



# Meeting Agenda

## Finance Committee

City Hall  
601 4th Avenue E  
Olympia, WA 98501

Information: 360.753.8447

---

**Wednesday, July 8, 2015**

**5:00 PM**

**Room 207**

---

**1. ROLL CALL**

**2. CALL TO ORDER**

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- 3.A** [15-0688](#) Approval of June 30, 2015 Finance Committee Special Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Minutes](#)

**4. COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

- 4.A** [15-0575](#) Briefing on Volume-Based Utility Rates Proposal to Base Single-Family Residential Wastewater Rates on Water Usage

Attachments: [UAC Letter 2015 WW Volume-based Rates 2014](#)  
[Sample Rate Table](#)

- 4.B** [15-0651](#) Parks Workforce and Asset Management Program Update

- 4.C** [15-0670](#) Briefing on the Preliminary Capital Facilities Plan (CFP)

Attachments: [Preliminary CFP Project Funding Report](#)

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

*The City of Olympia is committed to the non-discriminatory treatment of all persons in employment and the delivery of services and resources. If you require accommodation for your attendance at the City Council Committee meeting, please contact the Council's Secretary at 360.753-8244 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. For hearing impaired, please contact us by dialing the Washington State Relay Service at 7-1-1 or 1.800.833.6384.*



City Hall  
601 4th Avenue E.  
Olympia, WA 98501  
360-753-8447

## Finance Committee

### Approval of June 30, 2015 Finance Committee Special Meeting Minutes

**Agenda Date:** 7/8/2015  
**Agenda Item Number:** 3.A  
**File Number:** 15-0688

---

**Type:** minutes   **Version:** 1   **Status:** In Committee

---

**Title**

Approval of June 30, 2015 Finance Committee Special Meeting Minutes



## Meeting Minutes - Draft

City Hall  
601 4th Avenue E  
Olympia, WA 98501

### Finance Committee

Information: 360.753.8447

---

**Tuesday, June 30, 2015**

**5:00 PM**

**Room 207**

---

#### Special Meeting

**1. ROLL CALL**

Committee member Selby participated in the meeting by telephone.

**Present:** 3 - Chair Jim Cooper, Committee Member Nathaniel Jones and Committee Member Cheryl Selby

**2. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Cooper called the meeting to order at 5:19 p.m.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**3.A** [15-0656](#) Approval of June 10, 2015 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes

**The minutes were approved.**

**4. COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**4.A** [15-0649](#) Continued Discussion about the Proposed Olympia Metropolitan Park District (OMPD)

Chair Cooper introduced this topic and thanked the park advocates for their feedback and participation in the development process of the OMPD proposal. He thanked Joe Hyer for facilitating two negotiation meetings between the Finance Committee and the Coalition of Park Advocates (COPA). Chair Cooper stated he will ask City Council to waive attorney-client privilege on July 7 to reveal the Bond Counsel's comments on COPA's draft ordinances and interlocal agreement for the OMPD.

Chair Cooper gave an overview of the City's draft ordinances that would establish an OMPD, its role, and finances. Ordinances must go to the July 7 Council meeting for first reading unless suspension of the rules is granted by an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the Councilmembers present on July 21, to allow the ordinances to go forward on the agenda as first and final reading. He noted the City's debt capacity is currently \$28 million. If the OMPD is approved by voters, the City could use all of the capacity available. The capacity will increase with increased Assessed Value and payment of prior debt.

The first ordinance establishes the OMPD as a body. The second ordinance

establishes the roles of the City and Board through an Interlocal Agreement (ILA). The ILA is an attachment to the ordinance. Within the Interlocal Agreement there is language that binds future Councils to annual spending for the OMPD. There is a concern about the legality of this commitment and the City awaits a legal opinion from the Bond Counsel.

Chair Cooper asked park advocates in attendance to summarize their thoughts. Bonnie Jacobs and Karen Messmer of COPA said their group was formed to get more money for parks. They think the OMPD is a powerful system that will enable the City to meet expectations, acquire land, and perform maintenance.

Committee member Selby asked for an update on a possible Thurston County Metropolitan Park District. Chair Cooper believes their participation would be a liability at this point. Their MPD discussion meeting was cancelled due to lack of interest. Committee member Selby asked how the OMPD board would interact with the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission. Chair Cooper said details would come later but consideration will definitely be given.

Mr. Hyer noted that COPA and the Finance Committee are missing an important outcome of an OMPD. An OMPD can create jobs and industry in our community. He believes it should be presented as a jobs measure because of the great economic potential.

Ms. Cristiana Figueroa of COPA stated that expectations are important and she believes it is important that any communication crafted for the OMPD emphasizes the long-term commitment.

