

## Joyce Phillips

---

**From:** Jane Kirkemo  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 02, 2016 12:28 PM  
**To:** Joyce Phillips  
**Subject:** FW: Two comments on 2017-2022 Capital Facilities Plan

I am not sure if you got these or not but hopefully you can keep with the record. Jane

Jane Ragland Kirkemo  
Administrative Services Director  
360-753-8499

All emails may be subject to public disclosure

---

**From:** AdminServices  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 02, 2016 9:35 AM  
**To:** Jane Kirkemo  
**Subject:** FW: Two comments on 2017-2022 Capital Facilities Plan

**From:** David Albert [<mailto:davidalbert1717@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 02, 2016 8:23 AM  
**To:** AdminServices  
**Subject:** Two comments on 2017-2022 Capital Facilities Plan

Nice plan.

1. At least double the amount of funds devoted to enhancing bicycle transportation.
2. Commit to public broadband services, starting with \$500,000 for planning purposes.

Thanks.

David Albert  
1717 18th Court NE  
Olympia, WA 98506

## Joyce Phillips

---

**From:** Allen T. Miller <allen@atmlawoffice.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 02, 2016 10:17 PM  
**To:** Joyce Phillips  
**Cc:** jerryreilly@msn.com; JacobsOly@aol.com; cristianamfk@gmail.com; Paul Simmons  
**Subject:** CFP/Metropolitan Parks District comments for Planning Commission

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Joyce:

Please pass these comments on to the Planning Commission.

I was the Co-Chair of the successful effort to pass the Olympia Metropolitan Parks District last November. As you consider the Capital Facilities Plan, as it relates to parks, please keep in mind that the City needs to establish the 5-person Olympia Municipal Park District Advisory Committee, comprised entirely of Olympia residents, created to advise the City and the District on the City's compliance with the funding levels contained in the interlocal agreement between the City and the District. The Advisory Committee should be established by October of this year so it can be involved in the CFP process.

Also please include the purchase and removal of the Capitol Center Building for the extension of the North Capitol Campus Heritage Park in the CFP.

The 2009 Citizens' Initiative for the Park Feasibility Study, the 2012 Trust for Public Land poll, the 2015 Stuart Elway poll, and the November 2015 vote of over 60% approving the Metropolitan Parks District, have consistently shown the public's desire and willingness to purchase and remove the blighted building which was built in the historic view corridor of the State Capitol Campus as designed by Wilder and White and the Olmsted Brothers.

This area was first planned for Parks and Public uses in the 1956 Plan for Olympia and the Capitol led by Governor Langlie and Mayor Amanda Smith. Sixty years later it is now time to implement the 1956 plan and the more recent plans calling for the extension of the North Capitol Campus Heritage Park with public amenities such as a carousel and a Squaxin Island Tribal Longhouse museum.

The Capitol Center Building and properties have a fair market value of \$3 million, so please include \$4 million for the purchase and removal of the Capitol Center Building in the CFP. I understand there is currently only \$500,000.00 in the CFP for remediation of the area. This amount should be increased to at least \$4 million, so the Capitol Center Building can be purchased and removed in 2017.

We appreciate your consideration of these comments. Please contact me should you have any questions. Thanks.

Allen T. Miller  
Law Offices of ATM, PLLC  
1801 West Bay Dr. NW  
Suite 205  
Olympia, WA 98502  
[allen@atmlawoffice.com](mailto:allen@atmlawoffice.com)  
[www.atmlawoffice.com](http://www.atmlawoffice.com)  
Office: (360)754-9156

Fax: (360)754-9472  
Cell: (360)402-3376

## Joyce Phillips

---

**From:** philschulte@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Friday, August 05, 2016 2:58 PM  
**To:** Joyce Phillips  
**Cc:** Schulte Phil; Brian Mark; jerome parker  
**Subject:** Fwd: Comments on the Capital Facilities Plan  
**Attachments:** Comments\_Capital Facilities Plan\_pws.docx

**Follow Up Flag:** Flag for follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Ms. Phillips:

Per your request, I have attached my initial comments to Jerry Parker concerning the Capital Facilities Plan. Given the short deadline to review the CFP and develop comments, I didn't have the time to get into the utilities section but I wanted to get something back to Jerry to meet the deadline.

