

From: philschulte@comcast.net [mailto:philschulte@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 11:39 AM
To: David Smith
Cc: munoz, sal; Paul Simmons; David Hanna; Schulte Phil; Clydia , Cuykendall
Subject: Re: City of Olympia Proposed 2016-2021 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program

Dear Mr. Smith:

Thank you for sending me the list of priority projects. First, I did not see my name on the cc: list; was this email sent to all registered neighborhood associations or just to me? If not, I would like to distribute it to the 40 registered neighborhood associations.

Second, your list contains a number of similar non-auto Transportation Improvement project sub-categories. For example, there is the Parks and Pathways Sidewalks program, the Sidewalk program, Identified Maintenance Needs (Map 16) involving sidewalks, 2010 Park, Arts and Recreation Plan (pedestrian trails) and even the ADA Street access program which has a sidewalk construction component. Do each of these subcategory projects compete for funding against projects in their subcategory or more globally against all other pedestrian-oriented projects?

Also, is there a separate budget allocation for each subcategory so citizens can judge the likelihood of the projects in a particular subcategory being completed? For example, the Grass Lake and Woodland Trails projects will cost the city 8.7M and potentially 18M if the grant funding does not come through. If only 500K per year is allocated to this subcategory, then it might be many years before these projects are actually completed.

Finally, I noted a 17.7M total estimate for Percival Landing, Section A, Phase II. First, is there a total current estimate for all Percival Landing reconstruction and the expected costs to be paid by the city and by external funding sources? Also, since Percival Landing is a city community park and its reconstruction is included in the 2010 Parks Plan, is Percival Landing considered to be a higher priority than the other Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan activities (Grass Lake, Woodland Trail)? Further, if this is the case, would Percival Reconstruction consume most if not all of the Park Department's capital budget for many years?

Paul Simmons and Dave Hanna gave a total of three presentations to the Coalition of Neighborhood Associations this year. One of the outstanding issues was the complete disconnect between the costs of desired projects as identified by the public (Percival Landing, Isthmus Park, LBA Woods, future community park etc.) and capital funding which I believe is about 2M per year. Completing the reconstruction of the Percival Landing Community Park, the future Isthmus Park or other Community Renewal Act projects could consume all of the available "Parks" capital funding for many years, thus making it very unlikely that Grass Lake and Woodland trails would ever be funded. If this is true, then why are the other Parks projects listed in the 2016-2021 project list?

If it would be easier to meet and dig into the details, I can come down to city hall. I will be making a report to the City Council for this year's activities under CNA's MOU with the city and I want to cover this issue and neighborhood priorities for 2015 which could include parks projects and funding. Please let me know if you would like to meet and talk about this. Thanks.

Phil Schulte
866-3876

Response to Phil Schulte's Questions Regarding Projects in 2016-2021 TIP

November 10, 2014

1. I did not see my name on the cc: list; was this email sent to all registered neighborhood associations or just to me? If not, I would like to distribute it to the 40 registered neighborhood associations.

Staff Response:

Yes, the proposed 2016-2021 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) was sent to all Neighborhood Associations in Olympia by a "blind carbon copy" (Bcc) email.

2. Second, your list contains a number of similar non-auto Transportation Improvement project sub-categories. For example, there is the Parks and Pathways Sidewalks program, the Sidewalk program, Identified Maintenance Needs (Map 16) involving sidewalks, 2010 Park, Arts and Recreation Plan (pedestrian trails) and even the ADA Street access program which has a sidewalk construction component. Do each of these subcategory projects compete for funding against projects in their subcategory or more globally against all other pedestrian-oriented projects?

Staff Response:

Transportation

The Parks and Pathways – Sidewalk Program is the only non-auto transportation project which has a dedicated funding source. The funding source is the 1% Voted Utility Tax.

All other non-auto transportation improvement programs compete for Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funds, which include:

- *Bicycle Facilities;*
- *Capital Way Sidewalk –Union Avenue to 10th Avenue;*
- *Pedestrian Crossing Improvements;*
- *Sidewalk Construction; and*
- *Street Access Projects – ADA Requirements*

Parks

The 2010 Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan identifies future capital projects out to year 2019. Funding for those projects is based upon revenue derived from sources specifically designated for park acquisition, development and maintenance. Those sources of funds are Park Impact Fees, SEPA Mitigation Fees, Voted Utility Tax revenues and grants. The Condition Assessment Major Maintenance Program (CAMMP) has been created to pay for park maintenance projects and competes for General Fund based dollars with other City infrastructure programs, namely the Street Repair and Reconstruction Program and Building Facilities Repair and Replacement.

3. Is there a separate budget allocation for each subcategory so citizens can judge the likelihood of the projects in a particular subcategory being completed? For example, the Grass Lake and Woodland Trails projects will cost the city 8.7M and potentially 18M if the grant funding does not come through. If only 500K per year is allocated to this subcategory, then it might be many years before these projects are actually completed.

Staff Response:

No there is not a separate budget allocation for project funding that could replace lost grant funds. As indicated, if grant funds were not forthcoming, the project would require more funding from other sources or would be deferred until funding could be assembled.

4. I noted a 17.7M total estimate for Percival Landing, Section A, Phase II. First, is there a total current estimate for all Percival Landing reconstruction and the expected costs to be paid by the city and by external funding sources?

Staff Response:

At this time the replacement of all the remaining sections of Percival landing is estimated to cost \$55M. No external funding sources have yet been identified.

5. Since Percival Landing is a city community park and its reconstruction is included in the 2010 Parks Plan, is Percival Landing considered to be a higher priority than the other Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan activities (Grass Lake, Woodland Trail)?

Staff Response:

No. The Capital Investment Strategy presented in Appendix "I" of the 2010 Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan established the envisioned implementation schedule for all projects. The Grass Lake Phase 1 project is in Tier 1 (2009-2011); Percival Landing (reconstruction of balance of Phase A) in Tier 2 (2012-2015); and the design of the Olympia Woodland Trail Phases 3 and 4 and Grass Lake Phases 2 and 3 in Tier 3 (2016-2019).

6. Would Percival Reconstruction consume most if not all of the Park Department's capital budget for many years?

Staff Response:

You are correct that the reconstruction of Percival Landing exceeds the Department's capital budget for many years.

7. Paul Simmons and Dave Hanna gave a total of three presentations to the Coalition of Neighborhood Associations this year. One of the outstanding issues was the complete disconnect between the costs of desired projects as identified by the public (Percival Landing, Isthmus Park, LBA Woods, future community park, etc.) and capital funding which I believe is about 2M per year. Completing the reconstruction of the Percival Landing Community Park, the future Isthmus Park or other Community Renewal Act projects could consume all of the available "Parks" capital funding for many years, thus making it very unlikely that Grass Lake and Woodland trails would ever be funded. If this is true, then why are the other Parks projects listed in the 2016-2021 project list?

Staff Response:

The TIP allows for large projects that are not fully funded. In order for projects to receive grant funding, projects must be included in the TIP. We often fund CFP projects with more than one funding source. Having projects on the TIP list at least makes it possible that projects could be all or partially funded with transportation grant funds.