Ms. Messmer said the OMPD will serve as a huge lever. Once you have a commitment of funds, it becomes easier to obtain other funds such as grants.

City Manager Steve Hall listed the pros and cons of the OMPD proposal:

**Cons**

- complex issue
- unprecedented to grant a percentage of the budget to a single department
- obligates future Councils
- consumes a majority of councilmanic debt capacity

**Pros**

- plugs gaps in Parks maintenance and major repair
- focus on acquisition
- does not take from other City services
- avoids short-term cuts

Mr. Hall said he believes it's worth it to take the chance and recommends moving forward with a ballot measure on November 3, 2015.

**Committee member Selby moved, seconded by Committee member Jones, to**

**recommended for approval the Olympia Metropolitan Park District proposal and refer it to the full City Council for consideration at its meeting on 7/7/2015. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:**           3 - Chair Cooper, Committee Member Jones and Committee Member Selby

**5.       ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Cooper adjourned the meeting at 6:03 p.m.

**UPCOMING**

The Committee cancelled the meeting scheduled for July 24 at noon.



## Finance Committee

### Briefing on Volume-Based Utility Rates Proposal to Base Single-Family Residential Wastewater Rates on Water Usage

**Agenda Date:** 7/8/2015  
**Agenda Item Number:** 4.A  
**File Number:** 15-0575

---

**Type:** discussion   **Version:** 1   **Status:** In Committee

---

#### **Title**

Briefing on Volume-Based Utility Rates Proposal to Base Single-Family Residential Wastewater Rates on Water Usage

#### **Recommended Action**

##### **Committee Recommendation:**

The Utility Advisory Committee (UAC) reviewed and supports the recommendations (see Attachment 1).

##### **City Manager Recommendation:**

Recommend forwarding volume-based rates proposal to the full City Council.

#### **Report**

##### **Issue:**

Volume-based wastewater rates were discussed by the City's UAC during recent wastewater planning processes. The emerging rate proposal would provide a percentage of single-family residential customers with a discount on their wastewater rate for drinking water usage substantially lower than the average. The Committee will consider whether or not volume-based wastewater rates should be implemented in 2016.

##### **Staff Contact:**

Diane Utter, Water Resources Engineer, 360.753.8562  
Andy Haub, Water Resources Director, 360.753.8475

##### **Presenter(s):**

Diane Utter, Water Resources Engineer

##### **Background and Analysis:**

The 2013 Council-adopted Wastewater Management Plan includes goals for rates and fees that support financial equity and affordability, minimize rate increases and maintain consistent levels of service. The Plan supports evaluating the feasibility of volume-based wastewater utility rates for residential customers. Residential customers currently pay a flat wastewater rate regardless of how much drinking water they use and how much wastewater they generate.

The UAC initiated a discussion about volume-based residential wastewater rates as part of the 2013 Wastewater Management Plan. In May 2013, April and October 2014, and June 2015, City staff presented the UAC with options for both two- and three-tiered residential wastewater rates. The proposed rate structure would incentivize water conservation and provide rate discounts for customers that produce low volumes of wastewater. Since wastewater is not metered, drinking water is used to calculate how much wastewater is generated. Most drinking water is converted into wastewater through household use. The UAC discussion recognized that in order to maintain the Utility's total revenues, reducing rates for some customers would necessitate increasing rates for others.

UAC supports the concept of volume-based residential wastewater rates and asked staff to complete a financial analysis of a three-tiered rate structure. The proposed rate structure would apply to single-family residential customers only. Staff is introducing the rate structure changes to City Council as part of the 2016 utility rate/budget process. City Utility Billing confirms that proposed rate changes could be implemented without causing excessive workload.

- **Standard Rate:** The majority of customers (approximately 70% of single-family residential customers) would be in the top tier and pay a flat rate per month.
- **Discount Rates:** Customers billed for less than 350 cubic feet (cf) of drinking water per month (700 cf for a 2-month cycle) would qualify for a volume-based discount. The lowest discounted rate (Tier 1) would be for customers consuming 250 cf or less of drinking water per month (500 cf for a 2-month cycle). Approximately 18% of customers are expected to qualify for the maximum discount. Tier 2 rates would progressively increase to the standard rate (Tier 3) with increasing water use. About 12% of customers are expected to qualify for the Tier 2 partial discount.

See Attachment 2 that shows a sample wastewater rates/discounts based on the proposed structure.

Staff set the proposed volumetric rate thresholds and volume-based rates by analyzing the last five years of drinking water consumption data. The analysis verifies that wastewater utility revenue, under the new rate structure, will be equivalent to revenue collected under the existing rate structure.

**Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):**

Wastewater rates are a key element of overall City Utility charges. The new rate structure better reflects the amount of wastewater generated. It will continue to encourage water conservation.

**Options:**

1. Recommend that staff present the volume-based rates proposal to the full City Council.
2. Recommend that staff investigate additional options for volume-based wastewater rates.
3. Recommend not pursuing volume-based rates at this time.

**Financial Impact:**

Staff anticipates that wastewater utility revenues will not be adversely affected by the proposed rate changes. Wastewater utility customers not affected by the discount will experience approximately a 5% rate increase to implement the new rate structure. This translates to \$1.05 per equivalent

residential unit per month. The number of customers in each rate group will vary with actual drinking water consumption. A 0.5% cushion was included in the revenue analysis to account for additional revenue volatility and potential incentivized water conservation.

**Attachment(s):**

Attachment 1 - UAC Letter

Attachment 2 - Sample Rate Table





October 24, 2014

Olympia City Council  
PO Box 1967  
Olympia, WA 98507-1967

Dear Council Members:

**SUBJECT: 2015 Utility Recommendations, Including GFCs and Wastewater Volume-Based Rates**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed 2015 utility rates and general facility charges. Over the past few months, the Utility Advisory Committee (UAC) has reviewed financial information regarding the City utilities from both a capital and operational perspective. This is a fundamental role of our committee. We appreciate staff's willingness to help us understand the nuances of utility finances and the role our utilities play in meeting our community public health needs.

The UAC reviewed the proposed rates, keeping in mind key concerns such as equity to rate payers, meeting regulatory requirements, and responsibly managing our infrastructure in the interest of both current and future residents.

The following sections document the UAC's recommendations for the 2015 utility rates and general facility charges (GFCs). The recommendations are consistent with Olympia's utility master plans and the Comprehensive Plan.

The overall impact of the proposed rates to a typical residential customer for 2015 would be **four percent** or a **\$8.58 increase** in their bi-monthly bills (\$4.29/month). City general facility charges and LOTT capacity development charges will increase \$529 for a new single family home. Total charges in 2015 will be \$13,355.

**Drinking Water**

*Six Percent Increase Proposed for 2015*

We concur with staff's recommendation for a revenue increase of six percent. Each customer class (residential, non-residential and irrigation) will see an overall increase of six percent, although actual increases on customer bills will vary depending on water usage.

The proposed increase will cover a projected revenue shortfall of approximately \$350,000. Key budget drivers for 2015 include increasing debt service on the McAllister Wellfield and Service Meter Replacement Project (\$142,000), increasing State taxes (\$63,000), shifting some salaries from the Wastewater Utility to the Drinking Water Utility (\$104,000) and increasing City administration costs (\$67,000). Shifting salaries to Drinking Water more accurately reflects actual staff time spent working on drinking water tasks. The increase to drinking water is offset by corresponding savings in the Wastewater utility.

The revenue shortfall (\$350,000) generates a four percent rate increase. The additional two percent rate increase proposed by the UAC and staff begins to prepare for repayment of the State loan for the soon-to-be built Log Cabin Reservoir (construction begins in 2018). Annual loan payments will require a 7.5 percent rate increase. The UAC supports a rate “smoothing” approach that calls for modest rate increases over several years, rather than large spikes in rates. Revenue collected from the two percent rate increase will be reserved and dedicated to the reservoir project.

Reclaimed water rates were modified in 2014 and remain appropriate for 2015. Reclaimed water revenues closely mimic costs.

City staff is currently in the process of updating the Water System Plan for 2015-2020. The draft Plan will be brought to the UAC for review and to the City Council for adoption in mid-2015. A thorough financial analysis of the drinking water utility will accompany the Plan.

The Drinking Water Utility continues to experience cost of service increases associated with State-mandated water quality and quantity regulations and costly infrastructure needs. Additionally, rate revenues are somewhat volatile and hard to predict due to our effective water conservation program and variable irrigation-related water use. The trend of annual cost increases and associated rate increases will probably continue in future years.

The proposed six percent rate increase will result in an average single family residential account increasing by \$1.39/month.

We recommend a 6.7 percent increase in general facility charges for drinking water which equates to \$3,687. A greater increase (20%) is justified based on current and projected infrastructure investments. The UAC recommends “smoothing” the total over several years.

## **Wastewater**

### *Two Percent Increase Proposed for 2015*

We concur with staff’s recommendation for a revenue increase of two percent.