The CFP is an important document; I hope that the Finance Sub-Committee will dig into this subject in more depth and come up with some recommendations for OPC to consider.

Phil Schulte

---

**From:** "Joyce Phillips" <jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us>  
**To:** "jerome parker" <jerome.parker@comcast.net>, "Phil Schulte" <philschulte@comcast.net>  
**Cc:** "Brian Mark" <bmark@ci.olympia.wa.us>, "Leonard Bauer" <lbauer@ci.olympia.wa.us>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 5, 2016 10:22:53 AM  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on the Capital Facilities Plan

Good morning.

Yes, there will be multiple opportunities for public comments. The deadline of today at 5:00 p.m. is the deadline for the first public hearing. Comments received by 5:00 today will be shared with the Planning Commission and its Finance Subcommittee as the Commissioners work to review the plan in more detail and prepare comments for Council to consider in October. Any comments I receive will also be shared with Jane Kirkemo, Administrative Services Director, for consideration as the CFP is refined over the next several weeks.

Mr. Schulte – I still have not received your comments. Please send them to me at [jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.gov](mailto:jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.gov). Thank you!

Joyce

**Joyce Phillips, AICP | Senior Planner**

P.O. Box 1967 | 601 4th Avenue E | Olympia, WA 98507-1967

Phone: (360) 570-3722 | Email: [jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us](mailto:jphillip@ci.olympia.wa.us)



*Emails are public records, potentially eligible for release.*

---

**From:** jerome parker [mailto:[jerome.parker@comcast.net](mailto:jerome.parker@comcast.net)]

**Sent:** Friday, August 05, 2016 10:11 AM

**To:** Phil Schulte

**Cc:** Brian Mark; Joyce Phillips

**Subject:** Re: Comments on the Capital Facilities Plan

Phil -

I was caught by surprise by the Friday deadline. I have been working on getting ready for a vacation trip so I am just now sitting down to read your comments and the draft CFP (in reverse order).

I am banking on the promise of multiple opportunities for comment. I still do not understand why this early deadline was even proposed.

Jerry

On Aug 5, 2016, at 8:48 AM, [philschulte@comcast.net](mailto:philschulte@comcast.net) wrote:

Dear Brian:

I hadn't heard back from Jerry so I don't know if he received the attached comments concerning the Capital Facilities Plan for 2017-2022. If you have another email address for him, please forward the email. Normally, I don't spend the time to analyze these types of documents but I agreed to Jerry Parker's request for comments and I wanted to honor that commitment.

Many of the things I noted are not unique to Olympia (e.g., road maintenance is being underfunded in multiple local jurisdictions). However, postponing making a serious financial commitment to underfunded assets and necessary investments is short-sighted and it is time to confront these issues. I hope that the OPC Finance Committee can dig more into the details and come up with some proposals to gradually close the gaps.

Phil Schulte

---

**From:** [philschulte@comcast.net](mailto:philschulte@comcast.net)

**To:** "jerome parker" <[jerome.parker@comcast.net](mailto:jerome.parker@comcast.net)>

**Cc:** "Schulte Phil" <[philschulte@comcast.net](mailto:philschulte@comcast.net)>

**Sent:** Thursday, August 4, 2016 1:37:28 PM  
**Subject:** Comments on the Capital Facilities Plan

Dear Jerry:

Per your request at the last OPC meeting, I have attached some comments concerning the Capital Facilities Plan for 2017-2022. The comments relate to the broad issues concerning city finances and the priorities of city management that are reflected in the Capital Facilities Plan. I make reference to the materials distributed at a Finance Committee meeting last year to discuss the gaps in funding for capital projects.

