



City of Olympia

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Amy Buckler
(360) 570-5847

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Wednesday, August 21, 2013

6:30 PM

Room 112

Planning Commission Finance Subcommittee

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.A ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Roger Horn, Commissioner Jerry Parker, Commissioner Kim Andresen,
Commissioner Judy Bardin

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.A 13-0641 Approval of July 31, 2013 Olympia Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Meeting Minutes](#)

The minutes were forwarded to the next meeting.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

6.A 13-0596 Review of Draft 2014-2019 Capital Facilities Plan (CFP)

Attachments: [1. Draft edits to the 20-year CFP goals and policies](#)
[2. Link to the 2014-2019 Preliminary CFP](#)

Chair Horn began the meeting with discussion of the 2012 Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) letter. Commissioners selected possible items for inclusion in CFP letter, including:

- Carryover items from 2012 letter(s)
- New items based on 8/9 meeting with staff
- CFP goals & policies -> comments, recommendations
- Review Jerry's comments list

The Commissioners decided to go through the letter section by section in order to decide what recommendations they would like to keep, remove or rewrite in the new letter. Each Commissioner will contribute their own comments to the new letter and Chair Horn will construct a formal letter from the compiled comments

The first section they reviewed was the maintenance portion of the letter:

- As mentioned in the August 9th meeting by Jane Kirkemo, Director of Administrative Services, maintenance is extremely important and should be prioritize accordingly.
- Each year, funding is borrowed from maintenance projects, ultimately leaving those projects under funded and put on the back burner.
- There does not need to be the exact same detail from the 2012 letter in the new letter in the maintenance section.
- Most of the revenue acquired over the year is being used for paying off bonds.
- The CFP funding lacks clarity; where do the general funds come from? Commissioners agree the description of the borrowing system lacks clarity and would like to make note of this.
- Transportation projects are funded through the operating budget. One example given is potholes.
- Possibly use examples within the current CFP to highlight the confusion and lack of clarity.
- The CFP is a general fund with various projects determined by each program (Parks, Transportation, Utilities, etc.)
- It is suggested that in order to fund and prioritize maintenance, it should be at the expense of other CFP projects because the importance of maintaining our current infrastructure is invaluable.
- For each program (parks, transportation, general government) there should be a funding analysis; how much will it cost, where will the funding come from?
- The commissioners had a consensus of confusion around where funding comes from in general and how it is generated.
- What would be the implication of not funding particular programs?

Commissioners reviewed the Parks section of the letter:

-The bond debt will be paid off by 2016, and in 2017 we will have another 1.7 millions dollars for parks.

-There is some confusion about borrowing money from park projects and the absence of reimbursement.

-The voted utility tax is 2.2 million a year.

-There should be a statement in the letter that states the totals of how we are paying back debts.

-Perhaps there should be an introduction about funding sources for each section (parks, utilities, transportation, etc.) in the CFP.

-If a program asks for a sum of money but is granted less, who makes that decision?

-Commissioners suggest this would be a good time to purchase parks/land and increase there bond or they could wait and start with a new bond in 2017.

-Are the funding projections adjusted based on inflation?

-Because we are expecting more growth, it is essential to buy another bond and float another bond in 2016 (ten year) to purchase the land now for more parks.

-There is a non-voted bond for Percival Landing Park, it is not being paid for via voted utility tax.

-Recommendations five, six, and seven have been stricken, recommendation three and four will be kept.

Commissioners reviewed the Transportation section of the letter:

-There is no dedicated funding to bicycle projects within the CFP.

-Important to add a note about inadequate funding towards transportation issues.

-To tie in the Comprehensive Plan's vision of less driving and more alternative transportation, there should be mention of the absence of funding for those programs.

-There are state laws that refer to performance bonds and there is no need to mention it again because it is standard practice; therefore recommendation ten has been struck.

-Commissioners agree to rewrite recommendation eleven to be more specific.

-Recommendations twelve and thirteen have been stricken.

-Commissioner Bardin will rewrite recommendation fourteen.

-There is no mention of the Eastside Maintenance Center; recommendation fifteen and therefore will be rewritten.

-Recommendation sixteen was struck.

-Recommendation seventeen will be rewritten to include recommending a feasibility analysis for volume-based charges for sewer.

Commissioners agreed to finish the remaining business items at the next meeting on August 28th. Commissioners agreed to keep the September 11th meeting as it stands.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:05.

Upcoming

Accommodations