

## PRAC Proposed Motion in Review of CFP

I move the following statements be incorporated into a letter from PRAC to the City Council, as its review of the draft Capital Facilities Plan:

1. A regular process for PRAC review of the annual CFP, as well as other critical documents and plans, should include a stage for review of alternatives. The current process is that PRAC is presented with a completed staff-created draft. That approach to providing materials for PRAC recommendations limits the quality and value of PRACs contribution. Staff should in the future provide PRAC with alternatives that staff itself considered prior to providing a completed document draft. Alternatives could include project choices, spending levels and timing priorities.
2. Armory:
  - a. There should be LOS and measurable outcome measures for the Armory
  - b. Capital needs beyond 2026 should be at least estimated, so that the Armory can be integrated into the overall LOS and FCI goals for the city.
3. Community Park acreage deficiency: There should be a clear description of the relationship between Yelm Highway Park completion and any remaining deficiency in acreage LOS.
4. Regional Aquatics Facility: The CFP should identify the estimated cost and the LOS for this facility, and it should be integrated into the overall LOS and FCI analysis for parks and recreation.
5. Rebecca Howard Park and other parks that have yet to complete master plans: The cost estimate for all such parks should be in the CFP and integrated into system-wide LOS and FCI analyses.
6. Adjustments for Inflation: Last year PRAC recommended adjusting investment in CAMP for annual inflation and the Council approved that change. This staff-proposed CFP once again ignores inflation. The PRAC recommendation is to again increase basic maintenance allotment, and all other line items, to cover inflation.
7. Cost Estimating: While specific cost estimates are not always possible, it is appropriate and desirable to provide at least generalized cost estimates for all CFP projects.
8. The CFP would be a more valuable document if it provided an overall assessment of the City's capacity to maintain the system it has with the financial resources it projects. Is our system sustainable? Are we losing or gaining in facility condition? Does our desire for the Armory, a major Percival Landing rebuild in association with the Capital Lake/Estuary Project, a new Aquatics Center, a regional sports fields center, completion of West Bay parks, and other major projects match in any way our commitment to maintain the parks we already have with the funding stream we are projecting? The city has huge challenges and great opportunities. The CFP could do a better job of explaining and measuring those choices, so that our goals are realistic.