I hope that these will be considered to be "friendly" suggestions to think about when you are deliberating on the Capital Facilities Plan. How to pay for these underfunded items is a secondary issue that is dependent on accepting that these assets and investments should be fully funded. Finding the additional funds would require a separate analysis which can be undertaken at a later date.

Best wishes.

Phil Schulte

<Comments\_Capital Facilities Plan\_pws.docx>

I. Looking at the Capital Facilities Plan

First, the proposed Capital Facilities Plan is a 228 page document; only a small section of the plan was included in the OPC meeting packet. While summarization is beneficial, it difficult to analyze and give meaningful public comments when only 1/5<sup>th</sup> of the document is available.

The Plan shows total proposed capital spending of about \$25-\$27 M per year (see Table A) allocated into six categories. Given the time available, these comments will be restricted to the areas of Parks, Transportation and General Capital Facilities. These three areas have both asset management related projects (capital facilities improvements and modernization, road maintenance and building maintenance) and new investments (Parks: all Phases of Percival Landing, transportation investments (sidewalks and bike lanes) and Community Renewal Area investments.

Table A

Subject Area	2017	2018-2022	Total Spending
Parks	\$5,709,105	\$22,197,400	\$27,906,505
Transportation	\$9,229,823	\$46,719,155	\$55,948,977
General Capital Facilities	\$1,510,000	\$7,900,000	\$9,410,000
Drinking Water	\$5,339,500	\$18,507,500	\$23,847,000
Wastewater	\$1,891,000	\$7,497,000	\$9,388,000
Stormwater	\$2,116,100	\$13,516,900	\$15,633,000
Total	\$25,795,528	\$116,337,955	\$142,133,482

The review of the Capital Facilities Plan is made more difficult by an overconcentration on the sources of funds rather than the actual expenditures. The sources of funds may be important for fund accounting or other purposes but not for the public.

II. Maintenance Related Projects

A. Transportation: Street Maintenance

Street maintenance has been underfunded for years and the condition rating for streets has degraded from a high of 78 (good condition) in 2007 to a current 65 (fair condition). On Page 58 of the Plan, the City indicates that the backlog of deferred street maintenance is now \$48M. If recent mild winters are replaced with more traditional winters and traffic volume continues to increase, it is likely that the deferred maintenance gap will increase further.

Since construction costs will only increase in the future, making these investments now will likely save money in the long run, especially if streets degrade to the point where costly subsurface replacement is needed. The Commission may wish to confirm the average condition rating to be achieved by the level of investment shown in the proposed Plan and make adjustments to restore the average quality of city streets close to pre-recession levels.

The total proposed expenditures for street maintenance in 2017 are approximately 3.6 M. In a briefing to the Finance Committee last year, restoring the average condition of the streets to a condition

rating of “70” or more (good rating) would require an additional funding of \$1-2M per year. Significant expenditures of 4M per year beyond that would be necessary to eliminate the maintenance backlog within a decade. Therefore, to restore Olympia’s streets to good condition and to eliminate the maintenance backlog would require an increase in spending of 5-6M per year for the next decade. All of the estimated increases in spending are shown in Table B below.

B. General Capital Facilities: Building Maintenance and Repair

The General Capital facilities allocation is roughly 1.35M annually. Analysis of budget materials prepared in 2015 indicated that the level of capital repairs and replacement needed to maintain a standard of “medium to high” would require an additional investment of approximately 3.8M per year. It is unclear from the Plan the quality level proposed for general capital facilities so an exact estimate cannot be determined.

Many of the city’s facilities are aging and will require investment in the medium term. On Page 73 of the Plan, the city mentions a reserve which has not been adequately funded; the degree of reserve underfunding is not given in the Plan. Deferred maintenance can lead to either costly re-construction or disposal of City facilities at fire-sale prices. Proper building maintenance reserves should be determined and included in the Plan.

