

### **General Questions**

- Monitoring the progress of projects actively being built, even if fully funded, with respect to growth rates, development trends, changing priorities, and budget considerations and citations of any changes to indicate why they were implemented would be valuable when considering the data provided.

*Noted. The progress of projects actively underway is valuable information. We have had discussions with departments on how to present these. We have included projects in this CFP document that were approved in the previous year but have been delayed. More work to do here. Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- Some data that is provided is grossly out of date such as the evaluation of the General Capital Facilities project with data from 2019 with an update for that project slated for this year. Is there a way to prioritize upcoming evaluations at the end of the previous year to make the deadline for this report to be generated?

*The General Capital Facilities building condition assessment is done every 6 years, the last time being in 2019. The new condition assessment is planned to be completed by the end of the year in time for the final CFP document. Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- Any funding shortfalls and considerations for remediation even if one is not fully settled upon would be valuable insight.
- If a project is dependent on a Master Plan to color in the details of a proposition, it would be valuable to cite at least what from the master plan the project is aiming to address.
- Can we develop an infographic that visually identifies areas of CFP intersection between the Program Sections? While there may not currently be many, the potential for road work to have impervious surface & Critical Area requirements met by the expansion/development of a park that additionally serves to help onsite stormwater management (e.g. relocation of the Japanese Garden to the future Westbay park connection at Parcel 91011401001) could see CFP budgetary benefits by sharing the cost burden between while meeting mutually beneficial Level of Service standards. An infographic that identifies existing mutualistic programs could help make apparent other possibilities for similar cross development.

*Staff supports this idea but there are logistical difficulties in quantifying and sharing costs. Parks projects can certainly benefit stormwater management as you mention. However, isolating that cost from the rest of the project is not usually feasible. Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- The cable tax is noted as decreasing as people "cut the cord".
  - We also mentioned this during last year's CFP.
  - Are other options being explored to supplement this loss in revenue?
  - How will major maintenance on City-owned buildings, ADA improvements, and the Hazard Trees program be funded?
  - Will maintenance on those items be postponed due to declining revenue?

*The decrease of cable tax will need to be picked up by the city indirect rent calculation. This calculation determines which funds and departments should contribute to City Hall Debt repayment, City Hall/Maintenance Center maintenance work, and City Capital Facilities projects based on their square footage of office space. As a result, the General Fund revenues, Development Fee revenues, Parking revenues, and the Utility revenues all support this work. We can adjust this calculation to fund more or less projects, but it impacts the operating budget.*  
*Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- Impact fees
  - (p.45) The city does not collect fire impact fees.
    - Why not?

*The city stopped collecting fire impact fees in 2007 when it appropriated all of the saved funds to the construction of fire station 4. It also issued a bond to cover most of the station's cost (Ord. 6476). The city could begin collecting fire impact fees again if it chose to do so. We would need to do a rate study to determine how much new development contributes to the increased need for fire protection services.*

- Do other cities?

*Yes, MRSC gives the example of the City of Auburn who collects fire impact fees to help pay for fire engine and equipment replacement ([MRSC - Impact Fees](#)) -*  
*Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- LOS (Level of Service)
  - The LOS information and explanations vary widely between chapters.
  - Drinking water standards are very specific and very helpful.
    - "Service interruption due to line breaks. During a 3-year period, no customer will experience more than two service interruptions due to a line break; such service interruptions will average four hours or less"
  - Can other chapters also have the same level of specificity?
    - E.g. can bike lanes project the number of bike rides they will serve if built, collisions with cars avoided if they're enhanced, etc.

*Transportation Response: Not precisely. We do have estimates of how many people on bikes can travel in a bike lane per hour in Appendix H of the draft Transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan update. If you're curious, that estimate is 7,500 people per hour (source). There isn't enough data yet to estimate the number of collisions that can be avoided if the bike lanes are enhanced or not. Those are very difficult statistics to estimate, largely due to the small sample sizes of people bicycling in the United States, the small number of enhanced bicycle lanes, and the wide variability in contributing factors to crashes, among them land use conditions, speeds, vehicle design, curb radii, just*

*to name a few. Many of these contributing factors are not collected by typical collision reports.*

*Water Resources (Storm and Surface Water and Wastewater utilities) Response: Text was added this year to address how the Storm and Surface Water and Wastewater utilities make capital project decisions and to note each utility's commitment to developing levels of service in 2026 for inclusion into the 2027-2032 Capital Facilities Plan. Additionally, in the case of the Storm and Surface Water Utility this newly added text does describe several levels of service used by the utility when prioritizing flood mitigation projects.*

- Equity
  - Does project prioritization incorporate equity considerations?
  - Could each chapter incorporate equity criteria similar to what wastewater uses?
    - (p.155) "The Equity Criteria guides project prioritization by evaluating the breadth and magnitude of the project's impact—whether the benefits are limited to one neighborhood, extend across several neighborhoods, or serve the entire city"
    - E.g. can we estimate how many people will benefit from parks, or bike lanes, or sidewalk improvements?

