter Upgrades	To improve water quality and meet regulatory requirements	Design
3	Boston Harbor Waste Water Treatment Plant Electrical Upgrades	The electrical system, including the controllers to the plant are in need of repair and replacement	Design

4	Boston Harbor Watermain Upgrades	Replace watermains that are old and below current standards; loop mains together to improve water circulation and improve fire flow	Planning
5	Boston Harbor Wastewater Treatment Plant Program	Replace generator for reliable service during power outages and other work to keep WWTP functioning properly	Planning
6	Boston Harbor Sewer I & I Upgrades	Repair and/or replace leaking STEP tanks and pipes so that the collection system and the treatment plant are not processing storm and groundwater	Planning
7	Boston Harbor Sewer System Program	Repair and replace components of the collection system such as STEP, pipes, discharge end locate and repair, and other improvements to ensure the collection system operates efficiently.	Planning

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.

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.

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

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, and cost effectiveness, 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

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS Fund Source		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	6-Yr. Total
Real Estate Excise Tax		$1,350,000		$1,960,000	$540,000	$0		$3,850,000
Utility Revenue		$231,000	$385,000	$865,000	$2,360,000	$575,000	$660,000	$5,076,000
Grants								$0
Loans (Un-Funded Projects)			$300,000	$0	$500,000		$250,000	$1,050,000
TOTALS		**$1,581,000**	**$685,000**	**$2,825,000**	**$3,400,000**	**$575,000**	**$910,000**	**$9,976,000**
EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS **Project Name**	**Fund Source**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**6 Yr. Total**
Grand Mound Urban Growth Area								
Grand Mound Bio-Solids Management Program	Utility Revenue	$50,000						$50,000
Grand Mound System Scada Radio Control Upgrade	Utility Revenue	$5,000						$5,000
Second Grand Mound Reservoir	REET/Loan	$1,350,000	$300,000					$1,650,000
Grand Mound Vacuum Stations (North and South) Cooling Systems	Utility Revenue	$30,000						$30,000
Grand Mound Land Acquisition for Wells	Utility Revenue		$135,000	$135,000				$270,000
Grand Mound Manhole Rehabilitation	Utility Revenue			$80,000				$80,000
Grand Mound Wastewater Treatment Plant Second Oxidation Ditch	REET/Utility Revenue/Loan			$250,000	$1,800,000			$2,050,000
Grand Mound Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion for Class A Reclamation	REET			$1,710,000	$540,000			$2,250,000
Grand Mound Way Watermain Loop	Utility Revenue			$220,000	$780,000			$1,000,000
Grand Mound Vacuum System Program	Utility Revenue						$50,000	$50,000
Grand Mound Well and Pumps Program	Utility Revenue/Loan						$700,000	$700,000
SUB-TOTALS		**$1,435,000**	**$435,000**	**$2,395,000**	**$3,120,000**	**$0**	**$750,000**	**$8,135,000**
Rural Thurston County								
Tamoshan								
Tamoshan Waste Water Treatment Plant and Pump System	Utility Revenue	$30,000						$30,000
Tamoshan Water Reservoir System / Outlet Filter Screen	Utility Revenue	$5,000						$5,000
Tamoshan Water Treatment System	Utility Revenue	$15,000	$150,000	$150,000				$315,000

Grand Mound System Scada Radio Control Upgrade	Utility Revenue	$5,000						$5,000
Second Grand Mound Reservoir	REET/Loan	$1,350,000	$300,000					$1,650,000
Tamoshan Watermain System	Utility Revenue		$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$300,000		$450,000
Tamoshan Sewer I & I Repair/Upgrades	Utility Revenue		$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000		$200,000
Tamoshan Generators Replacements	Utility Revenue				$80,000	$75,000		$155,000
SUB-TOTALS		**$50,000**	**$250,000**	**$250,000**	**$180,000**	**$425,000**	**$0**	**$1,155,000**
Boston Harbor								
Boston Harbor Water System - Generator Auto Switch	Utility Revenue	$5,000						$5,000
Boston Harbor Water System - Green Sand Filter Upgrades and Source Meter Upgrades	Utility Revenue	$1,000						$1,000
Boston Harbor Waste Water Treatment Plant Electrical Upgrades	Utility Revenue	$90,000						$90,000
Boston Harbor Watermain System	Utility Revenue			$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$200,000
Boston Harbor Wastewater Treatment Plant Program	Utility Revenue			$80,000				$80,000
Boston Harbor Sewer I & I Upgrades	Utility Revenue					$50,000		$50,000
Boston Harbor Sewer System Program	Utility Revenue			$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$200,000
SUB-TOTALS		**$96,000**	**$0**	**$180,000**	**$100,000**	**$150,000**	**$100,000**	**$626,000**
Olympic View								
Olympic View Drainfield and Filter System Program	Utility Revenue						$60,000	$60,000
SUB-TOTALS		**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$60,000**	**$60,000**
EXPENDITURE TOTALS		**$1,581,000**	**$685,000**	**$2,825,000**	**$3,400,000**	**$575,000**	**$910,000**	**$9,976,000**
DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT	**Fund Source**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Total**
20YR LTGO Bond for Grand Mound		$1,196,812	$1,258,205	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,455,017
20YR DOE ST REV Tamoshan/Bev Bch		$78,282	$78,282	$78,282	$78,282	$78,282	$0	$391,410
20YR PWTF LOAN for Grand Mound		$5,863	$5,785	$5,708	$5,630	$5,553	$5,475	$34,014
20YR DOE Woodland Creek Loan (paid by REET)		$87,613	$87,613	$87,613	$87,613	$87,613	$87,613	$525,678
Total Debt Service		**$1,368,570**	**$1,429,885**	**$171,603**	**$171,525**	**$171,448**	**$93,088**	**$3,406,119**

Grand Mound System Scada Radio Control Upgrade	Utility Revenue	$5,000						$5,000
Second Grand Mound Reservoir	REET/Loan	$1,350,000	$300,000					$1,650,000

Completed Projects :	**Dropped Project:**	**New Projects:**
Grand Mound Well #1 Upgrade	Tanglewilde Sanitary Sewer	Grand Mound Vacuum System Program
		Tamoshan Waste Water Treatment Plant and Pump System
		Tamoshan Water Reservoir System / Outlet Filter
		Boston Harbor Waste Water Treatment Plant Electrical
		Boston Harbor Wastewater Treatment Plant Program
		Boston Harbor Sewer System Program

E. Transportation Background

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

Chapter 5 of the Comprehensive Plan outlines the following goals for transportation projects:

> **Goal 1** – Provide transportation systems that enhance the health, safety and welfare of Thurston County citizens.
>
> **Goal 2** – Provide transportation systems that support and complement the land use element of the Thurston County Comprehensive Plan, and are consistent with, and work to meet the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan.
>
> **Goal 3** – Provide mobility for all citizens regardless of age, handicap or income.
>
> **Goal 4** – Efficiently provide publicly accepted levels of service.
>
> **Goal 5** – Allow the state-wide and interstate movement of goods, services, and people.
>
> **Goal 6** – Maintain compatible relationships between airfields and surrounding land uses.

This section of the Capital Facilities Plan describes improvements or additions to transportation facilities such as roads, bridges, sidewalks, bike lanes, and other roadway features that are needed and have been prioritized in relation to the goals described above.

Methods to meet the above objectives the Capital Facility Plan includes projects that address:

- **Bridge** projects are typically selected by using the State of Washington Inventory of Bridges and Structures (SWIBS) database. The database analyzes the structural adequacy and safety of the bridge, its serviceability and functional obsolescence, and how essential it is for public use. The State Bridge Committee selects bridges based on the SWIBS criteria for

available federal funding.

- **Culvert Projects** include those culverts that are in need of repair and/or replacement based upon condition, maintenance history and other criteria.

- **Design Standard:** Providing greater lane width, improve roadway curves, slope flattening or increase load carrying capacity on new road construction projects. These does not typically do add lanes except as needed for safety or capacity at certain intersections.

- **Fish Passage Enhancements** that are fish passage barriers or deteriorating culverts are ranked in their order of benefits to salmonoid using the Salmon and Steelhead Enhancement and Restoration (SSHEAR) metrology developed by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Other priority methods may be used to secure funding depending on the funding opportunities.

- **Non-Motorized Improvements:** Includes the construction of new sidewalks, crosswalks, safe routes to school, and accessibility improvements.

- **Roadway Capacity** improvements are those that assure transportation infrastructure is available to meet demand created by new development as required by the Growth Management Act. County concurrency projects include those not addressed by developers and primarily consist of projects identified as regional needs in the Thurston Regional Transportation Plan, 20-year Transportation Project List contained herein.

- **Road Preservation** considers the inventory of visual pavement distress/cracking, traffic volumes and other factors to rate the pavement. Asphalt overlays are considered a restoration to the roadway versus routine maintenance such as patching or liquid asphalt sealing of the pavement surface.