Based on projected 2015 revenue and expenses, staff expects the wastewater utility to be out of balance by approximately \$95,000. The shortfall reflects both savings as a result of shifting some salaries to the Drinking Water Utility and increased costs associated with shifting salaries (\$71,000) from the Storm and Surface Water Utility to Wastewater. Crews from the three water-related utilities work together closely and efficiently. Workloads and finances are evaluated every few years and realigned as needed. The changes reflect a recent analysis of work and salary distribution.

The operating and capital budgets for the Wastewater Utility are aligned with the recently completed *2013-2018 Wastewater Management Plan*.

In general, the Wastewater Utility experiences stable revenues and expenditures. Capital infrastructure needs are manageable. A substantial amount of needed work is proactive and preventative in nature. The utility continues to provide financial support for the conversion of onsite septic systems to municipal sewer. We anticipate future financial needs of the Wastewater Utility to remain predictable and relatively modest.

The two percent wastewater rate increase will result in an average single family residential account increase of \$0.38/month.

No increase in Wastewater general facility charges is proposed. The GFCs were evaluated and increased in 2014.

### **Volume-based Wastewater Rates**

The UAC also supports the implementation of volume-based rates for wastewater. Under the proposed rate structure, rates would be based on drinking water consumption. Wastewater volume-based rates have been under consideration by the UAC for several years and are a recommendation of the *2013-2018 Wastewater Management Plan*. We support staff recommendations for a three-tier rate structure that increases both rate equity and water conservation. With continued refinements to the rate structure and draft code revisions, the UAC encourages City Council to adopt the proposed tiered rate structure

### **Wastewater Treatment Services - LOTT Clean Water Alliance**

The Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater, Thurston (LOTT) Clean Water Alliance collects revenue for its operations through the utility bills of the local jurisdictions. Increases to both LOTT monthly charges and new connection charges are proposed for 2015. The UAC plays a relatively minor role in LOTT's rate analysis and decisions. However, how the City collects what we owe LOTT for its services is entirely up to the Council; the UAC continues to be interested in the possibility of volume-based rates as a way to increase rate equity and conservation through this portion of citizens' utility bills as well, and may consider a recommendation to Council about this issue in the future if the LOTT Alliance as a whole does not adopt such a measure.

An inflationary adjustment in LOTT monthly rates of three percent is proposed for 2015. With the proposed rate increase, LOTT charges would increase \$1.05 per month for a single family residence. The current LOTT charge is \$70.02 bi-monthly for single family residences. Bi-monthly bills in 2015 would be \$72.12. Non-single family accounts would increase proportionately.

We support staff's proposal to increase the LOTT Capacity Development Charge (CDC) 4.3 percent, which is \$5,136 for a new single family home.

### **Storm and Surface Water**

#### **Three Percent Increase Proposed for 2015**

The UAC supports staff's recommendation for a three percent increase for the Storm and Surface Water Utility. The increase will be applied across all rate classes. The proposed rate would result in single family residential accounts increasing by \$0.35/month.



Waste ReSource staff are revising the current management plan for UAC and City Council consideration in 2015. The planning process will include a comprehensive evaluation of Waste ReSource's costs of service.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment and provide our recommendations. These proposals will support the important public health mandates of the four City utilities and help lower the long term costs of maintaining infrastructure by attending to developing needs in a timely way rather than passing more expensive repairs on to future residents. The proposed utility rates reflect our responsibility to maintain and improve our essential public infrastructure.

Please let me, or UAC Vice-Chair Chris Ward, know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



**THAD CURTZ**

Chair

Utility Advisory Committee

TC/lm

\\calvin\PW Shared Workgroup\UAC\2014- UAC\2014 Correspondence\UAC 2015 Rates and WW Volume Rates Letter\UAC 2015 Rate and WW Volume Rates Recommendation Letter\_10-20-14.docx

ec: UAC Members  
Jane Kirkemo, Administrative Services Director  
Rich Hoey, P.E., Director of Public Works  
Dan Daniels, Waste ReSource Director  
Andy Haub, Water Resources Director

**Table - Sample Volume-based Wastewater Rates\***

<b>Drinking Water Consumption</b>	<b>Flat Rate (current 2015)</b>	<b>Volume-Based Rate (proposed 2016)</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<u>Tier 1</u> Below 250 cf/month	\$19.67	\$13.47	35% lower
<u>Tier 2</u> 250 cf/month to 350 cf/month	\$19.67	\$13.47 to \$20.72	17% lower, on average
<u>Tier 3 (Standard Rate)</u> Above 350 cf/month	\$19.67	\$20.72	5% higher

\* Actual rates would be set as part of the 2016 rate setting process.