*Water Resources (Storm and Surface Water and Wastewater utilities) Response: the Storm and Surface Water Utility does currently consider the scale of benefit (one neighborhood, several, or the entire city) when prioritizing capital projects in a manner similar to the Wastewater Utility and scores higher benefiting area projects higher. The Storm and Surface Water Utility will request a revision to the text to more thoroughly explain its capital project prioritization process as the chapter is finalized.*

*Drinking Water: The Drinking Water Utility incorporates equity considerations through its project prioritization process. Along with other criteria such as operational efficiency, life-cycle management, security, resiliency, and regulatory compliance, projects are evaluated on their benefits to customers and the broader community, with higher priority given to projects that provide more widespread or long-term community benefits.*

- Project descriptions
  - Stormwater project descriptions include more than just the name. They include details about what work will be done.
  - Can we include a similar level of detail in other chapters? E.g. not just listing intersections in Transpo, but also listing details too

### **Opening/Introduction**

- Pg. 11 – What happens with capital funds being 'banked' – paid for incrementally – for a project. A retrospective table of funds etc. would be useful for context and forward projection.

*Noted. The banked funds, typically in the utilities, are transfers from the operating funds into the capital fund. They are saved, accumulate interest, and are then obligated to projects. In this document, projects with "Use of Fund Balance" as a funding source are using these "banked" funds. Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- Pg. 12 – The red and green used in the piechart is tough for colorblind accessibility. For simplicity, adding black lines along each pie wedge would help. -

*Noted, thanks! I've added black lines along each wedge for the final version. Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- Pg. 37 – Would unfunded liabilities include maintenance?

*The first things that come to mind are the city's self-insured workers compensation program and our Law Enforcement Officers' and Fire Fighters' Retirement System (LEOFF) Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) program. Deferred maintenance could also be considered an unfunded liability though. We try to capture that idea in the "Preserve Physical Infrastructure" principle. Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- Pg. 42 – Does the city consider opportunities to take on debt that would support reduced Operating costs? For example, using debt for building efficiency, electrification, and solar? For example, solar installation on the Maintenance Center and Olympia Center.

*Issuing and taking on debt as a city comes with a lot of administrative costs which makes using debt to reduce operating costs challenging for smaller projects. I think saving up and funding those types of improvements ourselves is the better option. For bigger projects however, such as our City Hall building, we used debt funding and will certainly save money over the life of the building compared to leasing multiple buildings as was done before. Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- Pg. 46 – What would be the process for suspending other impact fees as the Olympia School District plans to (e.g. transportation or parks)?

*Council will hear the proposed impact fees on October 21<sup>st</sup> this year. Typically, they adopt the rates determined by staff performing the rate study, but they could choose to suspend the rates if they wished. Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- Pg. 49 – Is it possible to expand the Cable TV Tax to Internet Providers?

*The city would not be able to do this on its own. Currently, Cable TV tax is regulated by state and federal law ([MRSC - Telecommunications Franchise and Lease Agreements](#)). Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- Pg. 50 – Could the additional TBD revenue in the table be shown as a stacked bar of a different color in the plot, with a legend to differentiate?

*Yes, we could do that. I will bring it up with the budget team as we work on the final CFP document. Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

### **Parks, Arts, and Recreation**

- The Parks section of the CFP identifies the existing ratio of Open Space to population as higher than the Levels of Service (LOS) standard of 15.96 acres per 1,000 residents and too little to meet the "substantial population growth...projected during the plan's 20-year horizon." Yet, the current CFP concentrates funds on a few large projects. Does this leave adequate resources for smaller acquisition efforts necessary to meet long-term LOS standards? If so, can we have a projection table provided that illustrates anticipated population increases with anticipated ratios? This seems particularly important given the current misses in both Neighborhood Parks and Community Parks LOS ratios.

*Response: To be clear, LOS calculations are based on developed park acres per 1,000 population. The calculation is completed every 6 years with the Parks Plan update, because the development of park land takes many years and does not change significantly on an annual basis. An in-depth analysis of LOS levels and projections is performed in coordination with community input and priorities at the time of Parks Plan development. The Parks Plan update process will begin in 2026.*

*Olympia's open space LOS, current and target, are both very high compared to similarly sized communities. As the LOS shows, neighborhood and community parks have more need.*

- The proposed Olympia Comprehensive Plan is trying to thread the needle of encouraging greater residential density in order to help meet an anticipated population increase while protecting and improving residents' quality of life through increased ease of access to parks, arts, and recreation (and shading tree canopy). How do LOS goals square with limited non-Critical Area encumbered land that can be developed for greater density? Is there a way to specify encumbered lands as targets of CFP acquisition for parks, arts and recreation?

*Response: LOS goals do not specify whether lands are critical area encumbered or not. Acquisitions are considered due to many factors and are looking to provide a variety of recreational needs. The CFP sets aside funding for acquisition but is not a policy document guiding which lands are acquired, that specificity is informed by the Parks Plan or department policies and City Council decision on land acquisitions.*

- (p.61) The LOS for parks notes acres per 1,000 residents.
  - Is there also a ratio of how far people are from parks?