- **Safety Improvements** includes a variety of investments that are intended to support the goals outlined in the Washington State Strategic Highway Safety Plan, Target Zero. These could include spot improvements such as turn lanes at an intersection or systemic investments made throughout the roadway network.

- **Programs** include miscellaneous projects, studies, culverts and small bridge improvements and other more minor improvements.

Priority Setting: in order to develop a program that is based on a realistic assessment of funding needs verses anticipated revenues, project costs and

priorities must be evaluated. This can be achieved through priority programming. Per WAC 136-14-010 priority programming is defined as the development and application of techniques designed to rank any array of potential projects in order of importance to serve as a guide in the formulation of the road program and distribution of limited resources. For further information on project prioritization please review the Transportation Improvement Program at the Thurston County Public Works website.

Facility Condition and Inventory**:** The County maintains the following inventories to help determine the transportation condition and capacity:

- Roadway Inventory (listing of traffic volumes, roadway widths, collisions, and pavement conditions)
- Traffic Sign Inventory
- Guardrail Inventory
- Bridge Index (summary of bridge conditions)
- Pavement Management Program (pavement condition survey)
- Thurston County Barrier Culvert Inventory (fish passage)

Project Financing:

Funding for the capital facilities program has depended almost exclusively on outside grants. Grants tend to fund a specific need, which may not reflect the county's needs (e.g., grant funds exist to replace structurally deficient bridges but there are no grant funds to address the existing substandard road/railroad grade separation or bridges that are deficient because they are too narrow).

The list of transportation projects identified in the 6-year capital facilities plan represent those projects that are reasonably expected to be funded within the next 6 years. Given the present level of available funding, not all projects on the Capital Facilities Project List are funded. If an unexpected source of funding for a particular project becomes available, the project could be moved forward in the under one of the several programs included in the plan. Grants are typically needed in order to enable the limited road funds to fund as many projects as possible.

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

- **30% County Portion of Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax (Gas Tax)** All Counties

within the state receive a proportionate share of the state gas tax based on population, road miles and other factors.

- **Second Quarter Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)** is proportioned to different county capital facilities. The second quarter REET is collected at the rate of one-quarter of one- percent of the selling price of real estate property in unincorporated Thurston County.
- **Developer Mitigation Fees** are charges on new developments to pay for the impacts they create. The mitigation fees are based on the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) review process.
- **Impact Fees** are charges on new developments to pay for their proportionate share of the public infrastructure they use. Fees collected from new developments will provide funding toward mobility and capacity projects.
- **Federal Funding Programs** are funds issued by the federal government on a competitive basis for specific types of projects.
- **State Funding Programs** are funds issued by the state on a competitive basis for specific types of projects.
- **Transportation Benefit District (TBD)** was formed by the Board of County Commissioners in December 2014. A funding source has not been adopted by the TBD Board.

Transportation Needs

Thurston County is responsible for maintaining over 1,000 miles of roads and associated facilities and 109 bridges. The capital facilities program attempts to meet the demands as the population grows. However inflationary pressures, aging transportation system and limited federal and state funds makes it challenging to meet expected or required services levels. Most normal maintenance and preservation of the transportation system is addressed through separate funding programs.

The projects listed in the 6-year capital facilities plan represent those projects that are reasonably expected to be funded within the next 6 years. The transportation needs are not limited to the 6-year list and the following is an overall 20-year listing of investments needed to support continued growth in Thurston County.

20-YEAR CAPACITY PROJECT LIST

Project ID	Impact Fee Project Group [1]	Project Location	Project Description	Total Cost (2012)
1	1	Elderberry Rd Upgrade (SR 12 to 196th Ave)	Widen to 4-6 lanes, urban improvements, access management, intersection improvements at 196th and SR12.	$1,644,000
2	1	Old Highway 99 & Tilley Rd	Provide left turn lane on EB Old Hwy 99 and provide illumination.	$500,000
3	1	Sargent Rd (183rd to Littlerock Rd)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes if necessary.	$3,400,000
4	1	Albany St SW (James Rd SW to Littlerock Rd SW)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes if necessary.	$1,977,100
5	1	183rd Ave SW (Old Hwy 99 to SR 12)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes if necessary.	$9,350,000
6	1	Old Hwy 99 (Great Wolf N. Property Line to 203rd Ave)	Widen to 4-5 lanes, urban improvements and Bridge O-9 replacement.	$3,003,456
7	1	Old Hwy 99 Rural Capacity Project (Old Hwy 99 (S. UGA boundary) to SR12)	Widen to 4-5 lanes, urban improvements, access management and intersection improvements.	$8,077,000
8	1	SR 12 (W. UGA boundary to Old Hwy 99)	New urban access road at west UGA Boundary, New SR 12 Intersection at west UGA, and SR12/Old Hwy 99/Elderberry Intersection improvements.	$7,552,000
9	2	93rd Ave & Lathrop Industrial Dr	Install left turn lane on 93rd Ave to Lathrop, and urban improvements	$642,000
10	2	Littlerock Rd & 113th Ave	Install left turn lane, lighting, replace Bridge L-5, realignment of 113th Ave SE.	$800,000
11	2	Maytown Rd SW (Littlerock Rd SW to SR121)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes if necessary.	$4,726,000
12	3	Delphi Rd SW Phase I (McLane Creek to SR 101)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes and if necessary.	$985,000
13	3	Mud Bay Rd & Evergreen Parkway	Install SPUI at Evergreen Parkway Ramps and Mud Bay Rd.	$1,500,000
14	3	Cooper Point Rd & Kaiser Rd	Install roundabout at intersection.	$3,500,000
15	3	Delphi Rd SW Phase II & III (62nd to McLane Creek)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes and if necessary.	$5,060,000
16	4	15th Ave NE & Draham Rd NE (Olympia City Limits to Draham)	Phase I - widen road to 2-3 lanes, urban improvements, shoulders and intersection improvements.	$8,000,000
17	4	15th Ave NE & Draham Rd NE (15th to Carpenter)	Phase I - widen road to 2-3 lanes, urban improvements, shoulders and intersection improvements at Carpenter Rd.	$3,000,000
18	4	Johnson Point Rd & Hawks Prairie Rd	Left Turn Channelization on Johnson Point Rd, widen shoulders.	$500,000
19	4	Meridian Rd (Martin Way to Interstate 5)	Widen to 2-3 lanes, urban improvements, shoulders.	$2,000,000

TABLE 1. 20- YEAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT LIST (cont…)				
20	5	Carpenter Rd (Pacific Ave SE to Martin Way SE)	Widen to 4-5 lanes, urban improvements and intersection improvements at Martin Way E.	$8,993,712
21	5	Kinnwood Rd (Pacific to Martin Way E)	Widen road to 2-3 lanes, urban improvements, shoulders and intersection modifications.	$4,500,000
22	5	Meridian Rd & Mullen Rd	Install left turn lanes for both for NB/SB Meridian, widen shoulders and provide street lights.	$850,000
23	5	Pacific Ave Capacity Project (Union Mills to SR510)	Phase I - widen road to 2-3 lanes, urban improvements, shoulders and intersection modifications at Steilacoom Rd.	$5,000,000
24	5	Yelm Hwy & Meridian Rd	Install roundabout at intersection.	$2,500,000
25	5	Marvin Rd (Pacific Ave/SR 510 to Mullen)	Widen to 2-5 lanes, intersection modifications and urban improvements.	$28,000,000
26	5	Steilacoom Rd (Pacific Avenue/SR510 to Dutterow Rd)	Widen to 2-3 lanes, shoulders and urban improvements.	$12,000,000
27	5	Mullen Rd (W. City Limits to Marvin Rd)	Widen to 2-3 lanes, shoulders and urban improvements.	$12,000,000
28		PROJECT PREVIOUSLY REMOVED		
29	5	Yelm Hwy Capacity Project 4 (Spurgeon Creek to Meridian Rd SE)	Phase 1-3. Replace and widen Bridge O-12 at BNSF railroad crossing, roundabout at Spurgeon Creek Rd SE, corridor improvements between Spurgeon Creek Rd and conceptual Marvin Rd extension.	$8,500,000
30	6	Henderson Blvd Bridge (H-2) at Deschutes River	Widen or replace bridge, shoulders, minor realignment and urban improvements.	$800,000
31	6	Henderson Blvd (Old Hwy 99 to Tumwater Blvd SE)	Widen to 2-3 lanes, urban improvements and intersection modifications at Tumwater Blvd.	$5,000,000
32	6	McCorkle Rd SE (113th Ave SE to Old Hwy 99) & 113th Ave SE (SR121 to McCorkle Rd SE)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes if necessary.	$4,400,000
33	6	Rich Rd SE (Deschutes River to 89th Ave SE)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, turn lanes and bridge over Scatter Creek.	$4,000,000
34	6	Rich Rd SE (Rixie Rd to Yelm Hwy)	Widen to 2-3 lanes, urban improvements and shoulders.	$3,700,000
35	6	Rich Rd SE Phase 2 (89th Ave SE to Normandy Rd SE)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes if necessary.	$1,515,954
36	6	Yelm Hwy Capacity Project 1 (City Limits (Orvas Ct SE) to Rich Rd SE)	Widen to 4-5 lanes, access management, and urban improvements.	$12,194,508
37	7	Bald Hill Rd SE (Smith Prairie to Clear Lake Rd)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes if necessary.	$8,160,000
38	7	Vail Rd Phase 2 (138th to153rd)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes if necessary.	$2,550,000
39	7	Vail Rd (138th to Bald Hill Rd)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes if necessary.	$3,269,000
40	7	153rd Ave SE (Vail Rd to Lawrence Lake Rd) & Lawrence Lake Rd (153rd Ave to Bald Hill Rd)	Rural Mobility Improvements include widening, geometrics, shoulders, and turn lanes if necessary.	$2,720,000
			Total	$196,869,730