## Finance Committee

### Parks Workforce and Asset Management Program Update

**Agenda Date:** 7/8/2015  
**Agenda Item Number:** 4.B  
**File Number:** 15-0651

---

**Type:** report   **Version:** 1   **Status:** In Committee

---

#### **Title**

Parks Workforce and Asset Management Program Update

#### **Recommended Action**

##### **City Manager Recommendation:**

Receive information and provide feedback.

#### **Report**

##### **Issue:**

Staff will update the Finance Committee on the progress of Workforce and Asset Management Programs since the last presentation on January 14, 2015.

#### **Staff Contact:**

David Hanna, Associate Director, Parks, Arts and Recreation, 360.753.8020

Gary Franks, Parks Maintenance Manager, Parks, Arts and Recreation, 360.753.8367

#### **Presenter(s):**

David Hanna, Associate Director

Sam Baker, Supervisor III

#### **Background and Analysis:**

The Olympia Parks, Arts and Recreation Department (OPARD) has been steadily working to create a data driven approach to maintaining parks facilities and the workforce responsible for the work. At the Finance Committee meeting we will share the progress made in the following areas:

- 1. Asset Management** - the continuation of rating the condition of park facilities and in turn developing projects under the CAMMP program to raise the Facility Condition Index.
- 2. Workforce Management** - the continuation of managing park maintenance operations in a system-based approach utilizing the City's investment in VueWorks software. This update will include work on maintenance plans for individual parks and setting future service levels.
- 3. Public Art Maintenance** - beginning efforts to employ asset management principles to the City's art collection.

**Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):**

The survey conducted for the “Parks Plan” clearly emphasized the need for the City to “take care of what we have.” The efforts in asset and workforce management demonstrate the Department’s commitment to efficiently maintain the public’s investment.

**Options:**

1. Receive the presentation on Parks Workforce and Asset Management.
2. Provide feedback or recommendations to staff.

**Financial Impact:**

As work progresses in both areas of asset and workforce management, there will likely be impacts on the Capital and Operating Budgets in the future. These impacts will be based on deliberate decisions on CAMMP funding and park maintenance service levels, which will drive the operations costs for maintaining parks. These choices will be brought forward as part of the Business Plan which will be an integral part of the 2016 Parks, Arts and Recreation Plan.





## Finance Committee

### Briefing on the Preliminary Capital Facilities Plan (CFP)

**Agenda Date:** 7/8/2015  
**Agenda Item Number:** 4.C  
**File Number:** 15-0670

---

**Type:** discussion   **Version:** 1   **Status:** In Committee

---

#### **Title**

Briefing on the Preliminary Capital Facilities Plan (CFP)

#### **Recommended Action**

##### **City Manager Recommendation:**

Discuss the Preliminary CFP scheduled for the Council's agenda on July 21.

#### **Report**

##### **Issue:**

Preliminary look at the 2016-2021 CFP.

#### **Staff Contact:**

Jane Kirkemo, Administrative Services Director, 360.753.8499

#### **Presenter(s):**

Jane Kirkemo, Administrative Services Director

#### **Background and Analysis:**

The City Manager is required to present a six-year CFP to the City Council for adoption. The CFP must be balanced (revenues received realistically pay for proposed projects). Such planning involves determining not only where the facilities will be needed, but also when; and not only how much they will cost, but also how they will be paid for, as well as maintained. The Preliminary CFP usually goes to the Finance Committee for review.

Because the City of Olympia collects impact fees for the Olympia School District, their CFP must be incorporated into our CFP document before final adoption. A draft school district CFP will be included in the Council's document on July 21. In addition, any Thurston County project within the Olympia boundaries or the Urban Growth Management Area should be included in the final document.

The six-year plan is \$133 million or 3% less than the current plan. The decrease is predominantly a drinking water grant (\$12 million) that is shown in the current plan.

The Preliminary CFP assures 100% of the Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) money will be spent on capital projects. As the operating budget progresses, the Council could choose to use some portion

of REET funds to balance the operating budget.

The CFP goals and policies have been included this year in the CFP. The Planning Commission reviewed the goals and policies and their revisions are included in the CFP.

**Neighborhood/Community Interests (if known):**

Neighborhoods are always interested in all of the projects in their area.

**Options:**

Discussion only.

**Financial Impact:**

The 2016-2021 CFP is \$133 million. The 2016 budget is \$23.3 million. The 2016 CFP includes one-time revenue available from REET as well as the Transportation Benefit District. There are sufficient revenues from approximately 16 different sources to cover this plan.