III. Capital Improvements

A. Transportation: Sidewalks and Bike Lanes

In the Vision Section of the Transportation Chapter of the current Comprehensive Plan, the city established the goal of “complete streets” which are built for “for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders, as well as cars, trucks and buses”. The stated goal is to increase walking, biking and using transit and under Goals PT-2.1-2.6, sidewalks and bike lanes are to be added to arterials, collectors, both neighborhood and main and local streets (see Appendix A). The Comprehensive Plan is supposed to guide city investments over its 20 year term.

Yet, despite the goals in the Comprehensive plan and 84 miles of sidewalk projects that have been identified as needed in prior Capital Facilities Plans (see Appendix B for a list of pending projects), there is no investment set aside for sidewalks. Earlier versions of the Comprehensive Plan included estimated cost of pending sidewalk projects at over \$200 million dollars with bike lane projects of nearly \$100 million. If growth projections for Olympia occur, no investment during 2017-2022 will make it very difficult to catch up to accommodate that expected growth.

If the city wants to improve walkability in neighborhoods, increase usage of neighborhood centers and decrease automobile usage, then substantial investments in sidewalks and bike lanes will be essential. If these sidewalk and bike lane projects were funded on a straight line accounting basis, a set aside of \$12 million dollars per year would be necessary.

B. Parks: Percival Landing Park

Another significant underfunding is the unaddressed cost for Percival Landing. The cost estimates from 2015 were a total of 64 million dollars over the next 10-15 years (see Table B) While the entire sum will not be needed and other funds sources may reduce the ultimate costs, the city is likely to



have to spend at least 40 million dollars. Also, during this six year period, the city has chosen to allocate Metropolitan Park District revenues to land acquisitions and maintenance rather than to Percival Landing.

Setting aside no funds at all for the next 6 years seems imprudent given the condition of the Percival Park and the real possibility during this time period that part of the park might have to be closed. The downtown waterfront is a key part of the Downtown Strategy and economy; therefore, a Percival Landing Park closure could impede the re-development of the Isthmus and nearby properties.

C. General Capital Facilities/Utilities Community Redevelopment Projects

Redevelopment of various focus areas, including the area known as the Isthmus will require infrastructure investment including repairs or changes to roads, parks and utilities, and transportation access. Also, planning and investment to mitigate sea level rise will be necessary to protect infrastructure investments in vulnerable areas, like the Isthmus. However, no funding has been set aside for sea level rise mitigation. The amount of investment is unknown since the final built environment has not been determined but clearly, some level of investment will be needed in the next five years to accomplish the goals of the Community Renewal Area initiatives.

IV. Facing Hard Fiscal Realities

A. The Capital Budget is Significantly Underfunded

Like many municipalities, the City of Olympia has been underfunding asset maintenance for years, deferring important investment in critical areas like Percival Landing and concentrating on smaller, visible projects. By doing so, the city has avoided budget cuts, like those undertaken in Tacoma while pursuing a policy of tax increase gradualism based on increasing spending for specific Departments (Police, Parks). However, this strategy will not be adequate for fully maintaining city assets or the three major investment areas (sidewalks and bike lanes, Percival Landing and Community Redevelopment Projects). The estimated shortfall is shown in Table B.

