



City of Olympia

City Hall
601 4th Avenue E
Olympia, WA 98501

Contact: Amy Buckler
(360) 570-5847

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Friday, August 9, 2013

8:00 AM

Room 112

Planning Commission Finance Subcommittee

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.A ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Roger Horn, Commissioner Jerry Parker, Commissioner Andresen, Commissioner Carole Richmond, Commissioner Judy Bardin, Commissioner Max Brown,

Staff Present: Jane Kirkemo, Randy Wesselman, Clark Halvorson, Mark Russell, Debbie Krumpols, David Hanna, David Okerland

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Horn announces the next meeting for August 21st. He suggests Commissioners will discuss the outcome of their meeting today on the 21st and begin drafting their letter based on the information received today.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

5.A 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](#)

Chair Horn opens the meeting by thanking Jane Kirkemo and City Staff for hosting the meeting and answering the questions Commissioners prepared. The City Staff and Commissioners went around the table introducing themselves. Following the introductions, Chair Horn prompted City staff to begin the discussion.

Each staff member reviewed the Commissioners questions and then were allocated certain

questions based on the relevancy of the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) chapters and their job with the City of Olympia.

Comments, questions, answers and discussion regarding the Parks chapter within the CFP.

-David Hanna, Associate Director of Arts, Parks and Recreation briefly discussed general funds and other funding sources relative to the CFP

-Parks Department collect fees based upon what category the Capital Projects falls under; Neighborhood Park, Community Parks and Open Space

-We have a responsibility to deal with growth but we also have to be careful with how we administer our parks system when it comes to funding

-Regarding the 2014-2019 Capital Projects, Mr. Hanna did not want to increase projects that would push the maintenance staff, especially when there are prior commitments such as; off-street walking connections which was voted by utility tax. There are also City Council directed projects such as the Isthmus and upgrading facilities are Priest Point Park

-Mr. Hanna gives a brief description of how funding is divided. He adds grants are not typically listed in the Capital budget because they are unpredictable and unreliable. Parks department does apply for grants strategically and they do receive them, however they do not like to include them under their Capital funding

-Jane Kirkemo, Director of Administrative Services adds that Council got voters to increase utility tax (which ultimately got parks to purchase property for parks, roughly ten million dollars). Council decided they wanted the money up front, in which case we have a certain amount of time to pay of the bonds

-Commissioner Bardin asks what park projects have actually been finished. Mr. Hanna says roughly 80% of the projects have been completed

-Parks only collect on residential projects while transportation collects on residential and commercial

-There hasn't been much gifting of property like there has been in the past, for the most part it has been the process of purchasing land. There has, however, been a few grants, such as Grass Lake property

-If projects from the Shoreline Master Program and the Comprehensive Plan come up, the Parks department adopts them and eventually they are brought to the CFP project list

-Commissioner Richmond wonders if there is a possibility to show green space on the Comprehensive Plan map. Mr. Okerlund notes stormwater has a lot of open space that is not shown in the current map as well

Comments, questions, answers and discussion regarding the Transportation chapter of the

CFP:

-Randy Wesselman, Engineering and Planning Supervisor with Public works discusses his questions

-If population decreases in an area where a transportation project is occurring, then the project is typically delayed because projects shadows growth

-If population and employment is going well then impact fees can be collected on projects, however when the economy is slow, impact fees are minimal, leaving less money for projects

-Commissioner Parker asks if there are any alternative design options for sidewalks or if they will remain constant. Mr. Wesselman responds by saying life expectancy is the determining factor; concrete has the longest lifespan, however the up front costs of having porous sidewalks is a mitigation factor versus having to purchase a piece of property for stormwater mitigation

-Ms. Kirkemo reviews a list of Capital Projects detailing funding sources as well as mentions the Full Councils request regarding each project

Comments, questions, answers and discussion regarding the Utilities chapter of the CFP:

Mark Russell, Line of Business Director for Public Works reviews the questions Commissioner Brown and Commissioner Andresen came up with.

-Utilities has not purchased land in quite a while. Instead they are working with Department of Natural Resources and Thurston County on pursuing easements for property so that maintenance and security costs are not factors. Their hopes are to work with private land owners to help secure drinking water protection

-Utilities is updating their Drinking Water Plan

-Commissioner Brown asked why five years was the allotted amount of time for the water utilities sustainability plan. Mr. Russell said funding is large part of that time line as well as the life cycle of pumps

-The City believes it is more appropriate for the Port of Olympia to maintain their own utilities due to the security issues with the Port.

-The proposed waste water plan that is currently in place has taken away the total restriction of having anymore septic systems in some areas and that has been done because Thurston County has done a lot of risk assessment in particular areas that suggests it is not a risk to ad more septic systems. The soil compositions are able to handle the extra systems. From a budget standpoint, there is minimal impact. There are only five or six properties that need septic systems in which case this is not a large impact on the overall budget

Comments, questions, answers and discussion for the Introduction of the CFP:

-Jane Kirkemo, Administrative Services Director, reviewed questions from the Introduction in the CFP

-The construction costs of a Capital Project would be in the CFP but the actual plans for the project would be in the operating budget.

-Before the economy tanked, any excess money at the end of the year goes into a reserve. There are a lot of worthy projects that are not in the CFP because there is simply not enough money. Unless the Council is going to push for a property tax levy on the ballot for acquiring additional revenue, it would be difficult to raise extra funding for more projects

-The City of Olympia has been doing the CFP for over thirty years, long before the Growth Management Act required jurisdictions to do so

-Commissioner Parker believes it would be useful for the public to see a sort of "wish list" of projects so they could see what projects are not able to happen due to lack of funding. In hopes that the list would prompt ways of increasing funding.

-Land banking is something the City did when they were writing the Comprehensive Plan and Ms. Kirkemo believes it is confusing and out of date and should be removed from the CFP

-There is a critical need for strengthening maintenance projects. It is important to encourage and recommend the Council to do maintenance projects

Chair Horn thanked City staff again for taking the time to answer the Subcommittee's questions.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 am.

Upcoming

Accommodations