* Project costs are 2012 Planning Level Cost Estimates

1) Thurston County Impact Fee Study, Fehr & Peers, 2012

Bridges
Independence Bridge (I-5) Scour Repair
O-12, Oly-Yelm RD. RR. OC
R-3, Reeder Road Bridge
O-7, Oly Hwy 99 Bridge
MC-8, Mclean Delphi Rd Bridge
L-5, Littlerock Road Bridge
C-2, Case Rd (Pearce Bridge)
J-3, James Road Bridge
L-6, W. Ulry Bridge
M-12, Mullen Road Bridge

Culverts
Hunter Point Road SW
Waddle Creek Road SW
Gull Harbor Rd Culvert (Ellis Creek)
Troy Drive SE -- Shotgun
216th (downstream of Hobson)
Chatwood Dr. SE
Cedar Flats Road SW
Libby Road NE
Offut Lake Rd SE Culvert (Trib to Offut Lake)
Summit Lake Road Cut-Off Road SW

Non-Motorized
Kingham Sidewalk (S of Martin Way)
Steilacoom Rd Sidewalk (SR510 - Hawks Glen Dr)
Boulevard Rd Crosswalk at 45th Avenue SE
Boulevard Rd Sidewalk Extension (Boulevard Heights to Log Cabin)

Road Preservation
Delphi Rd Phase 3 - 62nd to 32nd
Vail Rd SE - 138th to Rocking Ln
Yelm Hwy - Rich Rd Wiggens Ext Rd
Steilacoom Rd SE - Dutterow to Nisqually Cut-Off
Pacific Ave - Lacey City Limits to Steilacoom Rd
Old Pacific Hwy - Reservation Rd to Pierce County Line
Carpenter Rd SE - Lacey City Limits to Lacey City Limits
143rd Ave - Tilley Rd to Arrowhead Ln
15th Ave NE Preservation - Sleater Kinney to Draham
183rd Ave - Sargent Rd to Old Hwy 99
Road Standards
Johnson Point Rd NE (Rural Road Upgrade)

Safety
Martin Way Corridor Mobility Strategy
Mullen Rd BNSF underxing
Pacific Avenue & Steilacoom and Union Mills Roundabouts
Johnson Pt Rd NE at 78th Ave NE
Boston Harbor Rd NE at Zangle Rd NE

Miscellaneous
Quiet Zone - Carpenter/Atchison Dry SE
Quiet Zone – Marvin Rd SE (south of Kyro Rd SE)

Key Changes from Previous Capital Facilities Program:

Status	Project
Completed[1] (anticipated)	Piesenner Road Crossing Study
Completed (anticipated)	B-2 Bridge at Beaver Creek (77160)
Completed (anticipated)	Lydia Hawk-Safe Routes to School Project
Completed	Steamboat Island Road Rumble Strip
Completed	Mud Bay Road and Delphi Road Intersection
Completed	Countywide Signing Upgrade
Under Construction	Bald Hill Rd. Upgrade (Phase 1) - Smith Prairie to Owl Pit
Under Construction	Rich Rd. Upgrade - (Phase 2) - 87th to Normandy St.
Under Construction	Delphi Road Upgrade (Phase 3) –32nd Avenue to 62nd Avenue SW
Under Construction	Yelm Hwy and Clar Mar - Intersection (61192)
Under Construction	Steilacoom Road Improvements (Pacific to Marvin/SR 510) (61461)
Under Construction	Innovative Safety Program - High Friction Road Surface
Under Construction	Countywide Restoration and Resurfacing Project 2018
Under Construction	Fish Passage Enhancement Program
New	Independence Bridge (I-5) Scour Repair
New	Sargent Road Hwy 99 to US 12
New	Roadway Capacity Program
New	Fish Passage Enhancement Program
New	Safe Routes to School Program
Grant Award (anticipated)	County Road Safety Improvement Program

[1] Most Federally funding projects have project carryover into the following year to accommodate project closeout activities.

POLICIES

Thurston County's annual capital budget and six year transportation program required under RCW 36.81.121 will be consistent with the intent and substance of the Capital Facilities Plan and the Transportation Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

1. The year in which a project is carried out or the amount of the 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 as to when they may be used.

    b. Change in the timing of a facility to serve a new development that occurs at a different time than had been anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan.

    c. Anticipated timing of delivery of the project.

    d. The six-year transportation improvement program and capital facilities plan include funding reasonably expected within the 6 year period.

2. 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 financially advantageous.

3. The addition of an entirely new facility, not anticipated in the Capital Facilities Plan will require a formal amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

4. The transportation projects in the Capital Facilities Plan and Transportation Chapter of this Comprehensive Plan are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Table 6-8

Public Works - Transportation

2018-2023

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS **Fund Source**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**6-Yr. Total**
REET	$3,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$3,500,000
GRANTS	$6,739,213	$4,918,223	$5,144,919	$4,027,500	$0	$0	$20,829,855
COUNTY ROADS FUND (L)	$2,695,981	$1,241,998	$978,843	$1,034,500	$50,000	$450,000	$6,451,322
TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES (I)	$550,000	$150,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$700,000
OTHER (DEVELOPER, OTHER AGENCY, OR BOND)	$564,806	$416,779	$195,238	$0	$0	$0	$1,176,823
NON-GOVERNMENTAL GRANT	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTALS	**$14,050,000**	**$6,727,000**	**$6,319,000**	**$5,062,000**	**$50,000**	**$450,000**	**$32,658,000**

EXPENDITURES FOR PROJECTS **Project Name**	**Priority**	**Fund Source** See legend	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**6-Yr. Total**
City of Olympia Urban Growth Area									
CAPACITY									
Evergreen Parkway/Mud Bay Rd Interchange Improvements (61161)	40	M	$ -	$ 50,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000
Safety									
Yelm Hwy and Clar Mar - Intersection (61192)	1	L	$ 140,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 140,000
OLYMPIA UGA TOTAL			**$ 140,000**	**$ 50,000**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	$ -	**$ 190,000**
City of Lacey Urban Growth Area									
Bridges									
Yelm Hwy Capacity Project 4 - Phase 1 (O-12 Bridge) (61309)	34	L/I	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 50,000
CAPACITY									
Marvin Road Upgrade, Phases 1 & 2 - Pacific Ave/SR 510 to Mullen Rd (61478)	2 & 3	L	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ 350,000	$ -	$ -	$ 1,400,000
Steilacoom Road Improvements (Pacific to Marvin/SR 510) (61461)	16	GN/L/A/I	$ 2,300,000	$ 10,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2,310,000
Mullen Road Upgrade - (Lacey City Limits to Carpenter Road SE) (61487)	6	GC/L/A	$ 486,000	$ 3,236,000	$ 3,401,000	$ 12,000	$ -	$ -	$ 7,135,000
Yelm Hwy and Meridian Rd Intersection Improvements	13	I	$ 100,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 100,000
Meridian Rd (Martin Way to Lacey City Limits) (61338)	24	M	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 150,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 200,000
SAFETY									
Pacific Ave & Steilacoom Rd Roundabout	9	L	$ -	$ 50,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000
Olympic View Traffic Calming	25	GC	$ 125,000	$ 830,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 955,000
Lydia Hawk-Safe Routes to School Project (61493)		GC/L	$ 10,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 10,000
CITY OF LACEY GROWTH AREA TOTALS			**$ 3,371,000**	**$ 4,526,000**	**$ 3,901,000**	**$ 362,000**	**$ -**	**$ 50,000**	**$ 12,210,000**
City of Tumwater Urban Growth Area									
Other									

Table 6-8

Public Works - Transportation

2018-2023

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS **Fund Source**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**6-Yr. Total**
REET	$3,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$3,500,000
GRANTS	$6,739,213	$4,918,223	$5,144,919	$4,027,500	$0	$0	$20,829,855
COUNTY ROADS FUND (L)	$2,695,981	$1,241,998	$978,843	$1,034,500	$50,000	$450,000	$6,451,322
TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES (I)	$550,000	$150,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$700,000
OTHER (DEVELOPER, OTHER AGENCY, OR BOND)	$564,806	$416,779	$195,238	$0	$0	$0	$1,176,823
NON-GOVERNMENTAL GRANT	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTALS	**$14,050,000**	**$6,727,000**	**$6,319,000**	**$5,062,000**	**$50,000**	**$450,000**	**$32,658,000**