## Project Funding Reports - General Government Projects

### Project Funding Reports - General Government Projects: Parks

PARKS PROJECTS	FUNDING	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
Community Park Expansion	Grant	\$ 151,000	\$ -	\$ 151,000
	Impact Fees	\$ 732,500	\$ -	\$ 732,500
Condition Assessment and Major Maintenance Program (CAMMP)	CIP Fund	\$ 500,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 3,000,000
Neighborhood Park Development	Impact Fees	\$ 473,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,223,000
Open Space Acquisition and Development	Grants	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ 500,000
	Impact Fees	\$ 1,143,500	\$ 820,000	\$ 1,963,500
Parks Bond Issue Debt Service	Voted Utility Tax (V.U.T.)	\$ 1,435,150	\$ 1,210,600	\$ 2,645,750
Parks Land Acquisition	Voted Utility Tax (V.U.T.)	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000
Percival Landing Major Maintenance and Reconstruction	CIP Fund	\$ 357,000	\$ -	\$ 357,000
Small Capital Projects	SEPA Fees	\$ 5,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 130,000
	<b>Total Parks</b>	<b>\$ 5,297,150</b>	<b>\$ 10,405,600</b>	<b>\$ 15,702,750</b>

FUNDING RECAP	FUNDING	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
	CIP Fund	\$ 857,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 3,357,000
	Grant	\$ 651,000	\$ -	\$ 651,000
	Impact Fees	\$ 2,349,000	\$ 1,570,000	\$ 3,919,000
	SEPA Fees	\$ 5,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 130,000
	Voted Utility Tax (VUT)	\$ 1,435,150	\$ 6,210,600	\$ 7,645,750
	<b>Total Parks</b>	<b>\$ 5,297,150</b>	<b>\$ 10,405,600</b>	<b>\$ 15,702,750</b>

This CFP is only a planning document; it does not necessarily represent a budget for expenditures.



**Project Funding Reports - General Government Projects: Transportation**

<b>TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS</b>	<b>FUNDING</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017-2021</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Access and Safety Improvements	CIP Fund	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ 200,000
Bike Improvements	CIP Fund	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000
Sidewalks and Pathways	CIP Fund	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000
	Stormwater Utility Rates	\$ 186,500	\$ 932,500	\$ 1,119,000
	Voted Utility Tax - Parks	\$ 25,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 150,000
	Voted Utility Tax - Sidewalks	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 6,000,000
Street Repair and Reconstruction	CIP Fund	\$ 1,437,000	\$ 6,445,000	\$ 7,882,000
	Gas Tax	\$ 275,000	\$ 1,375,000	\$ 1,650,000
	Transportation Benefit District (TBD)	\$ 870,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 4,370,000
<b>Total Transportation</b>		<b>\$ 4,113,500</b>	<b>\$ 17,377,500</b>	<b>\$ 21,491,000</b>

<b>FUNDING RECAP</b>	<b>FUNDING</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017-2021</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
	CIP Fund	\$ 1,757,000	\$ 6,445,000	\$ 8,202,000
	Gas Tax	\$ 275,000	\$ 1,375,000	\$ 1,650,000
	TBD	\$ 870,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 4,370,000
	Storm Water Utility Rate	\$ 186,500	\$ 932,500	\$ 1,119,000
	Voted Utility Tax-Parks	\$ 25,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 150,000
	Voted Utility Tax-Sidewalk	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 6,000,000
<b>Total Transportation</b>		<b>\$ 4,113,500</b>	<b>\$ 17,377,500</b>	<b>\$ 21,491,000</b>

This CFP is only a planning document; it does not necessarily represent a budget for expenditures.



## Project Funding Reports - General Government Projects: Transportation with Impact Fees

TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE PROJECTS	FUNDING	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
2010 Transportation Stimulus Project Repayment	Impact Fees	\$ 438,663	\$ 2,181,862	\$ 2,620,525
Boulevard Road - Intersection Improvements (Program #0628)	Grant	\$ -	\$ 1,944,273	\$ 1,944,273
	Impact Fees	\$ -	\$ 3,057,057	\$ 3,057,057
	SEPA	\$ 46,398	\$ -	\$ 46,398
Cain Road & North Street - Intersection Improvements	Grant	\$ -	\$ 1,266,568	\$ 1,266,568
	Impact Fees	\$ -	\$ 1,580,823	\$ 1,580,823
	SEPA	\$ 7,553	\$ -	\$ 7,553
Fones Road—Transportation (Program #0623)	Grant	\$ -	\$ 7,256,890	\$ 7,256,890
	Impact Fees	\$ -	\$ 9,057,437	\$ 9,057,437
	SEPA	\$ 23,385	\$ -	\$ 23,385
Henderson Boulevard & Eskridge Boulevard - Intersection Improvements	Grant	\$ -	\$ 1,560,265	\$ 1,560,265
	Impact Fees	\$ -	\$ 1,947,391	\$ 1,947,391
	SEPA	\$ 2,897	\$ -	\$ 2,897
Log Cabin Road Extension - Impact Fee Collection (Program #0616)	Impact Fees	\$ -	\$ 4,038,097	\$ 4,038,097
	SEPA	\$ 18	\$ -	\$ 18
Wiggins Road and 37th Ave Intersection Improvements	Grant	\$ -	\$ 2,996,176	\$ 2,996,176
	Impact Fees	\$ -	\$ 3,739,573	\$ 3,739,573
	SEPA	\$ 83,187	\$ -	\$ 83,187
<b>Total Transportation with Impact Fee</b>		<b>\$ 602,101</b>	<b>\$ 40,626,412</b>	<b>\$ 41,228,513</b>