*There is a performance metric to ultimately have a park within ½ mile of all Olympia residents.*

- How far, for example, is a Bigelow Heights residents from a park, versus a downtown resident?

*The department uses a GIS mapping analysis to determine ½ mile from park areas. Bigelow Highlands residents and downtown residents are all served by nearby parks. There are approximately four areas in need of parks, which are more toward the outskirts of the city.*

- (p.66) LOS

- Can we add a goal that notes how far each resident has to travel to reach a park?

*There is a performance metric to ultimately have a park within ½ mile of all Olympia residents.*

- This would be in-line with Comp Plan goals to reduce VMT, increase green space, and connect residents to services
- It is noted on p.76 that "Additional park land is needed to meet the target outcome ratios established for parks"
- Open Space LOS (p.73) currently looks to exceed its target (17.55 > 15.96) but parks do not.

*The intricacies of LOS are addressed in the Parks Plan and levels are analyzed and set every six years during the Parks Plan process. This will be kicking off in 2026.*

- Rebecca Howard Park Master Plan

- No funding is provided. Why not?
- If it will not be funded, why is this included?
- (p. 81). This park is not listed in the 7-20 year probable funding. Why not?

*The Rebecca Howard Park Master Plan is noted on page 65 under Community Park Development. For 2026, \$170,000 is budgeted to continue the design work and develop a funding strategy. The master plan is nearing completion, and a cost estimate is currently being developed by the consultant team. Page 81 shows projects that are listed in the Parks Plan and at the time of development of the plan, the Rebecca Howard Park project had not yet started the master plan and therefore we did not have enough community involvement to know how the site would be developed and its costs*

- Pg. 77 The Park Land Acquisition table on page 77 of the CFP points to static levels of investment in park land appraisals through 2031. Is there an assumption that inflation will be low enough that the purchase power of \$30K in 2026 will still be sufficient in 2030 & 2031 to meet level of service standards and Comprehensive Plan goals as outlined on pg. 76? For an illustration of a potential problem with this, the City's [Park Maintenance and Stewardship Costs per Acre](#) shows a 30% increase in maintenance and stewardship costs per acre over the last six years. While this obviously isn't an apples-to-apples comparison of rising costs, it points to a potential disparity between goals in park land acquisition and efforts to acquire enough land to meet the LOS standard.

*The \$30,000 each year is intended to provide budget to hire a consultant for appraisal or environmental site assessment services.*

*To protect the City's negotiating position, it is not always possible or desirable to identify specific parcels to acquire for future parks in the CFP. Each parcel requires a willing seller and considerable negotiation to secure a purchase and sale agreement. We will set aside approximately \$540,000 each year for the next 4 years for land acquisition.*

- Pg. 81 – Grass Lake Connection to Yaeger Park. I would just like to highlight how great the new Grass Lake path is and how connecting it to more neighborhoods (asap) would be a boon for active transportation.

*This connection is in the long-range plans. It will be very challenging to receive permits to build a connection trail through north Yaeger Park due to the wetland area.*

- Has reduction/waiving of developer impact fees played a part in our LOS standards going unmet? What are we doing to address this?

*The reduction in park impact fees has amounted to approximately \$835,000 over the last three years. Park impact fees, along with grants, are our primary funding source to develop new parks. The cost to develop a neighborhood park is approximately \$3-4 Million, and with less revenue, it will take us longer to meet our goal of developing 5 neighborhood parks by 2041.*

*As we develop the Capital Investment Strategy with the upcoming Parks Plan update, we will do a full analysis of revenue projections, grant opportunities and community needs and priorities. We will take into account the reduced impact fee revenues and look to balance community priorities with funding levels.*

## **Transportation**

- (p.6) Other chapters note their master plans being updated. Transpo does not.
  - Can we include mention of the TMP to match other sections?

*Noted, will be added.*

## ***Pavement Condition Report, Sidewalk Maintenance Analysis***

- Pg. 83 – It would be useful to know the types of streets, and how many carry transit.

*Do you mean the street classifications? If so, there are 21.4 linear miles of Arterials, 52.7 linear miles of Major Collectors, 24.4 linear miles of Neighborhood Collectors, and 120.9 linear miles of Local Access streets. 75.4 linear miles of streets carry transit routes.*

- Pg. 84 – Misplaced comma on the last line of the Project Planning and Prioritization section “along the street, such as”

*Noted, thank you.*

- Pg. 85 – Has transportation considered a framework to consider the CO2 emission impact of different projects when considering prioritization? Colorado DOT has incorporated something like this. In the context of US/101 West Olympia Access Project Design (Pg. 101).



*We have considered this. We've struggled to have metrics to measure it in the way that a state DOT can. It's a good idea, and we are monitoring the developing metrics that are available to us.*

- Pg. 85 – Appreciate the inclusion of a discussion around debt service!
- Pg. 88 – What other treatments could we explore for safer pedestrian crossing with similar costs to enhanced crosswalks? Are there other approaches?

