

Olympia CFP Planning Commission Finance Subcommittee Questions
August & September 2024
CFP, 2025-2030 Financial Plan

Instructions:

- Use this document for questions, comments, suggested revisions, or items you would like to discuss about the CFP chapter.
- Do not discuss any questions/comments/suggested revisions within the document.
- Please include page numbers/reference point from the CFP when possible.

General Questions:

1. Explain use of fund balance. Is this non expended funds previously allocated to now finished projects within the same program?

Yes, our fund balances come from funds left over from other projects within the same program or from collections in prior years that were unspent. For example, we save money in our Facilities Fund for anticipated repairs and maintenance costs in future years. The revenue supporting those eventual expenses we call use of fund balance.

2. [Pg. 42] “Taxable Assessed Value as of January 1, 2024”. Are the “G.O. Bond Liabilities” supposed to be subtracted from “Legal Limit, 1.5% of Property Value:” instead of added?

This has been corrected. Thank you.

3. [Pg. 50] Why isn’t the estimated revenue from the TBD sale tax included in the chart? Tax collection were effective April 1, 2024. The 2024 estimated revenue is \$2M and the 2025 budget is \$2.9M.

TBD Sales Tax is in a different fund. It will be tracked separately and will have a different chart. Since it was just two bars and a new revenue stream, I thought the paragraph explaining this new tax was enough. A second chart can be added for the final document.

4. [Pg. 63] I really appreciate this chart; I think it could be a useful addition to the comprehensive plan as well.

5. It says 2025-2023. Typo? (Page 6)

This has been corrected. Thank you.

6. “reviewed and updated annually” (Page 6) — how are changes communicated to the public?

- a. E.g. if a sidewalk project was slated to be funded, but then lost funding, how is that communicated out?

Project managers will need to address this.

- b. Recent news identifies a [\\$12 million budget deficit](#). How should we think about that in relation to this plan? What (if any) projects will get cut?

Without the specific source of the “recent news”, I’m going to speculate that this is in reference to the General Fund shortfall for the 2025 budget. Capital funds have restrictions on how they are used. Only some of the completed projects will have an operating cost that impacts the General Fund (i.e. Parks, Fire and some of the General Capital Facilities projects). Cutting projects in general won’t benefit the General Fund shortfall however we are being mindful of the projects that will impact the General Fund and making strategic decisions

7. Transportation and wastewater are called out for causing the increases in the budget. Can more information be added to why? Was this reflective of priorities or need for repairs? (Page 7)

The 6-year budget for the Wastewater Utility increased by approximately \$7 million from the 2024-2029 Capital Facilities Plan, in part, for the reasons listed below. Whether to add additional information, from the Wastewater Utility’s perspective, is a decision to be made by Community Planning and Development as the primary author of the document.

- The expected costs for the Percival Creek Sewer Replacement increased by approximately \$1.6 due to a refinement of the budget resulting from work the utility did in late 2023 to submit an application for a Federal Emergency Management Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) grant. The current assumed source of funding for the project is a BRIC grant, with a 25 percent required utility match.*
- A project to rehabilitate the Roosevelt and Yew Lift Station at approximately \$1.4 million was added to the 2025-2030 CFP.*
- The utility increased the funding for “emergency sewer repairs” by approximately \$1.3 million to account for increasing costs and the possibility of additional unexpected repairs due to aging infrastructure.*

The utility increased the funding for “aging infrastructure rehabilitation” by approximately \$1.6 million to account for increasing needs to address aging infrastructure.

8. The cable tax is declining but is listed as a source of revenue. It says it peaked in 2017 and has been declining since. Is there any plan to replace that funding? (Page 10 and Page 49)

As more and more people move to streaming services, the cable tax will decline. Without a change in legislature allowing cities to tax for internet services, this tax will continue to decline. There currently isn't a plan for funding replacement as we are already leveraging all our available resources. The effect of the reduced funding that that maintenance of City-owned buildings, ADA improvements and the Hazard Trees program may need to adjust timing of projects or leverage other funding sources i.e. grants, etc.

9. Funding sources show that “other” is a huge source of — can we get a breakdown of what makes it up? (Page 11)

Other Financing Sources is bond issuance or intergovernmental loans.

10. “Transfer from TBD” for \$14.5 million? What is that? (Page 11)

Transportation Benefit District (TBD) money are held in its own fund and transferred to capital funds for identified projects and only once expenditures are incurred. Page 110 shows the estimated amount for projects in Street Repair and Reconstruction to be funded partially from TBD funds.

11. The water utilities are required to be self sustaining and do not receive support. Why not? Typical for other cities? (Page 12)

Proprietary funds account for business-like activities of the government that provide a specific measurable service, such as the utilities, in exchange for payment. The rate charged for those services must cover all costs, maintenance and plan for growth.

12. Policy 1.5 “pursue innovative approaches” — what does that mean? (Page 21)

In this context, I believe it means that the city would be open to considering new ways of evaluating and prioritizing capital projects. Most of this type of work occurs in the master plans (e.g., Parks, Transportation, Drinking Water, Wastewater, Storm and Surface Water). The master plans are reviewed through public processes before being approved by City Council.

13. Policy 2.2 references “greenbelts”, — do we have a greenbelt? (Page 22)

We don't specifically map or identify greenbelts (although the term is used on some subdivisions maps). In this context, the term is generally referring to open spaces and natural areas. There are open space and environmentally sensitive areas shown on a map in the Natural Environment chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

Utility Response: The Storm and Surface Water Utility currently owns and occasionally purchases property adjacent to or containing streams and wetlands for aquatic habitat protection that could be considered greenbelt as referenced in policy 2.2.