Table B: Estimated Cost of Unfunded Capital Projects

Unfunded Projects	Standard	Total Shortfall	Average Additional Cost Per Year (2017-2021)
Street Maintenance: Restore "Good" Pavement Condition; eliminate backlogs	Average Condition Rating of "70"		\$5- \$6M (estimated)
Capital Repair and Replacement	Medium and High	24.2M - 4.8 M= 19.4M	\$3.85M per year?
Sidewalks, including ADA Improvements	Complete 30 year cost \$290 million		\$9M per year
Bicycle Lanes	Complete 30 year cost \$90 million		\$3M per year
Percival Landing Replacement	Complete Sec A; Phase Two	18M	2.5 - 3.6M per year
Percival Landing Replacement	Complete Sec B and C Total Cost \$48M		Not within five year horizon
Community Reinvestment Area Projects	Dependent on final plans Preliminary Estimate \$5M		\$1M per year
Total Shortfall Range			\$21-26 M per year

In short, the cost for these unfunded capital projects to protect city assets, implement the comprehensive plan goals for sidewalks and bike lanes and make investments for Percival Landing and Community Renewal projects is close to the entire proposed capital spending budget for 2017! On a year to year basis, ignoring these significant funding gaps might be understandable but not for an effective five year capital strategy. Also, the slight increase in revenue is insignificant compared to underfunding of the capital budget by 45-50%.

B. Questions to Ask

Before a problem can be solved, the nature of the problem must be defined; these comments are a very brief attempt to show the extent of capital budget underfunding. RCW 36.70A.020 provides that capital facilities plans are to:

“Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.”

Therefore, I would suggest that Commissioners consider two questions in evaluating the capital facilities plan:

- Is this Plan financially prudent given the city’s responsibilities as an asset manager and service provider to citizens?
- Does this city’s proposed capital investment plan meet the city’s goals for the future as shown in the Comprehensive Plan and other city initiatives and policies?


If the answer to these questions are “no” but there are insufficient resources to address all of the underfunding areas , then the Commission could prioritize the unfunded tasks and ask the staff to develop a long range plan to eliminate backlogs and chronic underfunding. A combination of significant tax increases and cost reductions in the other areas of the budget is likely to be needed to solve this problem.

Kicking the can down the road or as Mayor Cheryl Shelby said in a council meeting “Ignoring the lack of funding for Percival Landing does not make the problem go away” is not a viable capital facilities strategy. Once citizens are informed of the problem and sensible policies are proposed to address this underfunding, I expect that citizens will support the changes needed.


## Complete Streets

Streets with wide sidewalks and trees invite us to walk to the store or a friend's house. Bike lanes make biking to work more appealing and convenient. The way we design our streets will create new opportunities for how we travel within our city, and how we interact with one another.

"Complete streets" are built for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders, as well as cars, trucks and buses. They increase the number of people walking, biking and using transit, and are also safe for motor vehicles. Complete street policies complement other goals, such as boosting our economy, reducing congestion, increasing land-use density, minimizing environmental impacts, and giving people more opportunities to be physically active.

***GT-1 All streets are safe and inviting for pedestrians and bicyclists. Streets are designed to be human scale, but also can accommodate motor vehicles, and encourage safe driving.***  SHARE

**PT1.1** Retrofit major streets to be human scale and include features to make walking, biking and transit use safe and inviting.

***GT-2 As new streets are built and existing streets are reconstructed, add multimodal features as specified in the City of Olympia Engineering Design and Development Standards*** .

**PT2.1** Build arterial streets to serve as primary routes connecting urban centers and the regional transportation network. Include bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips, pedestrian-crossing features, and other amenities that support pedestrian comfort and safety.

**PT2.2** Build major collector streets to connect arterials to residential and commercial areas. Include bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips and pedestrian-crossing features.


**PT2.3** Build neighborhood collectors to provide circulation within and between residential and commercial areas. These streets should include sidewalks and planter strips, and may include pedestrian-crossing features. Some neighborhood collectors include bike lanes, or signs and markings to designate a bike route. (See Appendix D: Bike Network Map and List.)

**PT2.4** Build local access streets to provide direct connections to properties within neighborhoods. All new local access streets should include sidewalks and planter strips and may include wayfinding signs to direct cyclists to the larger bicycle network.

**PT2.5** Provide transit stops and service accommodations, in consultation with Intercity Transit. Encourage sidewalk access to all designated stops and consider pedestrian crossing improvements to facilitate access, including mid-block crossing islands on high-volume streets.