*By definition, the streets that we have targeted as needing enhanced crosswalks are big, busy streets that need additional treatments beyond crosswalk markings to make them safer, more inviting places for people to cross. These streets serve as barriers in the pedestrian network, and we were strategic about selecting which ones to target for these treatments as well as where on the streets we'd put the enhanced crosswalk.*

*When evaluating which design treatment to use, we consider options like high-visibility markings, median islands, bulb-outs, raised crosswalks, advanced signs, and flashing beacons.*

*Because no single treatment works for every location, we evaluate sites individually. Factors such as topography, right-of-way, existing sidewalk and street widths, volumes, and the project budget all influence which design is most appropriate.*

*We also stay current with evolving best practices and guidance from agencies such as the Washington State Department of Transportation, the National Association of City Transportation Officials, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, and the Federal Highway Administration.*

- Pg. 88 – Why is the Street Connection Study (2029) after the Transportation Master Plan update (2028)?

*We committed to studying street connections in the southeast around 2030 when we amended the Comprehensive Plan in 2021 to remove the Log Cabin street connection.*

*We estimate that the Transportation Master Plan will be updated on an 6-8 year cycle. The first master plan was adopted in 2021, which would put an update between 2027-2029.*

*The dates for both projects are estimates, and it's likely they'll change as we get closer and have the opportunity to scope them.*

- (p.89) List of 7-20 year future needs
  - I believe we asked for a map during the 2025 CFP
  - Can we please have a map of these projects?

*Transportation staff have updated the data and provided it to mapping staff.*

- Pg. 92 – I appreciate discussing both “bike lanes” and “enhanced bike lanes”, any estimate of what the ratio is, or could we report it?



*At the moment, we are not able to report this.*

- (p.92) Bike projects LOS
  - The language about complete streets is very confusing.
  - Is the current level 59%? Or are more features needed to make them complete streets?
  - What is the goal percent? The LOS for sidewalks is 100% (p.103). Is it the same for bike projects?
  - Approximately how long will it take to get from the 59% to the goal LOS?

*Staff has not had the capacity to update this.*

- (p.95) no outcome or LOS for intersections. Why not?

*Staff has not had capacity to develop this*

- (p.98) no outcome for multimodal streets. Why not?

*Staff has not had capacity to develop this*

- Pg. 100 – Is the transfer from the REET matching funds for the State Grant from the Department of Transportation?

*No, the REET funds used here are to cover the additional project costs beyond available grant funds.*

- (p.102) 2026 Sidewalk Repair - various locations
  - Can we list the various locations?

*We don't yet have the locations determined. At the end of the year and beginning of next year we will evaluate all the existing locations of damage and determine which sites to tackle for that given year.*

- (p.103) The definition of "complete streets" for sidewalks seems to be different than when used for bike projects.
  - What are the elements that define a complete street?

*Yes, the wording is different than what is shown for the Bicycle Program. It should read: "We are monitoring the percentage of arterials and major collectors that are "complete streets," providing the appropriate type of bike lanes and sidewalks."*

- Pg. 103 – Improving our measurable outcomes for pathways could include a connectivity analysis – showing how trip length is reduced for a certain number of people.

*That's a great idea, and we did it when working on the Transportation Master Plan. What we found was most of the values were so close together they made no significant difference that allowed us to meaningfully score the projects. Instead, we opted to use a route directness index*

*analysis – which is essentially a connectivity analysis – to identify where we needed new pathways. You can see the results of that on page 74 of the TMP.*

- Pg. 108 – Street repair, could you comment on areas of concern in light of the updated Pavement Inspection Report?  
[https://www.olympiawa.gov/Document\\_center/Services/Transportation/Plans,%20Studies%20and%20Data/Paverment-Inspection-Update.pdf](https://www.olympiawa.gov/Document_center/Services/Transportation/Plans,%20Studies%20and%20Data/Paverment-Inspection-Update.pdf)

*The main area of concern is that with current funding dedicated to pavement management we will continue to see a decrease in pavement condition in the next six years. We are approaching a turning point in pavement condition where if we continue to let it slide too much longer repairs will become even more difficult and expensive.*

- Pg. 108 – Where do the TBD Vehicle fee transfers of >\$3,000,000 come from in 2027, 2028, and 2031 with the TBD Vehicle fee's showing about \$1,600,000 earlier in the CFP? Do we have a backlog of saved TBD fees?

*Yes, we do have some backlog of saved TBD fees, largely because several of our recent chip seal projects were funded primarily through grants— three of the last four, in fact. This has allowed more of the TBD revenue to be carried forward.*

*More broadly, larger projects tend to follow a different cycle than the annual chip seals. We typically complete a chip seal each year, which uses a portion of the TBD revenue. In contrast, asphalt overlay projects require more time for planning, design, and coordination, so we group them into larger projects on a 3-4-year cycle. This means TBD revenues are intentionally built up between overlay projects to fund those larger efforts.*

- p.109) The LOS for street repair is 66 with a goal of 75.
  - How long approximately will it take to reach that goal?