14. Policy 3.3 — what is a latecomers agreement? (Page 23)

Latecomer agreements, also referred to as recovery contracts, reimbursement agreements, or assessment reimbursement contracts, allow a property owner who has installed street or utility improvements to recover a portion of the costs of those improvements from other property owners who later develop property in the vicinity and use the improvements.

Latecomer agreement charges are not to be confused with local improvement district (LID) assessments. While the computation of charges to be recovered under a latecomer agreement can be very similar to that of an LID assessment, the procedures are different. Under an LID, the money goes to the municipality to pay off the LID bonds, rather than to the property owner. In addition, LID assessments apply to all properties within the reimbursement area, whether or not the property is developed.

Latecomer assessments, however, are triggered only if a property owner submits an application for a development that would have required similar improvements.

Latecomer agreement charges are also not to be confused with connection fees, also known as facilities charges or system development charges, for utilities under [chapter 35.92 RCW](#) (cities and towns) and [RCW 57.08.081](#) (water-sewer districts). These fees or charges are a property owner's equitable share of the cost of the entire utility system and not just for improvements that serve their property.

See Municipal Research Service Center (MRSC) overview at <https://mrsc.org/explore-topics/planning/subdivisions/latecomer-agreements#overview>.

Utility Response: Simplistically, Olympia Municipal Code 18.41.020 (Utility Latecomer Agreements) allows property owners that are required to improve or construct water or sewer facilities as a condition of development to recover costs of improvements from other benefiting properties as such other properties develop in the future through a mechanism termed a “latecomers agreement”.

15. “If not well not at all’ — what is the example of well? What is an example of not well? (Page 37)

The City Council has a financial principle that if the City cannot deliver a service well, the service will not be provided at all. Examples of capital projects that are done well are those projects that are designed and constructed to meet or exceed City standards, such

as water reservoirs or utility extensions or repair. If, as an example, the City did not have enough funding to construct a project to city standards, the project would either be delayed to allow more time to seek additional funding, or built in phases so that each phase would meet our standards. The City will not build (or accept when built by others), substandard infrastructure.

16. “Pursue entrepreneurial initiatives” — what does that mean? (Page 38)

As an approach to sustaining high quality services, setting priorities and making them happen, the City would consider or be open to entrepreneurial proposals, something that may be different than what we have done in the past.

17. No examples of “organizational excellence” — previous examples? Why none? (Page 52)

Of course the City and City Staff strive for organizational excellence in all aspects of our work. However, there are no capital projects proposed in this CFP that are categorized as organizational excellence. Organizational Excellence is one of six Focus Areas the City uses to assess effectiveness and implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. By the nature of the capital projects and the objectives of this focus area, it would be uncommon for a capital project to be in this category.

Organizational Excellence - Deliver exceptional services and programs that are responsive to the needs of the community.

What success looks like in this focus area:

- Programs and services are widely and easily accessible.*
- Community members feel connected to City government through authentic and inclusive outreach and engagement.*
- City operates in a transparent and fiscally responsible way.*
- The City has a diverse, talented workforce committed to pursuing new learning and innovation based on data and best practices.*
- All staff know that they belong and that their wellbeing is prioritized in the City’s work culture.*

18. What is the plan with 108 State? I had heard that two bids were rejected. But now there is improvements. Plans?

We are currently reviewing next steps for the facility and should know more in the next 6 months and there is no commitment to sell or lease the facility from what we know today. We put investments on the CFP for critical repairs to the exterior envelope, fire alarm, generator and some HVAC improvements with the expectation that this will remain a city facility.

Parks, Arts, and Recreation:

1. [Pg. 63] This investment still seems on the small side, though I realize a lot of ADA accomplishments come as part of other projects. How does this direct funding help in comparison to CAMP projects etc.?

Our approach to the ADA program is to match the \$200,000 with other funds like CAMP to address as many ADA deficiencies as possible, while creating construction efficiencies and cost savings on mobilization and construction oversight. About 30% of the issues on the ADA backlog list are valued between \$100 to \$3,000 and we are currently developing a plan to focus work by Parks Maintenance staff to help address these issues and reduce the need for increased capital funding. Also, for any capital project at an existing park, we will address the outstanding ADA deficiencies as part of the construction work. We have recently hired a new Senior Engineer and she will be assessing the funding level and program goals.

2. [Pg. 66, 69] The Armory and Yelm Highway Community Parks are very expensive compared to maintenance and ADA upgrades. How do we balance maintenance and accessibility vs. large project expansions (in general, not specifically for these already underway projects).

It is a balance between maintaining the parks assets that we have but also providing new amenities the community is asking for. In 2021 as part of the Parks Plan public outreach process, we asked the community to rank four priorities: addressing the major maintenance backlog, improving existing park facilities, buying new land and developing new parks. The results showed the community favored a balanced approach between all four priorities. The 2022 Parks Plan Capital Investment Strategy reflects this approach.

The Department commits \$950,000 annually to address major maintenance and ADA deficiencies. The passage of the Metropolitan Park District (OMPD) has ensured this funding is reliable and consistent.

The Yelm Highway Community Park and the Armory Creative Campus are monumental projects that have been community priorities for over 20 years. We don't see projects of this size and scale very often.

3. [Pg. 71] For clarification, the \$8.3M of estimated major maintenance repairs is the backlog right now? Does the \$6.43M in spending over the next six years reduce that backlog?