**PT2.6** Install or allow traffic-calming devices on local access, neighborhood collector, and some major collector streets where speeds, volumes and other conditions indicate a need. Consider pedestrian, bicyclist and transit bus safety and access when installing traffic-calming devices.

**PT2.8** Make it a priority to add bulb-outs for shorter pedestrian crossings and to slow traffic on existing arterials and major collectors with on-street parking. Consider building bulb-outs on neighborhood collector streets with on-street parking where overall narrowing of the street is not possible.

**PT2.11** Use Olympia's regularly updated Engineering Design and Development Standards  to ensure that transportation-related facilities constructed in Olympia and its Growth Area are safe, well-constructed, durable, and can be maintained.

**PARKS AND PATHWAYS — SIDEWALK (PROGRAM # 0626/FUND # 317)**

**Location** Various locations Citywide. See Project List.

**Links to Other Projects or Facilities** Parks and Pathways—Neighborhood Pathways—Transportation section  
Sidewalk Program—Transportation section

**Description** In September 2004, the voters approved a 3% increase in the utility tax. Of this increase, 1% is for recreational walking facilities.

**Project List** Recreational sidewalk projects are derived from the Sidewalk Program accepted by the City Council in 2003, with an emphasis on connecting parks, recreational facilities and trails. An estimated 70,000 feet of sidewalk will be constructed on major streets in the next 20 years. Sidewalks will also be constructed on selected smaller neighborhood streets that connect to parks and recreational facilities; specific locations have not yet been identified. Of the \$1 million in revenue that is anticipated to be collected annually for sidewalks and pathways, \$100,000 is proposed to be used for the Neighborhood Pathways Program.

YEAR	LOCATIONS	FROM	TO	COST
<b>No Projects Planned for 2015</b>				
<b>Anticipated 2016-2020 Project List</b>				
2016-2020	Eastside Street/22nd Avenue	Fir Street	I-5	\$ 4,042,000
<b>20 Year Project List</b>				
To be determined	Kaiser Road	Harrison Avenue	6th Avenue	
	Fir Street	Bigelow Avenue	Pine Avenue	
	Pine Avenue	Fir Street	Edison Street	
	Cooper Point Road	Conger Avenue	Elliott Avenue	
	Elliott Avenue	Cooper Crest Street	Cooper Point Road	
	14th Avenue/Walnut Road	Kaiser Road	Division Street	
	Division Street	Walnut Road	Elliott Avenue	
	Elliott Avenue	Division Street	Crestline Boulevard	
	Morse-Merryman Road	Hoffman Road	Wiggins Road	
	Boulevard Road	Log Cabin Road	41st Way	
	Decatur Street	13th Avenue	Caton Way	
	Fern Street	9th Avenue	14th Avenue	
	Boulevard Road	15th Avenue	22nd Avenue	
	18th Avenue	Boulevard Road	Wilson Street	
	Wilson Street	22nd Avenue	18th Avenue	
	Mottman Road	Mottman Court	SPSCC	
	McPhee Road	Harrison Avenue	Capital Mall Drive	
	Lilly Road	Woodard Green Drive	26th Avenue	
Marion Street	Ethridge Avenue	Miller Avenue		
Wiggins Road	Morse-Merryman Road	Herman Road		
Herman Road	Wiggins Road	Chehalis Western Trail		
26th Avenue	Bethel Street	Gull Harbor Road		

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee will review the planned project priorities in this program and make recommendations on the timing and priority of these projects.

**Justification (Need/Demand)** In 2003, the City Council accepted a new Sidewalk Program. The program includes an inventory of missing sidewalk segments on arterials, major collectors and neighborhood collectors, totaling 84 missing miles of sidewalk.

**Level of Service (LOS)** The City's identified LOS is to provide a sidewalk or walking path along at least one side of each major walking route.

Project Type: Functionality project