Gate Belmore Shared Use Path	26	GC	$	12,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	12,000
City of Tumwater UGA Totals			**$**	**12,000**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$**	**12,000**
GRAND MOUND URBAN GROWTH AREA												
CAPACITY												
Old Hwy 99 Capacity Project (Old Hwy 9 to SR 12) (61497)	20	L/GN/O/I	$	150,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	150,000
Sargent Road Hwy 99 to US 12 Urban Road Upgrade)	30	L	$	125,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	125,000
SR 12 Upgrade (West UGA Boundary to Old Hwy 99) (61502)	17	I	$	150,000	$ 100,000	$ 100,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	350,000
GRAND MOUND UGA TOTAL			**$**	**425,000**	**$ 100,000**	**$ 100,000**	**$ -**	**$ -**		**$**	**625,000**
RURAL THURSTON COUNTY												
CAPACITY												
Vail Rd Upgrade (Phase 2) - 138th Ave to 153rd Ave (61450)	14	GC/L	$	140,000	$ 194,000	$ 931,000	$ 1,150,000	$ -	$ -	$	2,415,000
Delphi Rd Upgrade (Phase 2) 32nd Ave to 62nd Ave (61451)	7	GC/L	$	2,120,000	$ 12,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	2,132,000
Rich Rd SE Upgrade - (Phase 2 - 87th Ave to Normandy St SE) (61460)	4	GC/L	$	725,000	$ 10,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	735,000
Bald Hill Rd SE Upgrade (Phase 1) - Smith Prairie to Owl Pit (61472)	8	GC/L	$	12,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	12,000
SAFETY												
Innovative Safety Program - High Friction Road Surface Treatment	9	GC	$	2,000,000	$ 10,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	2,010,000
Old Hwy 99 and Tilley Rd Intersection	26	I/L	$	50,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	50,000
Local Road Safety Plan	11	GC/L	$	25,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	25,000
Countywide Restoration and Resurfacing Project 2018		GC/L	$	830,000	$ 5,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	835,000
Countywide Restoration and Resurfacing Project 2019		GC/L	$	-	$ 830,000	$ 5,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	835,000
Johnson Point Rd and Hawks Prairie Rd Intersection Improvements	38	I/L	$	150,000	$ 50,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$	200,000
BRIDGES												
Independence Bridge (I-5) Scour Repair	15	GN/L	$	250,000	$ 250,000	$ 707,000	$ 2,000,000	$ -	$ -	$	3,207,000
Reeder Road Bridge(R-3) at Beaver Creek	45	GN/L	$	150,000	$ 200,000	$ 325,000	$ 1,500,000	$ -	$ -	$	2,175,000
CULVERTS												

Table 6-8
Public Works - Transportation
2018-2023

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS Fund Source	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	6-Yr. Total
REET	$3,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$3,500,000
GRANTS	$6,739,213	$4,918,223	$5,144,919	$4,027,500	$0	$0	$20,829,855
COUNTY ROADS FUND (L)	$2,695,981	$1,241,998	$978,843	$1,034,500	$50,000	$450,000	$6,451,322
TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES (I)	$550,000	$150,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$700,000
OTHER (DEVELOPER, OTHER AGENCY, OR BOND)	$564,806	$416,779	$195,238	$0	$0	$0	$1,176,823
NON-GOVERNMENTAL GRANT	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTALS	**$14,050,000**	**$6,727,000**	**$6,319,000**	**$5,062,000**	**$50,000**	**$450,000**	**$32,658,000**

Hunter Point Rd NW Culvert (Trib to Eld Inlet) (61352)	18	L/R/GC	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 50,000
OTHER									
Roadway Capacity Program		GN/L/I	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 50,000
County Road Safety Improvement Program		GN/L	$ 100,000	$ 440,000	$ 300,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 840,000
Bridge Program		GN/L	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 50,000
Fish Passage Enhancement Program		REET	$ 3,500,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 3,500,000
Culvert Program		L/GN	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 50,000
Road Preservation Program		GC/GN/L	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 50,000
Thurston County Americans With Disability Act (ADA) Improvement Program (61495)		L	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 50,000	$ 300,000
Safe Routes to Schools Program		GN/L	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 50,000
Thurston County Bicycle and Pedestrian Program		GN/L	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 50,000	$ 50,000
RURAL THURSTON COUNTY TOTAL			**$ 10,102,000**	**$ 2,051,000**	**$ 2,318,000**	**$ 4,700,000**	**$ 50,000**	**$ 400,000**	**$ 19,621,000**
TOTALS			**$ 14,050,000**	**$ 6,727,000**	**$ 6,319,000**	**$ 5,062,000**	**$ 50,000**	**$ 450,000**	**$ 32,658,000**

LEGEND:
GC - State or Federal Grants have been COMMITTED
GN - State or Federal Grants have NOT been COMMITTED
L - County Road Fund LOCAL match
A - Agency & contributions
B - Proposed county BOND
REET - Real Estate Excise Tax
I - Impact Fee Funding
* Joint project with the county stormwater utility
M - Developer Mitigation (Not impact fees)
TBDN - Transportation Benefit District - Non-Committed
TBDC - Transportation Benefit District - Committed
Project Numbers - (XXXXX)

STUDIES

Yelm Highway Midblock Crosswalk (Rich Rd to Lacey City limits)

Martin Way Corridor Mobility Strategy (61337)

Pacific Ave Midblock Crossing

Table 6-8								
Public Works - Transportation								
2018-2023								
REVENUES FOR PROJECTS								
Fund Source			**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**6-Yr. Total**
REET			$3,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$3,500,000
GRANTS			$6,739,213	$4,918,223	$5,144,919	$4,027,500	$0	$0	$20,829,855
COUNTY ROADS FUND (L)			$2,695,981	$1,241,998	$978,843	$1,034,500	$50,000	$450,000	$6,451,322
TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES (I)			$550,000	$150,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$700,000
OTHER (DEVELOPER, OTHER AGENCY, OR BOND)			$564,806	$416,779	$195,238	$0	$0	$0	$1,176,823
NON-GOVERNMENTAL GRANT			$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTALS			**$14,050,000**	**$6,727,000**	**$6,319,000**	**$5,062,000**	**$50,000**	**$450,000**	**$32,658,000**

New Projects or Programs		**Completed Projects**		**Dropped Projects**
Independence Bridge (I-5) Scour Repair		Piesenner Road Crossing		None
Sargent Road Hwy 99 to US 12		B-2 Bridge at Beaver Creek (77160)		
Roadway Capacity Program		Lydia Hawk-Safe Routes to School Project		
Fish Passage Enhancement Program		Steamboat Island Road Rumble Strip		
Safe Routes to School Program		Mud Bay Road and Delphi Road Intersection		
Olympic View Traffic Calming		Countywide Signing Upgrade		
County Restoration and Resurfacing Project 2018 and 2019		Bald Hill Road SE Upgrade (Phase I)		

F. County Buildings:

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

The recent economic recession resulted in a reduction of both staff and service levels, somewhat relieving the immediate space needs. The County continues to evaluate utilizing owned facilities to their highest and best use as an alternative to leased space.

In 2013 the County contracted with a consultant firm to provide a Space Needs Assessment Plan (SNAP). That study confirmed that some County government functions have outgrown the space available in the county buildings within the Courthouse campus. The study did establish space needs in terms of program and square footage. To gather more information, in 2015 the Board requested a broader analysis of the merits of renovating or replacing the Courthouse. The 2015 Courthouse Renovation or Replacement Comparative Feasibility study:

- Assessed the potential renovation needs of the existing Courthouse complex and explored suitable property near the existing Courthouse that could be used to expand as needed in the foreseeable future.
- Developed conceptual options for constructing a new Courthouse building or complex of buildings at various general locations within Olympia City limits.
- Generated cost estimates for the proposed projects and described potential financing options.

County administration is considering these strategies for renovating or replacing the Courthouse and will be determining next steps in the coming years.

Planning and design of a new jail facility was completed over the last few years, resulting in construction of the Accountability and Restitution Center completed in late 2010. Remodeling existing facilities to accommodate the options/work release program was completed in 2013. County administration is in the process of evaluating alternative uses of the courthouse campus jail facility that was mostly vacated when the ARC was placed into operation in 2015.

Facilities that are in good condition and expected to last for more than a decade include Courthouse Building 5, the Juvenile Detention/Family & Juvenile Court building (opened in 1998), the Medic 1/TCOMM Center (opened in 1998), the Public Health and Social Services building (opened in 2001), the Coroner building (opened in 2003), Tilley Campus Buildings and fuel island (housing Public Works, Central Services' Fleet Services, and Emergency Management, newly opened or remodeled in 2012) and the Evaluation and Treatment Center (opened in 2005). The 3400 Building seismic and roofing project was completed 2013, but the County has since sold that site for surplus. The remaining County

owned facilities are aging, and some will require extensive remodeling or replacement in the near future, including Courthouse Buildings 1, 2, and 3 (completed in 1978).