Yes the backlog is \$8.3M and the \$6.43M investment over the next 6 years will reduce it. The overall parks FCI reflects a "fair" rating of 17.3%. Our goal is to move that rating to "good" by achieving a rating of 15% or lower. Our major deficiencies are in ballfields, maintenance facilities and sport courts. The projects proposed are focused on reducing

the backlog as well as addressing ADA deficiencies. We have recently applied for a Recreation and Conservation Office grant which if successful will help stretch our CAMP dollars and renovate 3 baseball fields at LBA Park.

4. [Pg. 75] It would be really beneficial to have links to project pages. I am curious what is planned for bike parking in these park parking improvements.

Bike parking requirements and amounts are governed by the Olympia Municipal Code and the park projects provide bike parking in conformance with the OMC zoning code requirements.

5. There is a target level of parks per population ratio. At what point will there be a big enough population that it is impossible to meet? (Page 61)

We don't know exactly as we are still acquiring new park land at times and we don't know exactly how accurate the State's growth projections will be. That said, when the Parks Plan is updated every six years we perform an analysis of population growth and acquisition and development to inform adjustments to target levels of service standards.

6. If there is a limit to space, are there ideas to remove urban infrastructure to make way for more green space? (Page 61)

We're not sure we understand this question. We do not have plans to remove urban infrastructure.

7. Why expand parking at Squaxin Park? (Page 63) Were more mass-transit options considered?

Currently Intercity Transit does not have a bus route that services Squaxin Park. They have told us that their analysis and route planning does not support service on East Bay Drive. That may change in the future and if they begin to provide service to East Bay Drive, then we would certainly consider not expanding parking. This parking project is not scheduled until 2029 and additional project scoping and a needs assessment will need to be completed prior to the project moving forward. The parking at Squaxin Park has been under capacity for many years. In 2027, the new fully inclusive playground will be built at Squaxin Park and it is anticipated that more parking will be needed to accommodate the higher use.

8. The target ratios for Rebecca Howard Park on page 68 are different than page 61. Why?

This is an error. The target on page 68 should match page 61 – it should be 2.35 acres per 1,000 population. We will correct the text for the final CFP.

9. The 2023 FCI rating is 17.3 percent. Is this high? Low? Could use more explanation.

Our rating scale is Excellent, Good, Fair and Poor. The FCI goal is a rating of “Good” for the entire park system; our current rating is “Fair.” There are 3 asset categories Ballfields, Maintenance Facilities, and Sport Courts which have the most deficiencies. The current CAMP project list is focused on improving these asset categories.

10. Neighborhood Parks (Page 73)

- a. No parks planned because it is too expensive. Why too expensive? Plans to find more sources to fund?

The cost to develop a new neighborhood park is approximately \$3-5 Million. Our main funding source is impact fees. To leverage these funds, we will actively be pursuing grant opportunities. Even with grants, we typically need several years of impact fee collections to save up enough funding to construct a new park.

- b. The existing ratio does not meet the target level.

Yes, we are slowly working on moving toward the target level, however impact fees vary from year to year based on the number and type of residential units built in Olympia. For this reason it can be hard to project when we will have collected enough impact fees to fully fund a neighborhood park project. That is why we also actively pursue grants to help close the funding gap.

11. The 1% NVUT will sunset by 2029. But the population is growing. Why will it sunset if it is a funding the needed park development? (Page 77)

The 1% NVUT was negotiated as part of the interlocal agreement between the City and OMPD to provide temporary assistance for the purchase of new park land. Per the interlocal agreement, 0.5% will sunset in 2025 and the remaining 0.5% will sunset in 2029.

12. Efforts to replace Percival Landing have been ongoing since 2004. What has it taken two decades? (Page 80)

Percival Landing is 0.75-mile long and projects in a marine environment carry significant construction costs and permitting regulations. The first phase of Percival Landing reconstruction was completed in 2011, which addressed the oldest and most decayed part of the Landing. Other projects have occurred since then with the

F-Dock replacement in 2015 and the 400-foot bulkhead replacement along 4th Avenue and Water Street in 2019.

The City has recently hired a consultant team to lead a visioning effort to engage the community around what Percival Landing and the Downtown waterfront looks like in light of rising sea levels. A project timeline and a public outreach plan are currently in development.

13. \$20 million is for an aquatic facility. What is this? (Page 82)

In 2021, the City completed the Regional Aquatics Feasibility Study. Feasibility studies set the stage for big projects, but in many cases can take several years to implement. Due to the scale of the regional need, and the cost of both initial development and ongoing operations, the possibility of this moving forward is closely tied to developing multiple partnerships and new revenue sources.

In 2023, the City of Olympia and City of Tumwater staff worked closely with the 22nd District State Legislators to successfully approve SB 5001, which allows for the creation of a second Public Facilities District. If pursued, this would require a vote of the people and acceptance of additional sales tax. The PFD approach also requires at least two government agencies to come together.

We have set aside \$100,000 in 2027 that can be pooled with partners to start the next phase. Progress with these discussions around the needs for aquatic facilities is ongoing and will be contingent on regional partners coming together.

Transportation:

1. In general, there are many more transportation projects in this years CFP (2025-2030) compared to last years. Does the City feel this plan is realistic? What has changed since the last time the Planning Commission reviewed the CFP? How does the City plan to prioritize projects if staffing is not adequate to complete these projects?