FUNDING RECAP	FUNDING	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
	Grant	\$ -	\$ 15,024,172	\$ 15,024,172
	Impact Fees	\$ 438,663	\$ 25,602,240	\$ 26,040,903
	SEPA	\$ 163,438	\$ -	\$ 163,438
<b>Total Transportation with Impact Fees</b>		<b>\$ 602,101</b>	<b>\$ 40,626,412</b>	<b>\$ 41,228,513</b>

This CFP is only a planning document; it does not necessarily represent a budget for expenditures.



**Project Funding Reports - General Government Projects: General Capital Facilities**

GENERAL CAPITAL FACILITIES PROJECTS	FUNDING	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
Building Repair and Replacement	CIP Fund	\$ 1,330,000	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 8,330,000
<b>Total General Capital Facilities</b>		<b>\$ 1,330,000</b>	<b>\$ 7,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 8,330,000</b>

FUNDING RECAP	FUNDING	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
	CIP Fund	\$ 1,330,000	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 8,330,000
<b>Total General Capital Facilities</b>		<b>\$ 1,330,000</b>	<b>\$ 7,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 8,330,000</b>

**Summary of Funding Sources for General Government Projects**

FUNDING SOURCES	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
CIP Fund	\$ 3,944,000	\$ 15,945,000	\$ 19,889,000
Gas Tax	\$ 275,000	\$ 1,375,000	\$ 1,650,000
Grant	\$ 651,000	\$ 15,024,172	\$ 15,675,172
Impact Fees	\$ 2,787,663	\$ 27,172,240	\$ 29,959,903
SEPA	\$ 168,438	\$ 125,000	\$ 293,438
Stormwater Utility Rates	\$ 186,500	\$ 932,500	\$ 1,119,000
TBD	\$ 870,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 4,370,000
Voted Utility Tax	\$ 1,435,150	\$ 6,210,600	\$ 7,645,750
Voted Utility Tax - Parks	\$ 25,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 150,000
Voted Utility Tax - Pathways/Sidewalks	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 6,000,000
<b>Total General Government</b>	<b>\$ 11,342,751</b>	<b>\$ 75,409,512</b>	<b>\$ 86,752,263</b>

This CFP is only a planning document; it does not necessarily represent a budget for expenditures.



## Project Funding Reports - Utilities Projects

### Project Funding Reports - Utilities Projects: Drinking Water

DRINKING WATER PROJECTS	FUNDING	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
Asphalt Overlay Adjustments—Water (Program # 9021)	Rates	\$ 11,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 66,000
Groundwater Protection—Water (Program #9701)	Rates	\$ 158,000	\$ 889,000	\$ 1,047,000
Infrastructure Pre-Design and Planning—Water (Program #9903)	Rates	\$ 22,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 132,000
Reclaimed Water (Program #9710)	General Facility Charges	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Rates	\$ -	\$ 418,000	\$ 418,000
Small Diameter Water Pipe Replacement—Water (Program #9408)	Rates	\$ 525,000	\$ 2,625,000	\$ 3,150,000
Transmission and Distribution Projects—Water (Program #9609)	General Facility Charges	\$ -	\$ 199,500	\$ 199,500
	Rates	\$ 3,863,000	\$ 7,641,500	\$ 11,504,500
Water Source Development and Protection (Program #9700)	General Facility Charges	\$ 1,140,500	\$ 293,000	\$ 1,433,500
	Rates	\$ 2,710,500	\$ 240,000	\$ 2,950,500
Water Storage Systems (Program #9610)	General Facility Charges	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Rates	\$ -	\$ 3,600,000	\$ 3,600,000
Water System Planning (Program #9906)	General Facility Charges	\$ -	\$ 157,500	\$ 157,500
	Rates	\$ -	\$ 157,500	\$ 157,500
<b>Total Drinking Water</b>		<b>\$ 8,430,000</b>	<b>\$ 16,386,000</b>	<b>\$ 24,816,000</b>