A 30 year major maintenance plan was established and began funding in 1998, with final buildings added in 2010. Major maintenance needs for these facilities have been estimated and funded through annual reserves set aside within a 30-year horizon. The County hired MENG Analysis in 2016 to conduct a thorough set of building condition assessments in order to further develop and refine the major maintenance plan. The MENG study identified $120 million in predictable renewal project expenditures over the next 20 years, considerably higher than previous County estimates. The County is reviewing the findings to develop strategies to prioritize and fund critical renewal projects in the coming years.

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

COUNTY BUILDINGS OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES:OBJECTIVE 1-L:
***County Buildings* -** County government buildings should be located to provide convenient access to residents being served, where appropriate public facilities and services are available or can be provided, and designed for efficient and frugal use of public monies.

POLICIES:

1. Standards for level of service must be realistic, attainable, and not excessive.
2. Level of Service standards for County Buildings should be based on:
    a. Consideration of national, state and professional standards for the applicable space.
    b. Applicable federal and state laws.
    c. Cost effectiveness and consideration of the ability of the county to fund ongoing costs of operations and maintenance.
3. Efficiency in design, sustainability, 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 has been established to provide funding for major maintenance projects. Building condition assessments should be initiated and sustained to inform the major maintenance program.
7. Evaluation of capital costs and maintenance and operation costs should give priority to long-term energy efficiencies achieved through design and construction.
8. Charges for space in county buildings should recover full costs, including capital expenses, amortization, depreciation, and maintenance and operation cost.

Table 6-9

THURSTON COUNTY BUILDINGS CAPITAL PROJECTS

2018-2023

REVENUES FOR PROJECTS *Fund Source*		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	6 Yr. Total
Central Services Fund Balance	Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Central Services Reserves	CSBR	$3,305,000	$2,175,000	$1,600,000	$1,375,000	$1,950,000	$900,000	$11,305,000
Central Services FUTURE internal service rates	Other	$0	$125,000	$150,000	$0	$0	$0	$275,000
Detention Sales Tax	DST	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from existing committed revenue sources	Bond E	$7,200,000	$6,325,000	$1,625,000	$425,000	$800,000	$7,550,000	$23,925,000
Roads and Transportation Services/Bonds	Other	$0	$0	$750,000	$1,200,000	$0	$0	$1,950,000
General Fund	GF	$275,000	$0	$100,000	$0	$0	$0	$375,000
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)	R	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Grants	G	$0	$0	$0	$0	$275,000	$550,000	$825,000
Court Improvement Funds	Other	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from new, not yet committed revenue sources.	Bond F	$200,000	$17,950,000	$58,250,000	$92,500,000	$45,000,000	$0	$213,900,000
Noxious Weed Assessment	NW	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTALS		**10,980,000**	**26,575,000**	**62,475,000**	**95,500,000**	**48,025,000**	**9,000,000**	**252,555,000**

EXPENDITURES--PROJECTS	Funding Source	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	6 Yr. Total
Thurston County Rural								
10-year Facility and Capital Building Plan	Other	$0	$125,000	$150,000	$0	$0	$0	$275,000
Tilley Building A & B Power Systems Improvements	CSBR	$150,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$150,000
Tilley Campus Potential Property Purchase	Bond F	$0	$0	$0	$1,200,000	$0	$0	$1,200,000
Tilley Sand Storage	Bond F	$0	$0	$750,000	$0	$0	$0	$750,000
Tilley Water Systems Improvements	CSBR	$0	$200,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$200,000
Tilley Truck & Tire Wash	CSBR	$650,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$650,000
Lacey / Olympia / Tumwater UGA								
County Wide Security Upgrade	GF	$0	$125,000	$700,000	$425,000	$0	$0	$1,250,000
Potential Consolidated Sheriff/Training/Patrol Facility	GF	$0	$0	$0	$0	$800,000	$7,200,000	$8,000,000
Special Projects (Major Maintenance/Repairs)	CSBR	$885,000	$750,000	$950,000	$750,000	$950,000	$500,000	$4,785,000
Olympia UGA								
Courthouse Air System Major Maintenance	CSBR	$200,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$200,000
Courthouse Building #1 Infrastructure Improvements	CSBR	$0	$0	$150,000	$75,000	$50,000	$50,000	$325,000
Courthouse Building #1 Security Projects	CSBR	$60,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$60,000
Courthouse Building #2 Infrastructure Improvements	CSBR	$150,000	$75,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$0	$375,000
Courthouse Building #2 Secured Entrance Project	CSBR	$0	$0	$0	$400,000	$600,000	$0	$1,000,000
Courthouse Building #3 Infrastructure Improvements	CSBR	$275,000	$150,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$0	$575,000
Courthouse Building #4 Infrastructure Improvements	CSBR	$0	$150,000	$50,000	$50,000	$0	$0	$250,000
Courthouse Building #4 Security Projects	CSBR	$60,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$60,000
Courthouse Building #5 Security Projects	GF	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$350,000	$350,000
Courthouse Building #6 Security Projects	CSBR	$0	$0	$0	$0	$250,000	$0	$250,000
Courthouse Buildings #2 & #3 Security Projects	CSBR	$60,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$60,000
Courthouse Campus Geotechncial Report	CSBR	$0	$150,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$150,000
Courthouse Mansard Roof Major Maintenance	CSBR	$0	$200,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$200,000
Courthouse Project	Bond F	$200,000	$17,200,000	$55,000,000	$85,000,000	$42,500,000	$0	$199,900,000
Courthouse Secured Entrance Project	Bond F	$0	$750,000	$2,250,000	$0	$0	$0	$3,000,000
Emergency Services Center HVAC Replacement Project	CSBR	$0	$250,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$250,000
Emergency Services Center Roof Replacement Project	CSBR	$0	$0	$350,000	$0	$0	$0	$350,000
Energy Saving - Air Handling Systems, LED Lighting & Solar Panels	G	$0	$0	$0	$0	$250,000	$250,000	$500,000
Energy Savings - Automation & Metering Solutions	G	$0	$0	$0	$0	$25,000	$300,000	$325,000
McLane Property Improvements	CSBR	$10,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$10,000
Public Health Building Improvement Project	CSBR	$75,000	$175,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$250,000
Lacey UGA								
4422 Sixth Avenue Disposition	GF	$25,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$25,000
WSU-Extension Facility Remodel	CSBR	$70,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$70,000
Fairgrounds Building Infrastructure Improvements	GF	$250,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$250,000
Tumwater UGA								
3488 Ferguson Site Feasibility Analysis	GF	$0	$0	$100,000	$0	$0	$0	$100,000
3488 Ferguson Site Potential Development	Bond F	$0	$0	$500,000	$5,000,000	$2,500,000	$0	$8,000,000

ARC Expansion	Bond E	$7,200,000	$5,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$12,700,000
ARC Generator Access Improvements	GF	$0	$0	$150,000	$0	$0	$0	$150,000
Coroner Air Handler Replacement Project	CSBR	$125,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$125,000
Coroner Site Development Feasibility Analysis	GF	$0	$0	$75,000	$0	$0	$0	$75,000
Coroner Site Potential Development	Bond F	$0	$0	$500,000	$2,500,000	$0	$0	$3,000,000
CSA Building Remodel Project	GF	$0	$700,000	$700,000	$0	$0	$0	$1,400,000
Family Justice Center Cabling Upgrade	CSBR	$160,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$160,000
Family Justice Center Camera Controls System Replacement	CSBR	$200,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$200,000
Family Justice Center Delta Controls Upgrade	CSBR	$175,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$175,000
Family Justice Center Duress Alarm System	CSBR	$0	$75,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$75,000
Family Justice Center Roof Replacement	CSBR	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$350,000	$350,000
TOTALS		**$10,980,000**	**$26,575,000**	**$62,475,000**	**$95,500,000**	**$48,025,000**	**$9,000,000**	**$252,555,000**

DEBT SERVICE AMOUNT		**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**6 Yr Total**
Current Debt		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Future Debt			$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTALS			**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

Dropped:
3400 Building Improvements
Evaluation and Treatment Center Infrastructure Improvements
Evaluation and Treatment Center Storm-water Management Improvements

Added:
Courthouse Building #6 Security Project
Fairgrounds Infrastructure

Modified:
4422 Sixth Avenue Disposition (Formerly: Remodel)
ARC Expansion (Formerly: Jail Flex Unit Construction and ARC Stormwater Recovery System Improvements)
Tilley Sand Storage (Formerly: Shed Relocation)
Tilley Truck & Tire Wash (Continued from 2016)

Completed:
Courthouse Building #2 Superior Court Space Improvements

G. Conservation Futures Program:

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

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

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

In 1989, Thurston County became the first county in the state to implement the tax levy and has been collecting it ever since. The rate paid by taxpayers in 2015 was 4.69-cents per $1,000. By statute, the tax levy is limited to a 1% annual increase. The funding, identified in the budget as Conservation Futures, is budgeted annually by the Thurston County Board of County Commissioners.