With the passage of the TBD sales tax, there is more revenue for bike, pedestrian, and active transportation projects. Yes, we are short staffed currently and hope to fill positions soon to be able to deliver projects.

2. Where can I find scopes of work/description for transportation projects?

Generally, the TMP is the best place for the background to projects. A scope is not typically available until a project is being prepared for design. If a project is far enough along, you may find information on our website.

3. (86) What is the scope of work for the Pacific and State bike and pedestrian safety improvements? Is this another title for a project within the TMP? Is this a study or actual construction project? When is the expected start of construction and substantial completion dates?

This project will improve pedestrian and bike safety on State and Pacific Avenues between Sawyer St and Fir St. The project will include adjustments to the pedestrian island at State Ave and Wilson St. Project also includes new sidewalks with street trees on the south side of State Avenue from Turner to Wilson. New bus islands with raised bike lanes will also be explored during design at some of the bus stops.

This project is needed to accommodate the enhanced bike lanes planned in the TMP. We received a grant to do a chip seal along Pacific Ave and State Ave which gave us an opportunity to restripe the street with enhanced bike lanes. However, a few additional improvements are needed to fully accommodate the enhanced bike lane. We anticipate construction beginning in early 2025.

4. (86) Previously funding from Gas Tax was going to be used for Lilly and 12th Avenue enhanced crosswalk. Why the change in funding sources?

We frequently must adjust which funding sources we use. As a project gets closer to delivery, we get a better sense of available funding sources and project costs.

- a. \$900K seems high for a single enhanced crosswalk. What is driving the costs of this project?

This project has not been fully scoped yet so we don't have a perfect estimate for the costs. Given past work on enhanced crosswalks this is our most accurate estimate of costs. As we move closer to project delivery and have a more refined scope, we will update the project estimate and it will be reflected in future CFPs.

5. (86) Pacific Avenue Enhanced Crosswalks – What locations are being addressed as part of this project? The TMP has several.

This project aims to design and construct three to five enhanced crosswalks on Pacific Avenue, between Poplar Street and Birch Street, and Steele Street and Dehart Drive. The exact locations and sizes of the crossing islands will be determined during the design phase, considering impacts on driveways and other features.

6. (86) How do the Martin Way pedestrian safety improvements differ from the Martin Way Corridor project (pg 98)? What is the extent of these projects (e.g. Lilly Rd to Sleater Kinney)?

The pedestrian safety improvements project shown on page 86 are two enhanced crosswalks planned for the segment of Martin Way between the Chehalis Western Trail and Sleater-Kinney Road. This project addresses a history of pedestrian-involved collisions at these locations, which were identified in the most recent update to the Street Safety Plan. Earlier this year we submitted a grant request to WSDOT to fund this project under its City Safety program. We should know within a month if the grant request was successful.

The Martin Way corridor project shown on page 98 is to scope and re-design the full corridor from the 4th Ave E/Pacific Ave intersection to the eastern city limits just west of College Street. It will build on the recently completed Martin Way Corridor Study, which was a regional effort. This project will explore the feasibility and design of:

Roundabouts at Pacific, Ensign, Lilly, and Sleater-Kinney

- Enhanced bike lanes*
- Sidewalks*
- Enhanced crosswalks*
- Business access and transit-only lanes*

We plan to scope this project with local funds in 2025 and 2026. We have submitted a request for federal funds to pay for the design work in 2028 and 2029, which is the earliest those funds will be available. We will know the outcome of that grant request by the end of the year.

7. (93) How did you determine which bicycle projects to move forward with given the TMP did not have strict prioritization of the projects?

The answer is partly the type of project and partly its location. For example, the Transportation Master Plan prioritized bike corridor projects over enhanced bike lanes under the logic that it would be easier to build them in the next 20 years, because they'd be less expensive. That way we could have a reasonably connected spine of a low-stress bike network people could use as we began the harder – and likely slower – work of building enhanced bike lanes. When we selected the routes for the 20-year list, we tried to distribute them evenly throughout the city.

There are some areas of the city where the poorly connected street system means there are no low-volume, low-speed streets available for bike corridors, such as some parts of the westside. In that case, we included the planned enhanced bike lane on Capital Mall Drive on the 20-year list, knowing it was necessary to have a reasonable low-stress route in that part of the city.

Finally, we routinely look for opportunities to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in other projects. The Fones Road corridor project is just one of many examples of that. The Pacific/State/4th chipseal project you ask about below is another.

8. (101) Is the Martin Way from Phoenix St to Lily Road the same or different than the Martin Way corridor project (pg 98)?

Yes, the project on page 101 should be removed.

9. (96) Can you confirm that the \$200,000 for each of these intersection improvements represents design costs only, and therefore no improvements will be constructed through 2030?

Yes, design only.

10. (104) Is design of Elliot ave sidewalk complete? Is the total amount of money allocated for this project sufficient (\$5.4M based upon 2024/2025 CFP, website says \$5.8M)

No, we have run into some staffing shortages in the design phase. We are in the process of hiring a consultant to do the design for the project and will be updating the website and CFP to indicate the bulk of the design will take place in 2025 with construction beginning in 2026. Based on early conceptual estimate, the money allocated is sufficient. Once the project begins design a more precise estimate will be developed and funding can be adjusted accordingly.

11. (104) Is the \$100K for each pathway project the cost for construction? Or only design?

Yes, design only.

12. (104) Pathway projects have all been pushed out two years. Why?

We have not had the staff capacity to scope these projects.

13. (110) How will the Pacific/State/4th Chip seal project interact with the proposed safety improvements?