*Our current model indicates that we will not reach a goal of 75 with the current funding level. At current funding, our model predicts PCI dropping to 60 by the year 2029.*

- How much will the projects listed contribute to increasing that LOS towards the goal?

*The project listed will contribute to maintaining some of the streets that are still in relatively good shape to keep them from becoming more expensive to repair. This keeps our overall PCI from dropping faster than if we did not complete the projects.*

## **Fire**

- The Fire Department Projects Program Section identifies investing "in safety and long-term well-being of our Firefighters" and leveraging "equipment and technology for increased efficiency" as core commitments on pg. 113. Yet, all proposed expenditures either repair, replace, or replicate existing equipment and technology. There is no proposed expenditure for exploring the viability of drone, robotic, or a.i. technology. Why not?

*The submitted proposed expenditures are focused on repairing or updating current needs only. Recognizing the financial status of the general fund, the requests are limited to current and does not address new concepts or technology as these are typically not yet well supported in the industry and typically cost more than current. We do address this in our adopted strategic plan and hope to extend ourselves more towards new programs and concepts as resources and finances allow. Being on the cutting edge of programs and technology (early adopter) is not a strategic position the OFD is able to pursue currently due to limited resources.- Morris Fire Chief*

- The department's projects for 2026-2031 include the replacement of fire apparatuses such as a fire engine pumper, brush truck, and ladder truck, as well as the remodeling of two fire stations (Station 2 and Station 3) and the construction of a new Station 6. The project descriptions highlight that the department has historically had "no consistent funding source" for its apparatus (pg. 115), which reads like deferred investments. The proposed solution is a debt financed plan of General Obligation Bonds as shown in the tables on pg. 116 and pg. 123, with the department stating that its capital projects "will require the issuance of general obligation debt via voter-approved property tax levies" (pg. 123). The consequence of this strategy is a substantial increase in the City's debt service obligations which will need to be carefully managed in the coming decades. Is this an effort to side step current budget shortfalls in the City's General Fund by moving deferred investments in Emergency Vehicle apparatuses to deferred debt? If so, does this mean likely future increases in property taxes that would make current unaffordable housing issues more acute? What are the specific revenue forecasts to ensure these obligations do not strain the general fund in future years? -

*Financially, city expenses are increasing faster than revenues over the last several years. Additional debt repayment would increase expenses and does not have a clear funding source at this time. We have not saved for fire engine replacement, so debt is one of the only funding options if the city wishes to replace these vehicles as they near the end of their useful life. Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

- The proposal for the new Station 6 seems to be tied to the southeast urban growth management area annexation. What happens with the funds from a General Obligation Bond if an annexation doesn't occur or gets significantly delayed?

*This is correct, we would not issue this bond or build the station until annexation is fully approved. If annexation is approved, there will likely be a period of time where the city contracts with Thurston Fire District 6 to continue to provide fire protection services to this area as they currently do. Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

*The addition of a fire station in annexation area has not been a finalized project by far. The details need to be developed as part of the annexation process. The concept of contracting services was proposed by a consultant and has not been validated as a potential solution. Also, the need for an additional or expanded/relocated fire station on the west side of Olympia has been identified with the cost of this not being addressed currently - Morris Fire Chief*

- The same amount of money is set aside for remodeling Fire Station 02 and Fire Station 03 despite a two year project separation. Is there an accounting for inflation, or are the expected remodels different enough in scope to make up for cost increases?

*Different scope of projects and the final costs are not detailed as of this proposal. Recognizing that the current rate per Sq Ft can exceed \$1000, the requested amount is a placeholder.*

- The proposed Comprehensive Plan identifies increasing affordable housing stock as an important goal for Olympia over the next 20 years. Providing adequate Emergency Vehicle (EV) access that meets City Engineering Design & Development Standards is based on current fire apparatus sizing and is an expensive part of the development process. Has consideration been given to acquiring smaller urban fire apparatus vehicles that are potentially less expensive to purchase and maintain in order to decrease the EV access requirements and associated costs in order to make building affordable housing more realistic?

*Yes – as development is approved and occurs, this will change the risk analysis and thus change the resource needs for apparatus and equipment. With the current risk profile for the city, the current apparatus are required to support water flow, equipment, hose lengths, etc. to support our current WSRB rating.*

- (p.6) Overview notes that increases are from the Fire Dept. Why? Did something change in fire code that contributed to this?

*This is due to the fire station remodels and new station 6 being included in the CFP this year. - Owen Thompson, Finance Analyst*

*In addition, the changes are result of a comprehensive strategic planning effort led by OFD and the development of a Standard of Cover/Risk analysis that will be presented to council later this year.*

- (p. 114) will equipment replacement include trucks that can navigate smaller urban streets?

*Yes; as the development changes the apparatus/equipment needs will change to address the current risk in the community. Recognize that all development presents challenges to providing services with a wide variety of mitigating solutions.*

- (p.121) LOS / measurable outcome
  - What is the goal OFD Response time / what is the current rate?

*The current goal is the national standard of 7 min 6 seconds 90% of responses. Currently the performance is 10 minutes and 23 seconds for the city as a whole.*

- What is the current Washington State Rating Bureau (WSRB) Rating? What is the goal rating?