Project selection process:

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

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

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

B. Unique natural features and or natural resources?

C. Historic or culturally significant lands or markers?

D. Critical and/or sensitive lands?

E. Desirable agricultural and/or forest working-lands characteristics?

4. What is the certainty of project success?
5. What is the amount of other financial contributions toward the project purchase?
6. Does the project proposal address public access?
7. How many partners and project supporters are there?
8. How well does the project meet the program Goals and Objectives?

Conservation Futures Projects:

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

Conservation Futures Program Goal and Policies:

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

POLICIES:

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

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

Table 6-10
Resource Stewardship - Conservation Futures

	2018 Projection	2019 Projection	2020 Projection	2021 Projection	2022 Projections	2023 Projections	Total Budget 2018-2023
Revenue							
Conservation Futures Revenue	$1,369,804	$1,383,510	$1,397,399	$1,411,461	$1,425,716	$1,425,716	$8,413,606
Total Revenue	**$1,369,804**	**$1,383,510**	**$1,397,399**	**$1,411,461**	**$1,425,716**	**$1,425,716**	**$8,413,606**
Expenditure							
Debt Service							
Cooper Point Property #2270 (pay off 2025)	$22,503	$22,476	$21,299	$21,370	$21,542	$21,542	$130,732
Total Debt Service	**$22,503**	**$22,476**	**$21,299**	**$21,370**	**$21,542**	**$21,542**	**$130,732**
Programs/Projects							
Public Works M&O for Conservation Future Projects	$195,938	$197,897	$199,876	$201,876	$203,894	$203,894	$1,203,375
Indirect Costs	$29,315	$29,901	$30,499	$31,109	$31,731	$31,731	$184,286
Total Programs/Projects	**$225,253**	**$227,798**	**$230,375**	**$232,985**	**$235,625**	**$235,625**	**$1,387,661**
Capital							
Commissioners Challenge Projects	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$300,000
Frye Cove Creek Habitat Acquisition	$250,000						$250,000
New Project Acquisition of Property	$700,000	$950,000	$950,000	$950,000	$950,000	$950,000	$5,450,000
Total Capital	**$1,000,000**	**$1,000,000**	**$1,000,000**	**$1,000,000**	**$1,000,000**	**$1,000,000**	**$5,000,000**
Total Expenditures	**$1,247,756**	**$1,250,274**	**$1,251,674**	**$1,254,355**	**$1,257,167**	**$1,257,167**	**$7,518,393**

NOTES:

A. Public Works M & O for Conservation Futures Projects is 15% of prior year Property Taxes and can only be used on property acquired with Conservation Futures.

B. Conservation Futures funds cannot be used for development.

C. In current year, funds may be allocated for projects that will not be completed until a future year--many projects take longer than one year to complete.

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

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

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

SUMMARY OF SIX-YEAR FINANCING PLAN
Table 6-11

SUMMARY OF 2018 - 2023 CAPITAL COSTS
(From Tables 6-4 through 6-10)

	Expenditure Total	
Project Category	2017 - 2022	2018-2023
CAPITAL		
Parks and Open Space	$7,954,000	$4,308,000
Solid Waste	$15,200,000	$13,395,000
Stormwater	$12,358,381	$12,336,373
Water and Sewer	$8,641,000	$9,976,000
Roads, Bridges and Bike Lanes	$35,733,000	$32,658,000
County Buildings	$254,150,000	$252,555,000
Conservation Futures	$8,344,182	$8,413,606
Capital Costs Total	$342,380,563	$333,641,979
DEBT SERVICE PAYMENTS		
Parks and Trails		
Solid Waste		
Stormwater		
Water and Sewer	$4,458,426	$3,406,119
Transportation		
County Buildings	$47,525,827	$40,972,932
Conservation Futures	$178,917	$130,732
Debt Service Total	$52,163,170	$44,509,783

Table 6-12
SUMMARY SIX YEAR FINANCING PLAN
2018 - 2023

Revenue Sources	Six Year Totals							Totals by Revenue Source
	Parks and Open Space	Solid Waste	Stormwater	Water and Sewer	Roads	Buildings	Conservation Futures	
Existing Revenues - Earmarked (May be used only for specific types of facilities)								
Property Tax - Cons. Futures (Cash)							$8,413,606	$8,413,606
Forest revenues (& reserves)					$6,451,322			$6,451,322
Interest Income and Leasehold Excise Tax								$0
Utility Fees/Rates - w/o increases		$12,595,000	$12,246,373	$5,076,000		$275,000		$30,192,373
Detention Sales Tax						$0		$0
Committed Developer & other Jurisdiction Financing								$0
Sewer - Water Fees & Assessments								$0
Utility Loans - to be repaid from existing fees / REET				$1,050,000				$1,050,000
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from existing committed revenue sources						$23,925,000		$23,925,000
Councilmanic GO Bond Proceeds - for repayment from existing, general use revenue sources								$0
Earmarked Carryover Funds (or cap. reserves)		$800,000						$800,000
Noxious Weed Assessment (NW)						$0		$0
Central Service Reserves						$11,305,000		$11,305,000
Internal Department transfers from non-capital programs								$0
SUBTOTAL	**$0**	**$13,395,000**	**$12,246,373**	**$6,126,000**	**$6,451,322**	**$35,505,000**	**$8,413,606**	**$82,137,301**
Existing Revenues - General Use (May be used for more than one type of facility)								
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) / General Fund (cash)	$2,530,000			$3,850,000	$3,500,000	$375,000		$10,255,000
REET. Gen. Fund, or owner assess. (to be determined)								$0
SUBTOTAL	**$2,530,000**	**$0**	**$0**	**$3,850,000**	**$3,500,000**	**$375,000**	**$0**	**$10,255,000**
Proposed New Revenues or Increased Rates								
GRANTS	$240,000		$90,000	$0	$20,829,855	$825,000		$21,984,855
Impact Fees	$1,520,000				$700,000			$2,220,000
Emergency - FEMA, Applicable Co. Reserves, etc.								$0
Utility Rates - portion from increased (or new) rates/assess.								$0
Utility Loans - to be repaid from increase rates								$0
Trail Permit Fees	$18,000							$18,000
Other					$1,176,823	$1,950,000		$3,126,823
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.						$213,900,000		$213,900,000
Transportaiton Benefit District								
SUBTOTAL	**$1,778,000**	**$0**	**$90,000**	**$0**	**$22,706,678**	**$216,675,000**	**$0**	**$241,249,678**
REVENUE TOTALS	**$4,308,000**	**$13,395,000**	**$12,336,373**	**$9,976,000**	**$32,658,000**	**$252,555,000**	**$8,413,606**	**$333,641,979**

EFFECT ON LOCAL TAXES AND FEES:

Table 6-13
Effect on Local Taxes and Fees

FACILITY	CURRENT FEE/TAX USED FOR THE FACILITY	PROPOSED CHANGE IN FEE/TAX FOR THE FACILITY IN THIS PLAN
County Buildings	REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX must be spent for Capital Projects specified in the Capital Facilities Plan. This is a tax of ½ of 1% paid by sellers upon the sale of real property in the unincorporated county. SALES TAX - 1/10 of a cent. The voters approved this tax in September 1995 for construction, maintenance and operation of juvenile detention facilities and adult jails.	No change in the real estate excise tax. No change in the Sales tax.
County Parks	REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX for some current park development and major maintenance costs. CONSERVATION FUTURES PROPERTY TAX LEVY for some current park land and open space acquisition costs. This is a county-wide property tax. The current rate is 4.64 cents per thousand assessed value. PARKS IMPACT FEES for purchase of additional Park Lands and Open Space to comply with required Level of Service. TRAIL PERMIT FEES	No change in either the REAL ESTATE EXCISE TAX or the CONSERVATION FUTURES property tax levy and IMPACT FEES.
Roads Construction (and Major	FOREST REVENUES TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES to fund traffic projects that add	NOTE: Revenues the county receives from the property tax road levy are used for road maintenance, not construction.

FACILITY	CURRENT FEE/TAX USED FOR THE FACILITY	PROPOSED CHANGE IN FEE/TAX FOR THE FACILITY IN THIS PLAN
Maintenance and Repair)	capacity to the existing transportation network to meet required Levels of Service.	Grants, forest revenues and a portion of the gas tax that are deposited in the Road Fund are the primary funding sources for road construction and Traffic Impact Fees.
Water Facilities	Water utility rates and charges for each respective utility.	Annual changes in the Water utility rates and charges are expected, as established by Thurston County Code 15.12. 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. 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.
Sewer Facilities	Sewer utility rates and charges for each respective utility.	No changes in the Sewer utility rates and charges are expected, as established by Thurston Code 15.12. If authorized by the BOCC, REET may be used to fund efforts associated with new capital facilities or portions thereof, when necessary. 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.
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling Facilities	TIPPING FEES (landfill disposal fee): $119.00 per ton for garbage, $48.00 for yard waste, and $143.00 for asbestos.	Tipping Fee increase is reviewed every 4 years to cover a 20-year period (to 2030). In 2010 the BOCC elected to implement rate increases on an annual basis.