These projects are highly connected and coordinated. The chip seal project provided an opportunity to restripe the street with an enhanced bike lane. The safety improvement projects will accommodate the needed space for the enhanced bike lane as well as improve pedestrian crossings and sidewalks through the area.

14. (110) Pacific, State and 4th Avenue Chip Seal, and Capital Way South Overlay are new to the CFP and did not appear on last years. What caused these projects to jump to the front of the queue?

We try and do a chip seal on an annual basis. The Pacific, State, and 4th Avenue chip seal project is the 2025 chip seal. Part of the decision for these streets was that we were

successful in receiving a federal grant to chip these streets specifically (only certain streets are eligible for this grant). Another factor in the decision was that a portion of Pacific and State is marked to receive an enhanced bike lane in the TMP. Chip sealing a street provides an opportunity to restripe the road for this enhanced bike lane.

While not as frequent as our annual chip seal projects, we routinely use some of our paving funding to do asphalt overlays on streets that have deteriorated beyond the point that a chip seal is viable. In the 2024 CFP we had a place holder of “asphalt overlay” as we had not yet determined the specific location the overlay would be applied. Several factors went into the decision to include Capitol Way in our overlay schedule. The condition of the street warranted an overlay, the segment is marked to received bike lanes/enhanced bike lanes in the TMP, and there is an opportunity to apply for some grant funding on this specific segment to help with the construction costs.

15. [Pg. 85] In the list of concurrency programs there is still 4 miles of bike corridors and 4 miles of sidewalks, can this be increased with the increased TBD funding? How do we calculate the concurrency value of a bike lane/bike corridor vs. a road lane?

There will be more than 4 miles of sidewalks and 4 miles of bike lanes built with the in the 20-year period of the concurrency program. Yes, those sidewalks and bike lanes will be built with sales tax revenues, among other sources. The second part of the response is complicated. A brief response is that our concurrency program is based on “person trips,” a unit of measure. Person trips can be quantified for development projects (such as a new commercial building); and person trips can be equated to infrastructure projects, based on their cost. The types of projects that compose our concurrency program are the full network need we’ve defined in the TMP.

16. [Pg. 85] Could you include the number?

Unsure what number is being referred to. One possibility relates to debt service. Debt service is an operational cost and is therefore included in the City’s Operating Budget.

17. [Pg. 91] What do we base our bike corridor designs on?

We typically use multiple sources when developing our designs for bike corridors. Most commonly we refer to the National Association of City Transportation Officials’ (NACTO) Urban Bikeway Design Guide for “Bicycle Boulevards” as well as the Washington State Department of Transportation’s (WSDOT) Design Manual Chapter 1520 Roadway Bicycle Facilities.

18. [Pg. 98] It would be very useful to have links to project pages for these projects.

These can be added.

19. [Pg. 98, 100] “5th Avenue Bridge (DES)” How is Olympia involved in this project? At one point the design included a non-motorized-vehicle bridge and this project could have critical impact on other city projects. It appears that there is two million dollars of grants for this project, does it take up City of Olympia staff time?

The Department of Enterprise Services is leading this project. The bridge would become Olympia’s infrastructure. The current design has enhanced bike lanes and wide sidewalks, and one vehicle lane in each direction. Olympia staff are involved in reviewing the design of the bridge. It is listed in the City’s CFP to help facilitate grant funding. A public process is underway. Learn more at <https://deschutesestuaryproject.org/>

20. [Pg. 99] Why isn’t there a level of service standard for these Major projects?

These projects combine infrastructure elements that might otherwise be found in other programs like the Sidewalk Program, Access and Safety Program, Street Repair and Reconstruction, and Bicycle Program. Its simpler to refer to the metrics for those programs. There is no other separate purpose or goal for the Major Street Reconstruction program. It is a program that more efficiently achieves what we are trying to achieve in other programs by combining elements for economies of scale. See also the response to #32.

21. [Pg. 101] US 101/West Olympia Access Project. Has there been climate impact analysis done for this project and the potential negative impact on other safety and VMT goals from the comprehensive plan? What leverage does the City of Olympia have over this project?

No climate impact analysis has been done. Olympia is the lead on this project.

22. [Pg. 103] For a potential level of service for pathways. Could a connectivity of population/area/amenities be done for adding pathways that overcome barriers?

Thank you for the suggestion. In the Transportation Master Plan, we prioritized pathways by their proximity to schools and trails and whether they were in a disconnected area of the city. We also analyzed the pedestrian network to find out where we needed new pathways in parts of the city that were not well connected. This is described [on page 69 of the plan](#).

23. [Pg. 108] “An update of this program will be completed in 2023”. Does this projection need to be updated? When do we now expect this update and is there any information that can be shared about it? Is the note 2025 CFP on Pg. 109 the same thing?

In 2021 we hired a consultant to evaluate the condition of our street network and then help us develop our pavement management plan and priority project locations. We are in the final stages of reviewing the pavement management plan and hope to have it

posted to our website before the end of the year. We will also likely be adding in some of that information as well as priority project locations into the CFP before the final CFP is published this year.

24. [Pg. 110] What is a “Pavement Management System”?

This project in the CFP reflects funding needed to perform the administrative tasks associated with this program; this is how one of the engineers in the transportation group is funded. The maintain the pavement management system we: rate our streets, evaluate data, assign appropriate treatments (crack seal, chip seal, overlay), define projects, prioritize projects, estimate projects and plan them for construction.