### Project Funding Reports - Utilities Projects: Wastewater

WASTEWATER PROJECTS	FUNDING	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
Asphalt Overlay Adjustments - Sewer (Program #9021)	Rates	\$ 11,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 66,000
Infrastructure Predesign and Planning - Sewer (Program #9903)	Rates	\$ 39,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 234,000
Lift Stations—Sewer (Program #9806)	General Facility Charges	\$ -	\$ 1,890,500	\$ 1,890,500
	Rates	\$ 630,000	\$ 1,228,500	\$ 1,858,500
Onsite Sewage System Conversions - Sewer (Program #9813)	General Facility Charges	\$ 158,000	\$ 1,840,000	\$ 1,998,000
Replacement and Repair Projects - Sewer (Program #9703)	Rates	\$ 405,000	\$ 2,220,000	\$ 2,625,000
Sewer Systems Extensions - Sewer (Program #9809)	General Facility Charges	\$ 788,000	\$ -	\$ 788,000
Sewer System Planning - Sewer (Program #9808)	Rates	\$ 22,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 132,000
<b>Total Wastewater</b>		<b>\$ 2,053,000</b>	<b>\$ 7,539,000</b>	<b>\$ 9,592,000</b>

### Project Funding Reports - Utilities Projects: Stormwater

STORMWATER PROJECTS	FUNDING	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
Aquatic Habitat Improvements - Stormwater (Program #9024)	Rates	\$ 250,000	\$ 625,000	\$ 875,000
Flood Mitigation & Collection - Stormwater (Program #9028)	General Facility Charges	\$ -	\$ 2,371,650	\$ 2,371,650
	Rates	\$ 519,500	\$ 5,119,650	\$ 5,639,150
Infrastructure Pre-Design & Planning - Stormwater (Program #9903)	Rates	\$ 28,400	\$ 142,000	\$ 170,400
Water Quality Improvements - Stormwater (Program #9027)	Grants	\$ 570,975	\$ 1,617,750	\$ 2,188,725
	Rates	\$ 190,325	\$ 539,250	\$ 729,575
<b>Total Stormwater</b>		<b>\$ 1,559,200</b>	<b>\$ 10,415,300</b>	<b>\$ 11,974,500</b>

**Additionally: Included in the Transportation Section are Projects funded by transfers from the Stormwater Utility as follows:**

PROJECT	FUNDING	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
Sidewalks and Pathways—Transportation Section	<b>Stormwater Utility Rates</b>	\$ 186,500	\$ 932,500	\$ 1,119,000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 186,500</b>	<b>\$ 932,500</b>	<b>\$ 1,119,000</b>

This CFP is only a planning document; it does not necessarily represent a budget for expenditures.

### Summary of Funding Sources for Utilities Projects

FUNDING SOURCES	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
General Facility Charges	\$ 2,086,500	\$ 6,752,150	\$ 8,838,650
Rates	\$ 9,384,725	\$ 25,970,400	\$ 35,355,125
Stormwater Grants or Loans	\$ 570,975	\$ 1,617,750	\$ 2,188,725
<b>Total Utilities</b>	<b>\$ 12,042,200</b>	<b>\$ 34,340,300</b>	<b>\$ 46,382,500</b>

### Combined Summary of Funding Sources for Both General Government and Utilities Projects

FUNDING SOURCES	2016	2017-2021	TOTAL
CIP Fund	\$ 3,944,000	\$ 15,945,000	\$ 19,889,000
Gas Tax	\$ 275,000	\$ 1,375,000	\$ 1,650,000
General Facility Charges	\$ 2,086,500	\$ 6,752,150	\$ 8,838,650
Grant	\$ 651,000	\$ 15,024,172	\$ 15,675,172
Impact Fees	\$ 2,787,663	\$ 27,172,240	\$ 29,959,903
Rates	\$ 9,384,725	\$ 25,970,400	\$ 35,355,125
SEPA	\$ 168,438	\$ 125,000	\$ 293,438
Stormwater Grants or Loans	\$ 570,975	\$ 1,617,750	\$ 2,188,725
Stormwater Utility Rates	\$ 186,500	\$ 932,500	\$ 1,119,000
TBD	\$ 870,000	\$ 3,400,000	\$ 4,370,000
Voted Utility Tax	\$ 1,435,150	\$ 6,210,600	\$ 7,645,750
Voted Utility Tax - Parks	\$ 25,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 150,000
Voted Utility Tax - Pathways/Sidewalks	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 6,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 23,384,951</b>	<b>\$ 109,749,812</b>	<b>\$ 133,134,763</b>

This CFP is only a planning document; it does not necessarily represent a budget for expenditures.