FACILITY	CURRENT FEE/TAX USED FOR THE FACILITY	PROPOSED CHANGE IN FEE/TAX FOR THE FACILITY IN THIS PLAN
Stormwater	STORMWATER AND SURFACE UTILITY RATES AND CHARGES Beginning in 2015 the Storm and Surface Water Utility Rates and Charges will be adjusted based on projections of costs and requirements for the five year period ending in 2019. The Capital Facilities portion of the rate is proposed to increase over the 5-year period from $3.00 to $9.00 per year for rural residences and from $18.00 to $37.00 per year for urban residences. 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.	Storm and Surface Water Utility Rates and Charges are established by Thurston County Code 15.06. Rates shown are for 2015. These rates may increase over the next five year period, subject to approval.
Conservation Futures Program	Conservation Futures property tax levy for some parks, open space, salmon habitat, and agricultural lands. The current Conservation Futures tax rate is 4.64-cents per $1000 assessed value.	Changes in the Conservation Futures property tax levy are made on a yearly basis. Rates may not be increased over 6.25-cents per $1000 assessed value on property. The levy is subject to a statutory limit of 1% increase a year.
School District Impact Fees	As proposed for single family and multi-family development per the individual school district's CFP. As authorized in the Thurston County Impact Fee Ordinance (Title 25 TCC).	As proposed for single family and multi-family development per the individual school district's CFP. As authorized in the Thurston County Impact Fee Ordinance (Title 25 TCC).

VII. Summary of 2018-2038 Project Projections

As noted in the introduction to this Plan, the emphasis here is on a six-year forecast of capital needs, costs and revenues. However, this is in the context of a broad summary of anticipated 20-year project needs. This summary is presented in Table 6-14, below.

Table 6-14
2018 - 2038 Twenty-year Generalized Project Projections

Program	Project Categories	Estimated 20-Year Costs
Parks and Recreation	Development	$25,000,000
	Major Improvements	$10,000,000
	Acquisition	$5,250,000
	Master Planning	$500,000
Parks Subtotal		$40,750,000
Solid Waste	Land Acquisition	$2,500,000
	Capital Planning	$1,500,000
	Construction	$50,000,000
Solid Waste Subtotal		$54,000,000
Stormwater	Land Acquisition	$1,000,000
	Capital Planning	$3,400,000
	New Construction	$29,244,200
	Facility Replacement Construction	$10,723,000
Stormwater Subtotal		$44,367,200
Water and Sewer	Water Rights Acquisition	$5,100,000
	Capital Planning	$1,530,000
	Land Acquisition	$3,570,000
	Construction	$38,760,000
Water and Sewer Subtotal		$48,960,000
Transportation	Capacity	$122,040,000
	Design Improvements	$57,120,000
	Safety	$21,420,000
	Bridges	$14,280,000
	Other	$14,280,000
Transportation Subtotal		$229,140,000
County Buildings	New Construction	$190,000,000
	Major Improvements	$109,000,000
	Acquisition	$10,000,000
County Buildings Subtotal		$309,000,000
Total		$726,217,200

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 - 15 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 6-15
- School districts not listed in Table 6-15
- Grand Mound/Rochester Park & Recreation District
- Tanglewilde Park and Recreation District
- Cemetery Districts #1 and #2
- Other special districts not listed above

Thurston County cannot control the planning or construction of capital facilities by other public entities within its borders, such as school districts, fire districts, port districts and transit entities. However, the capital facilities planned by these other entities must, under the Growth Management Act, be part of the County's Capital Facilities Plan. Inclusion of the capital facilities planning by these other entities will promote consistent and unified capital facilities planning throughout the County. However, the inclusion of their plans does not imply County approval or disapproval of the plans or the levels of service, which they adopt. Rather, their inclusion insures compliance with the GMA and enables a consistent approach to capital facilities planning throughout the County, taking into consideration the Capital Facilities Plans of all public entities in the County. Most of the public entities referenced in table 6-15 have adopted their own 6 and 20 year Capital Facilities Plans. For more information, please refer to those adopted Capital Facilities Plans. For goals and policies related to schools and coordinated planning with other public entities, see below.

Table 6-15
Facilities of Other Public Entities

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	**Location**		
Rainier School District #307			
Construction/modernizations	207 Centre St.	$1,000,000	TBD
Mechanical/Lighting Upgrades at High School	308 Second St.	$800,000	TBD
Rainier School District Total		**$1,800,000**	
North Thurston School District #3 (2014-2020)			
New Construction	Varies	$50,000,000	Bonds & voluntary mitigation
Modernizations	Varies	$119,000,000	Bonds & state assistance
Site/Land Acquisition	Varies	$2,000,000	Bonds
Facility Upgrades / Asset preservation	District wide	$27,000,000	Bonds
Emergent Needs	Varies	$24,705,000	Bonds
Facility Planning	Varies	$1,652,500	Bonds
Temporary Classrooms purchase (5 per year) and relocation	Varies	$10,500,000	Bonds & voluntary mitigation
Site/Land Acquisition	Varies	$2,000,000	Bonds

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	**Location**		
North Thurston School District Total		**$241,307,500**	
Olympia School District			
Garfield Elementary School Modernization	326 Plymouth St. NW	$21,300,000	Bond Financing impact/ mitigation fees
Centennial Elementary School Modernization	2637 45th Ave SE Olympia	$12,200,000	Bond Financing impact/ mitigation fees
McLane Elementary School Modernization	200 Delphi Rd. SW	$16,800,000	Bond Financing impact/ mitigation fees
Roosevelt Elementary School Modernization	1417 San Francisco Ave. NE	$16,600,000	Bond Financing impact/ mitigation fees
Capital High School Modernization and JAMS Pathway	2707 Conger Ave NW	$19,700,000	Bond Financing impact/ mitigation fees
Olympia High School Addition/Portable Replacement	1302 North Street SE	$11,900,000	Bond Financing impact/ mitigation fees
Avanti High School Addition and Modernization & Relocation of District Administrative Center	1113 Legion Way SE	$13,800,000	Bond Financing impact/ mitigation fees
Build New Intermediate Middle School (on the same campus as the Centennial Elementary School)	2637 45th Ave. SE	$33,100,000	Secured local bonds and impact / mitigation fees

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	**Location**		
Olympia Regional Learning Academy	Boulevard and 15th Ave. SE	$28,000,000	Secured local bonds
Small Works Roster Projects	Various	$11,681,929	Secured local bonds and levy
Olympia School District Total		**$185,255,329**	
Rochester School District #401			
Study and survey for a new elementary school		To be determined	To be determined
Site acquisition and development	Various sites	$3,000,000	Proposed bonds and impact fees
Temporary Classrooms	Various sites	$1,000,000	Mitigation and impact fees and capital project funds
Rochester School District Total		**$4,000,000**	
Tumwater School District #33			
Site Acquisition & Development	Various sites	$500,000	Secured bonds and impact fees
Temporary Classrooms	Various sites	$600,000	Impact fees
Littlerock Elem. Replacement	12710 Littlerock Rd SW	$1,000,000	Secured bonds/state grant
Bush Middle Additions & Renovations	2120 83rd Ave. SW	$2,000,000	Secured bonds and impact fees
Tumwater Middle School Additions & Renovations	6335 Littlerock Rd. SW	$2,000,000	Secured bonds and impact fees

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	**Location**		
East Olympia Elem. Renovations	8700 Rich Rd. SW	$11,400,000	Secured bonds/state grant
Tumwater Hill Elementary Renovations	3120 Ridgeview Ct. SW	$15,00,000	Secured bonds
New Market Skills Center - minor Renovations	7299 New Market St. SW	$2,000,000	State grants and NMSC Capital Investment Funds
Tumwater High School – Various Renovations and Weight Room Addition	700 Israel Rd. SW	$5,000,000	Secured bonds
Black Hills High School – Various Renovations	7741 Littlerock Rd. SW	$3,400,000	Secured bonds
New Alternative Learning Center	Undetermined	$6,400,000	Secured bonds
District Stadium – Various Improvements	700 Israel Rd. SW	$1,000,000	Secured bonds
Various Small Works Projects (Health Safety & Security, Buildings & Grounds, HVAC, Painting, Sidewalks & Parking Lots)	Various Locations	$6,200,000	Secured bonds
Technology Enhancement	Various Locations	$5,500,000	Secured bonds
Tumwater School District Total		**$62,000,000**	
Yelm Community Schools District #2			
Construct New Elementary School	To be Determined	$16,000,000	Proposed Bond/ Impact Fees
Southworth Elementary Replacement		$16,000,000	Proposed Bond/Impact Fees
Prairie Elementary Modernization		$14,000,000	Proposed Bond/Impact Fees