25. [Pg. 110] Is the current investment in the “Street Repair and Reconstruction” sufficient to maintain or improve the street conditions? Are Overlay activities an opportunity for safety improvements or lane reductions?

No, it is not sufficient. Our current modeling shows a steady decline in pavement condition over the next 6 years at the current funding level. Streets are rated with a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) with 100 being a perfect street and 0 being a failed street. At the time of the analysis (2023) the average PCI was 67 and the predicted average PCI at the end of a six-year period with current funding levels was estimated to be at 60. Overlays and chip seals are an opportunity for other safety improvements and/or lane reductions. You will see this in several of our current projects in the CFP like the Pacific, State, and 4th Chip Seal as well as the Capitol Way Overlay project to name a few.

26. It is noted that there are 526+ road lane miles, but only funding 4 miles of bike lanes and 4 miles of sidewalks. Does that keep up with population growth and climate goals? (Page 85)

Those 4 miles of bike lanes and sidewalks are just referring to what we will complete to meet our concurrency program 20-year commitment, not the total miles of sidewalk or bike lane associated with the TMP or this CFP. The concurrency program is structured to respond to new person trips on our system which is a reflection of population growth. The concurrency program is not directly tied to climate goals. Concurrency programs are required by law to provide infrastructure concurrent to new growth.

27. Access and Safety projects has no LOS or measurable outcome. Why not? Could we not add an outcome to improve safety since we know that 4th and plum is one of the most dangerous intersections in the city?

The CFP is a financial planning document that shows how we plan to fund capital projects. We bundle projects into different “programs” to organize and queue them up for funding.

The projects in the Access and Safety program come from different sources, including the Street Safety Plan, the Transportation Master Plan, and maintenance priorities that rise to the scope of being capital projects. Both the Street Safety Plan and the Transportation Master Plan show the methods we use to identify and prioritize projects. Given this, creating one metric for this program would be difficult.

28. Map for list of improvements? (Currently only text tables)

This is a good suggestion. For now, we encourage Commissioners to review [Chapter 4 of the Transportation Master Plan](#), which shows project maps.

29. Analysis of where projects are and how equitably they're distributed?

We are unclear about what this question means. We have seen some analyses from larger cities that map where disadvantaged or marginalized populations live and where capital projects are planned. If that is the kind of analysis this question is asking about, it is not possible to do with any degree of fidelity for a city of Olympia's size and density. This is because most demographic data in the United States comes from the American Community Survey, and the ACS's sample size is not big enough to produce reliable data for subareas of Olympia.

There are several ways to define equity. This CFP shows a significant investment in making it easier for people to live in Olympia without needing to own a vehicle. That could be viewed as a policy that improves equity for those who cannot drive or those for whom car ownership is a cost burden.

30. Knowing the evidence that protected bike lanes are safer, Why are bike lanes not always enhanced with a buffer? (Page 91)

Enhanced bike lanes with buffers or barriers take additional space. We can get this additional space by either removing/narrowing vehicle lanes, or rebuilding the street width. Because of this, we have to be judicious about where we decide to add enhanced bike lanes. Enhanced bike lanes are defined in the TMP. The network we are planning in the TMP provides a low stress bike facility on half mile intervals, so no one will ever be more than a quarter mile from one. A standard bike lane without a buffer can still serve a smaller percentage of cyclists who are more comfortable with a higher level of vehicle stress, so they are still valuable, and are included in some projects as space allows.

31. LOS is currently 59% for bike improvements. What is the goal? (Page 91)

We could also have a measure for how much of the TMP's low stress bicycle network is complete. This network is composed of more than enhanced bike lanes on major streets, so both measures are meaningful: "how many major streets have enhanced bike lanes"

and “how much of the LSBN is complete.” While this second measure is not yet computed but it could be added to future CFPs.

32. Intersection improvements (Page 95) have no LOS or measurable outcomes. Why not? No safety or CO2 metrics? Nothing?

We are adding roundabouts for several reasons: safety, access management, in order to change the lane configuration on a street to add enhanced bike lanes (roundabouts allow us to remove vehicle lanes or lanes creating space for enhanced bike lanes), or to address congestion. In the past there was a congestion measure “vehicle LOS” but we no longer use this to determine which intersections are a priority to address. We could have a metric that reflects how many intersections identified in the TMP are complete.

33. Major Street Reconstruction has no LOS or MO. None? Seems like a lack of focus. (Page 99)

See the response to #20. The LOS used for the Sidewalk and Bike Programs could apply here. It would be: “We are monitoring the percentage of arterials and major collectors that are complete streets, providing sidewalk and bike lanes. Currently XX percent of our Arterial and Major Collectors are complete, and this program will contribute XX more miles.”

34. Sidewalks — policy under consideration by CC. Update? When will be updated? (Page 102)

The City conducting a sidewalk condition assessment this year to get a better understanding of the scope of the repairs that are needed. We expect that the City Council will review policy options to address sidewalk repair in 2025.

35. Could we include a map of sidewalk projects (Page 105)? It would be easier to visualize.

Please see the [Transportation Master Plan](#) for project maps.

36. LOS only mentions that current rating is 67. What is the goal LOS?

Page 109 states “The average pavement condition-rating target is 75. The current system rating is 67.”

37. Goal 29 aims for the lowest cost life cycle. Are streets the lowest cost? I thought streets were the largest single source needing funding and constantly deteriorating (Page 109)

Lowest cost life cycle refers to how we prioritize our pavement management funds. Some jurisdictions have a worst-first approach to pavement management where they repair the streets that are in the worst shape. Due to our funding shortfall in pavement management, we use a least-cost approach. This means we repair streets that give us

the most benefit for the cost. Often this means keeping the good streets good before they deteriorate further, making the repairs even more expensive.