*Currently a 1.8 so listed as a 2. Goal is to maintain the current level.*

- What is the current CPR Save Rate? What is the goal?

*Thurston county medic one statistics have a save rate for the county nearly 40% of a very specific and limited patient profile.*

## General Capital Facilities

- (p.7) 2019 Building Condition Assessment estimated \$160 million over next 20 years.
  - Where are we now in 2025?

*We are currently underway on the new facility condition assessment and have contracted with McKinstry to complete this work. This year we are also including a building electrification plan, energy management plan, and a roadmap to move all our facilities to net zero by 2040.*

- How much of a dent have we put in that total projected need?

*We are diligently working through updating all the FCA and should have this completed before the start of 2026.*

- (p.122) "The last update to the building condition assessment was done in 2019 and will be updated in 2025"
  - When will we see the results of the updated assessment?

*We're planning on presenting the updated FCA and BEA the first quarter of 2026.*

- (p.122) "funding gap of \$ 21.4 million"
  - What're the results of the 2025 assessment?
  - Has the gap grown, shrank, or stayed the same?

*The funding gap is being calculated into the updated FCA and that will be reported first quarter of 2026. The sale of the Justice Center will significantly change the outlook of the funding gap.*

## Drinking Water

- The CFP earmarks 58% percent of the Transmission and Distribution Projects budget, as outlined in the Project List on pages 141 & 142, for replacing "substandard pipe throughout the City" with the primary focus on Asbestos Cement (AC) pipe that's "prone to leaking and breaks." Within the 7-20 Year Future Needs table on pg. 145, \$13M more is called out for the same. According to the Project List table on pg. 142, AC pipes currently make up 40% of the City's water system. What percentage of existing AC pipe is anticipated to be replaced with the current CFP \$8.25M investment (Aging Watermain Replacement + Martin Way Water Main Replacement)? Does the Future Needs cost anticipate 100% replacement, or is additional deferred maintenance anticipated?

*Asbestos Cement (AC) pipe accounts for about 40% of the City's water distribution system and is prioritized for replacement due to greater susceptibility of leaks and breaks. The CFP allocates \$8.25 million to near-term projects, including Aging Watermain Replacement and the Martin Way Water Main Replacement. These projects do not replace the entire AC inventory but are coordinated with other planned work to optimize costs and minimize community disruption. An additional \$13 million is identified in the 7–20 Year estimate as part of a phased approach, which also reserves funding for potential future work related to the City's 36-inch transmission main*

*that conveys approximately 80% of the City's water supply. A condition assessment of the transmission main is scheduled for 2026, and the results will guide specific future investments. Because infrastructure naturally ages, the Aging Watermain Replacement is an ongoing effort, updated over time with improved data to keep investments aligned with community needs.*

- Water Source Development and Deschutes Ranch Restoration costs, as outlined in the Water Source Development and Protection table on pg. 148, are static over the CFP's six years. Does the scope of proposed work decrease each year to account for standard rates of inflation?

*The static costs shown for Water Source Development and Deschutes Ranch Restoration in the current CFP reflect placeholder funding for anticipated needs rather than fully defined projects. The Deschutes Ranch Restoration line item reflects ongoing stewardship responsibilities associated with the City-owned property. For Water Source Development, specific projects are still being evaluated, with a new source evaluation study scheduled to begin in early 2026. The results of that study will guide future investments and inform how funds are allocated in later CFP updates. In addition, these allocations provide flexibility for smaller or unforeseen work that may arise. As project scopes become clearer, future plan updates will refine both costs and timelines to more accurately reflect actual needs.*

- Level of Service (LOS) I and II both prioritize minimum psi standards for water pressure to meet UFC fireflow criteria. The City currently requires all new residential construction install fire sprinklers. There is an increasing body of evidence from recent wildfire events that residential sprinkler systems can lead to reduced water pressure at fire hydrants during the fires ([Do Urban Water Supply Systems Put Out Wildfires](#)) and that with the rise of wild fire events, relying on potable water for residential firefighting may not be the best long term solution ([Rethinking the Responsibility of U.S. Public Water Systems to Fight Wildfires](#)). Given the proposed Comprehensive Plan's goal to provide more affordable housing, is there room for exploring CFP construction grants for [home hardening](#) and [defensible space](#) development in existing and new construction in lieu of increased reliance on drinking water for fire suppression as a potential way to help maintain healthy potable water for an increasing population?