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	**Location**		
Yelm Middle School Replacement		$31,000,000	Proposed Bond/Impact Fees
Portable Classrooms	Various	$15,000,000	Mitigation Fees
School Buses	Various	$5,000,000	Mitigation Fees
Field Improvements		$5,000,000	Other
Yelm Community Schools Total		**$102,000,000**	
Griffin School District #324			
Re-roofing a portion of the school	6530 33rd Ave. NW	$350,000	Capital Projects Fund
Additional space for all day Kindergarten		$125,000	State Appt./Tuition
Special Education Preschool		$125,000	State Special Ed. Funds
Expansion of Transportation Facility		$50,000	Capital Projects Fund
Building storage and security for compressor		$3,900	Capital Projects Fund
Upgrade Security System		$55,000	Capital Projects Fund
Perimeter Fencing for Schools		$50,000	Capital Projects Fund
Griffin School District Total		**$758,900**	

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	**Location**		
West Thurston Regional Fire Authority			
Renovating Station #1-4	2640 Trevue Ave. SW		Completed
No Capital Projects			
South East Thurston Fire Authority			
Station #21 Remodel	708 Mill Road	$750,000	Bond
Station #22 Remodel	17213 153rd Ave. SE	$750,000	Impact Fees
Station #41 Upgrade	12506 133rd St. Rainier	$1,500,000	Impact Fees
South East Thurston Fire Authority Total		**$3,000,000**	
Fire District #5 & #9, McLane/Black Lake Fire Department			
No Capital Projects			
East Olympia Fire District #6			
Upgrade Fire Station #64 Training Facility	9530 Old Hwy 99	$367,000	Bond
Fire District #6 Total		$367,000	Bond
Fire District #7, North Olympia Fire			

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	**Location**		
No Capital Projects			
Fire District #8, South Bay			
District Fire Training Center Phase II	3349 South Bay Rd. NE	$ 550,000	To be determined
New North- end Fire Station	7804 Henderson Rd. NE	$2,701,000	To be determined
Fire District #8, South Bay Total		**$3,251,000**	
Fire District #12			
No Capital Projects			
Fire District #16, Rochester			
No Capital Projects			
Fire District #17, Bald Hills			
Station 17-1 Remodel	16306 Bald Hill Rd. SE	$ 300,000	To be Determined
Station 17-2 Upgrades	17701 Lawrence Lake Rd. SE	To be Determined	To be Determined
New Station	To be Determined	$ 3,000,000	To be Determined
Fire District #17 Total		$ 3,300,000	
Port of Olympia (2013 only) – Still Waiting for Updated Project List			
Airport Projects	Olympia Regional Airport	$3,900,000	Federal and State grants and local funds

Projects (Name and Location of Each Capital Project)		6 Year Costs	Funding Source (For 6 year projects)
Project Name	**Location**		
Marina and Boatworks	Swantown Marina and Boatworks	$1,100,00	Federal and State grants and Local funds
Marine Terminal Projects	Port Marine Terminal	$2,000,000	Federal and State grants & Local Funds
Environmental Program	Various Port Properties	$1,500,000	Federal and State grants & Local Funds
General Projects	Various Properties	$900,000	Local funds and third party reimbursements
Cascade Pole Groundwater Treatment Plant	Cascade Pole Site, Port Peninsula	$500,000	Federal and State grants and local funds
Port of Olympia Total		**$9,900,000**	
Intercity Transit			
Facilities & Transit Centers	Service District	$9,100,000	Federal and Local Funding
Intercity Transit Total		**$9,100,000**	
Public Utility District #1			
Multiple Water System Upgrades and Facility Replacements	Unincorporated Thurston County	$675,000	Capital Project Fund
Lew's 81st Consolidation of Class B Water System into a Class A System	Olympia, WA		Completed
Total Public Utility District #1		**$675,000**	

B. Public purpose lands and essential public facilities.

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

- Shall identify lands useful for public purposes;
- Will work with the state and cities within its borders to identify areas of shared need for public facilities;
- Shall prepare with other jurisdictions a prioritized list of lands necessary for the identified public uses;
- Include a process for identifying and siting essential public facilities; and
- No local comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude siting essential public facilities in their jurisdiction.

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

Table 6-16

Distinguishing Public Purpose Lands From Essential Public Facilities

PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS	ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES
FOCUS: Lands needed to accommodate public facilities.	FOCUS: Facilities needed to provide public services and functions that are typically difficult to site.
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.	Those public facilities that are usually unwanted by neighborhoods have unusual site requirements or other features that complicate the siting process.
Examples include: • Utility Corridors[1] • Transportation Corridors[2] • Sewage Treatment Facilities • Stormwater Management Facilities • Recreation • Schools • Other Public Uses *Note: See Chapter 2, Land Use, for an inventory map of public purpose lands.* 1. Addressed in the Utilities Chapter. 2. Addressed in the Transportation Chapter.	Examples include: • Large-scale Transportation Facilities • State Educational Facilities • State and Local Correctional Facilities • Solid Waste Handling Facilities • Airports • Inpatient Facilities Such As: ➢ Substance Abuse Facilities ➢ Mental Health Facilities ➢ Group Homes ➢ Secure Community Transition Facilities

C. Coordinated Public Purpose Lands:

The GMA calls for coordination among the cities, the State and the County, to identify and prioritize lands needed for public facilities. This provides the opportunity to also identify areas of shared need, and possibly, shared use or other efficiencies. The County is currently coordinating public facility needs (including land needs) with the cities and towns through the joint planning process. Additional coordination and prioritization should be pursued through a regional consultation process. A partial list of shared needs identified to date is presented in Table 6-17.

Table 6-17

Interjurisdictional Shared Needs for Public Purpose Lands

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

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

D. Siting Essential Public Facilities:

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

Each city and town will:

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

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

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

DESIGNATION OF ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES:

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

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

SITING ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

b. Type Three facilities. Type Three essential public facilities are subject to the county's standard notification requirements for special uses.

3. Essential public facilities shall not have any probable significant adverse impact on critical areas or resource lands, except for lineal facilities, such as highways, where no feasible alternative exists (adapted from County-Wide Policy 4.2(a)).

4. Major public facilities which generate substantial traffic should be sited near major transportation corridors [adapted from County-Wide Policy 4.2(b)].

5. Applicants for Type One essential public facilities shall provide an analysis of the alternative sites considered for the proposed facility. This analysis shall include the following:

    a. An evaluation of the sites' capability to meet basic siting criteria for the proposed facility, such as size, physical characteristics, access, and availability of necessary utilities and support services;

    b. An explanation of the need for the proposed facility in the proposed location;

    c. The sites' relationship to the service area and the distribution of other similar public facilities within the service area or jurisdiction, whichever is larger; and

    d. A general description of the relative environmental, traffic, and social impacts associated with locating the proposed facility at the alternative sites that meet the applicant's basic siting criteria. The applicant shall also identify proposed mitigation measures to alleviate or minimize significant potential impacts.

    e. The applicant shall also briefly describe the process used to identify and evaluate the alternative sites.

6. The proposed project shall comply with all applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, zoning ordinance, and other county regulations.

7. In acquiring and developing parks, trails and other recreation facilities, the County should explore every opportunity to create revenue centers within the park system to generate funding for ongoing park maintenance and operation needs.

PUBLIC PURPOSE LANDS SECTION:

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

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

POLICIES:

1. All development proposals should consider enrollment impacts on schools.

2. Where the size of a single proposed development warrants, the developer should identify at the first stage of project review proposed school sites meeting school district standards such as topography, acreage requirements, location, and soil quality. Such sites should be dedicated for school use under terms negotiated by the developer and the school district.

3. Schools should be sited to consider transportation and health needs as follows:

    a. Where practical, schools should be located along non-arterial roads in order to minimize potential conflicts between pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Where the school district finds that siting on arterials is the most practical, school development should include frontage and off-site improvements needed to mitigate the impacts of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

    b. Availability of sewer and water facilities should also be considered in siting schools, as well as location in areas not subject to exposure from hazardous/dangerous materials, poor air quality or safety hazards.

4. School siting and expansion should avoid prime agricultural land.

5. The County should notify affected school districts of new subdivision proposals, and new schools should be reviewed by the county through a site plan review zoning process where impacts on roads and neighboring uses are considered.

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

POLICIES:

1. Shared use of school facilities by the general public should be encouraged.

2. The county and the school district should cooperate in the planning and utilization of school and recreational facilities.

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

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

POLICIES:

1. The County should obtain or secure (e.g., by obtaining a right of first refusal for desired property) sites needed for County public facilities as early as possible in

the development of an area, to ensure that the facilities are well located to serve the area and to minimize acquisition costs.

2. The County should support regional coordination efforts in identifying shared needs for lands for public purposes to maximize the efficient use of public capital resources.

3. The County should ensure that its development regulations do not preclude the siting of essential public facilities, subject to reasonable development standards and mitigation measures, within Thurston County.

4. The County should identify and site essential public facilities in accordance with the County-wide Planning Policies.