Fire:

1. How do city goals of reduced climate emissions (potentially more efficient trucks?), encouraging infill development (different firefighting conditions), and building safer complete streets (different street configurations for response) factor into the design and purchase of new Fire Apparatus?

-In the future, it is safe to say that we will be moving from diesel and gas engines to electric motors. Currently, this technology and infrastructure are limited and not cost-effective. As technology and infrastructure improve, we expect the emergency apparatus market to become more feasible.

-Infill will result in more people living within a smaller area, whether horizontally (infill) or vertically (mid-rise and high-rise). This change will impact the spread of fires and those exposed. These hazards can be improved through engineering measures (fire protection and detection systems). More fires will spread from one building to another (closer proximity = exposures).

-Increasing street connectivity will benefit the fire department's response.

-As our city becomes denser and street access narrows, fire engine build specifications must be adjusted. Our current engines have equipment for all hazards (fire, EMS, rescue, and hazmat). The vehicle must be large enough to accommodate the equipment, personnel, and the equipment's payload. The significantly smaller engine will have less storage space and a lower payload. This will require additional specialized response vehicles and the personnel to operate them. Changing to a smaller engine will significantly impact our operations and responses with mutual aid partners.

2. Are there any plans to add an urban-size smaller fire truck? This has been brought up as a reason for not being able to have smaller streets. But there is no funding planned to purchase smaller fire trucks to deal with this "issue".

This is an option, and all factors must be considered. Our engines are a tool, a part of a response system that addresses hazards. As our community's hazards change, so will the size and configuration of our engines.

3. Is there an urban version of the brush trucks? Could a brush truck be used in compact urban settings?

A brush truck and a fire engine are not interchangeable, each with its own NFPA standard.

4. What do standards say about urban fire trucks? NFPA? WSRB? (Page 116)

NFPA sets the standards for all fire services, including staffing, response times, critical tasking, an effective response force, and training. All of these are aimed at controlling a specific hazard. As community hazards change, so will our response system, including the size and configuration of our fire engines. WSRB measures compliance with NFPA.

General Capital Facilities:

1. \$50k is included for unforeseen emergency projects. This seems low. What are past examples? (Page 122)

We used this in 2024 for two Fire Department heat pumps that had failed and were not listed on the CFP. The contracted work came to \$70,000 so it's possible we may need to raise this for future years.

2. ADA Program. There is a need, but it is not defined. No LOS? (Page 126)

We will be including long range planning in the 2026 CFP that will be integrated with our updated facility condition assessment that is being prepared to go out to bid as early as October 2024.

3. 108 State is slated for \$2.2M. Plans? (Page 128)

The facility was built in 1912 and has remained vacant for the last 5 years and if we do not continue to make investments in this facility it will further degrade to an unsafe condition. We believe this facility will be part of our portfolio and need to keep up on these critical systems with the plan that it will be an integral part of future facility needs.

4. Some city-owned properties are conspicuously absent. The artesian well? Currently fenced and asphalt. Plans?

The artesian well is located on property owned and maintained by Olympia Parks, Arts and Recreation. The Drinking Water Utility is responsible for maintenance of the well's piping system. There can be a fine line between a capital project and a maintenance project. Maintenance and/or replacement of the well's pipe completed by the Drinking Water Utility is an operating budget expense rather than a capital expense. Monthly water quality sampling done by the Drinking Water Utility is also an operating expense. The Drinking Water Utility does not have plans to do a capital project at the artesian well.

Drinking Water:

1. LOS is very specific. “During a three-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”. (Page 132)
 - a. Similarly specific with customer service. “The Utility responds to main breaks within 15 minutes during business hours and within one hour outside business hours. The Utility responds to low pressure and water quality complaints by the end of the following business day”
 - b. Why was such specificity included? Could other chapters similarly be this specific?

As a component of the development of the Drinking Water Utility’s regulatory document, known as a water system plan, the Drinking Water Utility developed specific levels of service to guide its work. To be consistent with its water system plan, the Drinking Water Utility chose to include its detailed levels of service into the Capital Facilities Plan. As a component of the Comprehensive Plan update of the Capital Facilities Plan (e.g. Olympia 2045), the Drinking Water, the Wastewater and the Storm and Surface Water utilities intend to review established levels of service and/or establish levels of service for inclusion into the Capital Facilities Plan.

2. Utilities Goal 7.3 aim for “the most favorable and practical fire insurance rating”. This is very specific. Could other chapters be as specific? (Page 145)

The referenced utility goal (sic) 7.3 is included as policy 7.3 in the Utilities Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. As a component of the Comprehensive Plan update (e.g. Olympia 2045), the Drinking Water, the Wastewater and the Storm and Surface utilities will consider incorporation of its more specific Utilities Chapter capital facilities decision making goals and policies, as they may exist, into the Capital Facilities Plan, including any new capital facilities decision making goals and policies resulting from the Olympia 2045 update of the Utilities Chapter into the Capital Facilities Plan.

Wastewater:

1. A computer model was used to estimate overcapacity would be at 2050. Do other chapters also use computer modeling? (Page 160)

Albeit not mentioned in the Capital Facilities Plan, the Drinking Water Utility also uses a computer model to evaluate the capacity of its system water distribution system. The transmission and distribution system project “Eastside Street and Henderson Boulevard Water Main Extension” was identified as a distribution system capacity project through the Drinking Water Utility’s computer modeling work.