*The growing risk of wildfire introduces new considerations for community safety and long-term water system reliability. The CFP is structured to prioritize investments in critical infrastructure—such as source wells, distribution pumps, and storage reservoirs—to maintain reliable service and meet state fire protection standards. The Drinking Water Utility contributes directly to wildfire resilience through projects like the Allison Springs Fire Suppression System, which adds protective measures for critical infrastructure and source water. By directing resources toward these collective system improvements, costs can be managed across the community, supporting both resilience and the Comprehensive Plan's goal of providing more affordable housing.*

## **Storm & Surface Water**

- The City's proposed Comprehensive Plan identifies increasing access to affordable housing as a significant goal. Additionally, the health of our shared waterways is recognized as the public good. The City has adopted the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington's requirements for onsite stormwater infiltration for new construction in order to help protect our shared waterways, but it also places significant construction cost burdens on would be builders of single-family or multi-family residences. As it stands, the cost to build a new home is so high

that it's helping create housing scarcity due to our increasing population. Why does the proposed Capital Facilities Plan not attempt to allocate funds for the development of a more extensive municipal stormwater management system that helps spread the cost of offsite stormwater management throughout the community in order to lower individual development costs and help create more housing stock while also protecting our waters?

*Storm and Surface Water Utility Response:*

*The Storm and Surface Water Utility is responsible for constructing and managing stormwater infrastructure located within the public right-of-way and stormwater infrastructure within dedicated easements and on City-owned property. In this way, the Utility works to control stormwater runoff from the street right-of-way that discharged on or through private property. The City of Olympia's stormwater permit requires us to regulate runoff from new development and redevelopment projects. We meet this requirement in part by adopting the Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual (DDECM) into code. The DDECM is re-written every few years to keep up with State level regulations. The DDECM allows two approaches to controlling runoff, either by regulating individual developments or through regional stormwater facilities.*

*Historically, as Olympia developed into a low-density city with mostly single-family residential land use, we have regulated stormwater at the parcel and subdivision level. Large conveyance systems and regional stormwater facilities were not constructed as they might be in larger cities. Newer subdivisions typically build their own stormwater facilities that are owned and maintained by homeowner associations. A notable exception was Yauger Park, a privately funded and publicly maintained facility which manages runoff from Capital Mall and surrounding areas.*

*As stormwater regulations became more stringent over the years, the cost impact to new development has increased. Additionally, as Olympia increases in density, as encouraged by Missing Middle legislation, it will become less feasible for each parcel or subdivision to manage its own stormwater, therefore, the Storm and Surface Water Utility expects that more regional facilities will be an inevitable result of higher density.*

*As developers would be expected to contribute financially to the regional facilities that benefit them, regional facilities are not part of our capital facilities plan. The Storm and Surface Water Utility looks forward to working with developers to build regional flow control facilities, especially in high density growth areas such as the Capital Mall Triangle and Martin Way Corridor and will continue to monitor the conditions under which moving forward with regional facilities become necessary*

- The most extensive costs in the CFP's Storm & Surface Water section are reserved for Long Term Needs & Financial Planning around Sea Level Rise Adaptation. Given the success of the city's Metropolitan Parks District for helping address park acquisition and maintenance budgets, is it worth exploring a Flood Control District as established by [RCW 86.09](#)?

*Storm and Surface Water Utility Response: Because the Storm and Surface Water Utility's mission includes addressing flooding, the Utility has continued to include sea level rise related projects in its longer-term Flood Mitigation Program list of capital projects. Such projects are consistent*



*with the Olympia Sea Level Rise Response Plan which includes the potential near, mid and long-term sea level rise adaptation strategies the City of Olympia, the Port of Olympia and the LOTT Clean Water Alliance could implement both individually and as the Sea Level Rise Collaborative over the next few decades to protect downtown from rising seas. Additionally, currently the Storm and Surface Water Utility provides Olympia's contribution to the work that is being done by the Olympia Sea Level Rise Collaborative. With that said, key to the successful long-term implementation of the Olympia Sea Level Rise Response Plan will be effective governance and funding strategies: Work items the Sea Level Rise Collaborate is currently addressing. For example, the Sea Level Rise Collaborative recently completed the Olympia Sea Level Rise Response Plan Funding and Governance Evaluation. As the work of the Sea Level Rise Collaborative progresses, including the identification and establishment of a funding strategy, the list of capital projects in the Storm and Surface Water Utility's list of projects is expected to be refined, which could include a change of the source of funding away from the sole responsibility of the Storm and Surface Water Utility.*

## **Wastewater**

- (p.56) Old Port 1 Lift Station Upgrade. Anticipated Result: Enhance system reliability.
  - What does "enhance reliability" mean? Can we add more detail?

*Wastewater Utility Response: The current lift station is at risk from sea level rise and from landslides. The project will re-locate the station away from the landslide risk, and elevate all components above the expected 100 year high tide elevation.*

- (p.56) 4th Avenue Sewer Construction. Anticipated Result: Enhance system capacity.
  - What does enhanced capacity look like? Can we explain this further?

### *Wastewater Utility Response:*

- *The sanitary sewer does not have the capacity to convey the current flow from the west side neighborhoods. There has been 3 overflows of the sanitary sewer at this location in the past 6 years. This pipeline carries all the sewage from west Olympia that is east of Division/Black Lake and north of 13th Ave.*
  - *The sanitary sewer in 4th Ave will increase in size from a single 16-inch pipe to two side by side 24-inch pipes. (A single 36-inch pipe would have been preferred, but could not physically fit in the road prism.) The upgraded pipe will be capable of conveying the full expected build-out flow from the westside sewershed.*
- Pipe extensions LOS
    - (p. 168, 171, 175, 178) LOS is "Currently under development"
    - When will LOS be added?

