



# City of Olympia

City Hall  
601 4th Avenue E  
Olympia, WA 98501

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Contact: Amy Buckler  
(360) 570-5847

---

**Wednesday, July 31, 2013**

**6:30 PM**

**Room 207**

---

### Finance Subcommittee

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

##### 1.A ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Roger Horn, Commissioner Jerome Parker, Commissioner Max Brown,  
Commissioner Carole Richmond, Commissioner Judy Bardin arrived at 7:30

Absent: Kim Andresen

#### 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved.

#### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**13-0597** Approval of July 1, 2013 Planning Commission Finance Subcommittee  
Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Final Minutes](#)

The minutes were approved as amended.

#### 4. BUSINESS ITEMS

Chair Horn's meeting agenda:

1. Approve minutes
2. Review draft CFP questions
3. Go over Capital Facilities element (p 13, 14)
4. Identify initial items for CFP letter
5. 20-year Plan
6. Upcoming meetings:
  - Friday 8/9 8:00-12:00
  - Wednesday 8/21 6:30
  - Wednesday 8/28 6:30
  - Wednesday 8/28 6:30
  - Wednesday 9/11 6:30

**13-0596** Review of Draft 2014-2019 Capital Facilities Plan (CFP)

**Attachments:** [1. Draft edits to the 20-year CFP goals and policies](#)  
[2. Link to the 2014-2019 Preliminary CFP](#)

The Commissioners begin discussing questions relative to the chapters from the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) that were designated to each commissioner. Chair Horn has prepared a document entitled "Discussion Draft Questions/Comments for Staff" to be reviewed by the Subcommittee.

The first question discussed is "Has the lifecycle cost analysis changed our practices regarding replacement or renovation of City facilities? Is there more that staff would like to do in this area?" Chair Horn would like more information regarding this issue and believes it is an important item to bring to the next meeting with staff. Commissioner Parker would like more clarity of the term "lifestyle cost."

Commissioner Parker moves to his questions regarding the Transportation chapter in the CFP. Each item is listed below:

- "Grant funds seem to drive priorities. This might be giving up local control. Is this a problem? Do grants reflect City Priorities?" Commissioner Parker notes that we are doing what the federal government wants rather than what we want and questions the priority given to grant funded projects.
- "Needs a definition of what is a "capital" project. Is maintenance of a physical facility a capital project?"
- "Why is City not collecting fire impact fees. (This appears at odds with subsequent graphs and charts which show impact fees for fire.)" Commissioner Parker notes there should be a footnote that mentions the program has been terminated.
- "Don't grasp difference between SEPA fees and impact fees and whether City can collect both on same project."
- "Should add discussion of zonal impact fees."
- "Under concurrency, can development occur with nothing more than a 'financial commitment'? What constitutes a binding commitment? What if circumstances change significantly and no money is available?" Commissioner Parker goes further to ask if there are penalties if plans change.
- "Should discuss the revenue generated by area of City, by existing development, by commercial, by retail, by property taxes, etc."
- "Discussion of 'revenue sources' explains in terms of bonds, grants, LIDs, impact fees, REET. Need to show by area of City. Would help determine where to focus."
- "What is the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) fund? Where does money come from?"  
Chair Horn directs Commissioner Parker to the answer is within the chapter. Commissioner Parker asks how the Planning Commission is involved in siting facilities for improvement and Chair Horn clarifies that the Planning Commission is involved in zoning.
- "Define capital facilities. Says it does not include routine maintenance but does include major renovation."

- "Says recommendation of Planning Commission considered in siting projects. How so?"
- "Not obvious how Chart 2.2 demonstrates how Land Use Element directly impacts other plan and CFP. The suggestion is that allowable land uses, residential commercial, industrial, open space, affect type and necessary capacities of capital facilities."
- "Under CFP funding sources, REET is 1/2% of what?"
- "Debt is described but not the criteria for when and why debt is used. Is it to provide infrastructure that can then generate repayment and eventual "profit" to City?"
- "Why do various impact fee receipts differ? Are they not all tied to new buildings? So should they not all rise and fall together. Note the great divergence between transportation and park collections."
- "Why show fire impact fees when introduction says City doesn't collect?"
- "REET not same as property tax. Why no mention of property tax? Should at least explain. Perhaps can't be sued for capital projects?"

Commissioners Parker discusses the possibility of showing revenue spatially. He notes that the Westside region, namely the mall and the auto-mall probably produce much more tax revenue than the Downtown. He would like a fuller description of where revenues come from spatially. Chair Horn adds, could knowing tax revenue spatially help plan and inform the CFP. Commissioner Brown further adds that if a large part of the tax revenue comes from the Westside, why isn't there a larger focus on committing facilities plan towards that region? He asks the Commissioners if the issue of revenue generation geographically is a part of the 20-year plan discussion. The Commissioners agree that it is.

Commissioner Richmond adds that we are planning for population growth, so we need to facilitate through our CFP.

Roger moves forward with his set of questions. The questions for the Transportation Chapter are listed below:

- "Page 8, Debt Limitation- The table indicates that remaining non-voted debt capacity is \$16.8 million and remaining voted debt capacity is \$53.6 million. The non-voted debt capacity is included in the voted debt capacity, as explained in Funding Sources on page 11. It would be useful to clarify the total capital is \$53.6 million, and is not the total of non-voted and voted debt capacity (\$80.4 million, which I originally concluded)."
- "Page 10, Charts- In the "bull's eye" chart at the top of the page is there significance to the chapter groups in each band? If so, it should be explained." Chair Horn adds that land use is not mentioned in the chart and he does not understand the tool being used.
- "Page 12, impact fees- The vertical scale for parks impact fee collections at the bottom of the page appears to be incorrect. Total collections are about \$8 million according to the chart at the top of the page compared to about \$16 million at the bottom of the page."
- "Page 23, County Funded Projects in the Urban Growth Boundary-Does the City have to pick up any of the county costs if an area is annexed?" Commissioner Parker

questions why services to the Urban Growth Area (UGA) are being given and that they should not be given until annexation due to the lack of impact fees collected.

- "Page 46 Recent Trends- The first paragraph indicates funding is reduced for many CFP programs because sales tax revenues have been low. Haven't property taxes, the other major general fund tax source, also been low?"
- "Page 47, 4th Avenue Bridge Railing, Comp Plan and Functional Plan Citations - Since this project mainly being done for aesthetic reasons, it seems that the comp plan policies about maintenance and preservation in the Capital Facilities element should be included."
- "Page 50m Capitol Way Sidewalk- hasn't work already been done on this project in the last year or two?"
- "Page 55, Pedestrian Crossing Improvements- are there temporary, low-cost solutions (signs, street markings) that could be implemented for some of the 34 projects that won't be funded in the near term?"

Commissioner Bardin refers to the Chart on page 67 and asks what happens if the City does not receive grants. Commissioner Richmond notes that much of the grant money for transportation is reliable.

Commissioner Richmond questions the types of facility projects. She notes that the City should be focusing on green projects due to operating costs. She adds that by concentrating on green retrofitting and various other green and sustainable projects, it would ultimately lower the operating costs.

Commissioner Brown discusses briefly some of his questions regarding the Water chapter in the CFP.

The Commissioners agree to send all of their questions relative to their assigned chapters within the CFP to Commissioner Horn by Sunday evening so he can prepare them for Jane Kirkemo and staff for the August 9th meeting.

**The work session was discussed and continued.to the OPC meeting for 8/9/2013.**

## **5. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:44 pm.

### **Upcoming Meetings**

### **Accommodations**