2. Could computer modeling be used for example to equitably distribute parks throughout the city at desired ratios?

Not applicable to the Wastewater (or Drinking Water) Utility as both use computer models to evaluate capacity. The Storm and Surface Water Utility does not use a computer model to evaluate capacity of its public stormwater infrastructure as a whole due to the disconnected nature of the stormwater system. Instead, as new public infrastructure (e.g. a new treatment facility or detention pond) is considered, such new infrastructure is engineered to current standards. For example, a new stormwater pond is designed to the 1 percent (or 100-year) flow, and a new stormwater pipe is designed to the 4 percent (or 25 year) flow. Additionally, the Storm and Surface Water Utility is beginning to address the equitable distribution of new stormwater infrastructure, especially as related to flooding concerns, through its capital project decision making processes by considering the scale at which new infrastructure will benefit the community and the level at which flooding impacts the community. Finally, State stormwater regulations require new development and redevelopment to implement flow control measures (low impact development (LID), detention or infiltration) and verify the capacity of stormwater conveyance systems up to one mile downstream of the project.

Storm and Surface Water:

1. No mention of removal of impermeable surfaces like roads. Any plans to do so? E.g. capital mall was once swamps and is now all paved over.

The Storm and Surface Water Utility has no plans to remove impermeable surfaces such as roads but would work with the Transportation Division in the lead role as may be possible in the future. Due to the level of compaction involved in paving, it can be difficult and impractical to restore paved surfaces to permeable. This difficulty is reflected in the approach the City's Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual takes to address the long-term reduction of impervious surface by requiring significant re-development projects (defined as costing 50 percent of more of assessed value) to bring new and replaced hard surfaces to current standards. This usually involves adding detention, infiltration, bioretention, treatment and/or low impact development to reduce downstream water quality and/or increased runoff impacts of impervious surfaces.

Representatives from the Storm and Surface Water Utility participated in the recently completed Capital Mall Triangle planning process. As the area may redevelop in the future, the Storm and Surface Water Utility intends to work with private developers as may be possible to redevelop the area using green infrastructure. This could include removal of impervious surfaces.

2. Could a map of projects be included? (page 191) It would be easier to visualize.

The Storm and Surface Water Utility could include a map of its projects should it be directed to do so by Community Planning and Development as the primary authors of the document. Additionally, perhaps this is an item that could be considered for all capital facilities providers as a component of the Olympia 2045 update of the Capital Facilities Plan?

Waste ReSources:

1. Progress on 2006 zero waste resolution? (Page 211)

- a. *Response: In 2006, Olympia City Council adopted a resolution establishing a “vision” of zero waste. It directed the solid waste utility to develop its first ever strategic operational plan that would provide a road map toward success. Zero waste is a paradigm shift from the traditional, linear waste model of cradle to grave (take, make, dispose), to circular model where waste is considered a resource. It encompasses both, working up stream to design products to be recovered, such as supporting legislative actions, using fewer virgin resources, reducing toxicity in manufacturing, and recycling/composting to the greatest extent possible. The resolution and resulting 2008 Zero Waste Plan, ultimately set the utility on a new path; and be more than a municipal hauler of waste.*

Some highlights since 2006:

- b. *Waste per capita in Olympia has declined from 4.08 pounds per person per day to 3.04 pounds per person per day.*
- c. *Customers subscribing to curbside organics has grown from 5,500 to over 9,700.*
- d. *Banned single-use disposable bag*
- e. *Supported statewide ban on disposable plastic bags.*
- f. *Began providing free waste assessments to commercial customers – roughly 50 to 75 each year.*
- g. *Supported statewide legislation for electronics, battery, paint, and EPR programs, and plastics reduction.*
- h. *Residential contamination reduction program to include removal of glass from commingled recycle to improve the quality of material Olympia collects and sends to market.*

2. “Waste free future” — achievable? (Page 211)

- a. Progress on goal?

The utility’s mission is; “to inspire our community toward a waste-free future.” The mission was developed to support the zero waste resolution. It is really about working toward being waste-free – see highlights from 2006 as progress toward the mission and vision.

3. Waste ReSources not required by any agency. So why include? (Page 212).

Response: This refers to the Waste ReSources Master Plan, or solid waste master plan. The City of Olympia is not required by the State to have its own solid waste plan. Only counties are required to have comprehensive solid waste management plan. Cities are required to sign onto those plans through an interlocal agreement, unless they want to draft their own. The state does not like when cities break off on their own and it only makes sense when a city has its own landfill or transfer station within its jurisdiction. Only Seattle and Spokane draft their own regulatory plan. Olympia signs onto the Thurston County Solid Waste Plan to fulfil its regulatory requirement. Olympia's Waste ReSources Plan provides a road map and strategic direction for its municipal hauling operation and waste prevention program. The Plan is also consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan that states city utilities should draft and regularly update utility master plans.

Home Fund:

1. I thought we did not have to comment on this chapter. Why included here?

The Home Fund section was added to the CFP when the City of Olympia began awarding funding to affordable housing projects because even those the funds are not capital funds and the city did not use the funds to build housing directly, the money was being used to support the development of affordable housing units. The City thought community members may expect to see the relationship between the new Home Fund revenue and the housing units being constructed that used Home Fund dollars as part of the funding package for them. Now that the City is participating in the more recent regional home fund, it is likely that this section will be removed from future CFPs.