*Wastewater Utility Response: Text was added this year to address how the Wastewater Utility makes capital project decisions. Included in this newly added text is the Utility's commitment to developing levels of service in 2026 for inclusion into the 2027-2032 Capital Facilities Plan.*

## **Waste ReSources**

- (p. 211) "Reduce the quantity and environmental impact"
  - Where are we in that goal? What is the target?

*Waste ReSources Response: The CFP includes the four goals from the 2023-2030 Waste ReSources Management Plan adopted by council in March 2023. Goal number 1 is: "Reduce the quantity and environmental Impact of waste (garbage, recyclables, and organic materials) generated in Olympia." No targets were established/linked to the goals. They are broader visionary goals with corresponding broad strategies designed to help achieve the desired outcome. The Waste ReSources Utility key community indicator is tracking pounds per capita per day of solid waste sent to the landfill. This metric accounts for waste reduction and diversion. Waste sent to landfill has reduced from 4.03 lbs/capita/day in 2005 to 3.09 lbs/capita/day in 2024. The City still tracks recycling rates, however, consistent with the State of Washington approach, no longer reports the results because it was found to not be a great indicator of actual material recycled, only material collected for recycling – which includes contamination, and system loss through the sorting and remanufacturing process. A recycle transload option at the proposed Carpenter Road facility would increase the utility's opportunity to increase diversion.*

- Pg. 212 'The facility may also support a recycling transload and hauling operation, though space analysis needs to be completed.'
  - Who will be doing the analysis and how much will the cost be? This project already is wearing a \$43.86M price tag, most of which is coming in 2028. Who are the investors who are promised to purchase the 40M in bonds?

*The City has a professional services agreement with a consultant (i.e. KPFF). This work was outlined in the original scope of work. The evaluative work is nearly complete and is using existing money allocated for the 2025 Capital Facility Budget.*

## **Home Fund**

- "Construct new affordable housing units, shelter beds, or treatment beds in Thurston County."
  - How many units and beds have been built since 2018?

<i>Developer</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Unit #</i>	<i>Population Served</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Housing Type</i>
<i>LIHI</i>	<i>Unity Commons</i>	<i>Southeast Olympia</i>	<i>65</i>	<i>Low income, 50% AMI or less</i>	<i>Complete</i>	<i>Shelter and Permanent Supportive Housing</i>
<i>FSCSS</i>	<i>The Landing</i>	<i>Southwest Olympia</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>Homeless families w/ children; DV survivors</i>	<i>Complete</i>	<i>Multi-Family Rental with supportive services</i>
<i>LIHI</i>	<i>Lotus Court</i>	<i>Southeast Olympia</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>Low income, 50% AMI or less</i>	<i>Complete</i>	<i>Multi-Family Rental with supportive services</i>
<i>Homes First</i>	<i>Scattered site acquisition</i>	<i>Olympia and Lacey</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Low income, 80% AMI or less</i>	<i>In progress</i>	<i>Single-Family Rental</i>

	<i>and development of 2 DADUs</i>					
<i>Behavioral Health Resources</i>	<i>B&amp;B Apts Phase 1</i>	<i>Downtown Olympia</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>Low income, 50% AMI or less</i>	<i>In progress</i>	<i>Multi-Family Rental with supportive services</i>
<i>Homes First</i>	<i>O'Farrell ADUS</i>	<i>Olympia</i>	<i>2-4</i>	<i>Low income, 80% AMI</i>	<i>In progress</i>	<i>Single-Family Rental</i>
<i>LIHI</i>	<i>Franz Anderson PSH</i>	<i>Southeast Olympia</i>	<i>70</i>	<i>Low income, up to 50% AMI</i>	<i>In progress</i>	<i>Multi-Family rental with supportive services</i>
<i>LIHI</i>	<i>Maple Court PSH</i>	<i>Lacey</i>	<i>~124</i>	<i>Low income, up to 50% AMI</i>	<i>Planned</i>	<i>Multi-Family rental with supportive services</i>
<i>South Puget Sound Habitat for Humanity</i>	<i>3900 Blvd Rd.</i>	<i>Olympia</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>Homeownership for low income up to 80% AMI</i>	<i>In progress</i>	<i>Homeownership</i>
<i>South Puget Sound Habitat for Humanity</i>	<i>Tâlicn Townhomes</i>	<i>Tumwater</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>Homeownership for low income up to 60% AMI</i>	<i>In progress</i>	<i>Homeownership</i>
<i>South Puget Sound Habitat for Humanity</i>	<i>Yelm Longmire</i>	<i>Yelm</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>Homeownership for low income up to 80% AMI</i>	<i>Planned</i>	<i>Homeownership</i>
<i>Vital Housing</i>	<i>Courtside Apartment acquisition and preservation</i>	<i>Olympia</i>	<i>211</i>	<i>Low Income up to 80% AMI</i>	<i>Complete</i>	<i>Multi-Family rental</i>