ORDINANCE NO. 1277

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF GIG HARBOR, WASHINGTON, RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING, AMENDING THE CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT TO UPDATE THE SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECT LISTS CONCURRENTLY WITH THE ANNUAL BUDGET ADOPTION; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City of Gig Harbor plans under the Growth Management Act (chapter 36.70A RCW); and

WHEREAS, the Act requires the City to adopt a Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City adopted a revised GMA Comprehensive Plan as required by RCW 36.70A.130 (4) in December 2004; and

WHEREAS, the City is required to consider suggested changes to the Comprehensive Plan (RCW 36.70A.470); and

WHEREAS, RCW 36.70A.130(2)(a)(iv) allows the city to adopt amendments to the Capital Facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan that occurs concurrently with the adoption of the annual budget process; and

WHEREAS, the City is required to provide public notice and public hearing for any amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and the adoption of any elements thereto (RCW 36.70A.035, RCW 36.70A.130); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Director notified the Washington State Department of Commerce of the City's intent to amend the Comprehensive Plan and forwarded a copy of the proposed amendments on September 17, 2013, pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106; and

WHEREAS, on October 23, 2013, the City's SEPA Responsible Official issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) for comprehensive plan amendment applications, pursuant to WAC 197-11-340(2); and

WHEREAS, a notice of public hearing was published per GHMC 19.09.110 on October 30, 2013 in the local newspaper; and

WHEREAS, the Gig Harbor City Council had a first reading and Public Hearing of an Ordinance implementing the recommendations for the Capital Facilities Element in conjunction with the adoption of the 2014 Annual Budget on November 12, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Gig Harbor City Council had a second reading of an Ordinance implementing the application and amending the Comprehensive Plan on November 25, 2013;

Now, Therefore,

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GIG HARBOR, WASHINGTON, ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments.

A. **Notice.** The City Clerk confirmed that public notice of the public hearings held by the City Council on the following application was provided.

B. **Hearing Procedure**. The City Council's consideration of the comprehensive plan text amendments is a legislative act. The Appearance of Fairness doctrine does not apply.

C. **Testimony.** None to date.

D. **Criteria for Approval.** The process for Comprehensive Plan amendments (Chapter 19.09) states that the City Council shall consider the criteria found in GHMC 19.09.170 make written findings regarding the applications consistency or inconsistency with the criteria. The criteria found in GHMC 19.09.170 are as follows:

19.09.170 Criteria for approval.

A. The proposed amendment will further and be consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the comprehensive plan; and

B. The proposed amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act, the countywide planning policies and other applicable interjurisdictional policies and agreements, and/or other state or local laws; and

C. The proposed amendment will not adversely impact the city's ability to provide sewer and water, and will not adversely affect transportation facilities and other public facilities and services such as parks, police, fire, emergency medical services and governmental services; and

D. The proposed amendment advances the public interest; and

E. For text amendments which propose to increase density or intensity of permitted development and all land use map amendments, the following approval criteria also apply:

1. Adequate infrastructure, facilities and services are available to serve the proposed or potential development expected as a result of this amendment, according to one of the following provisions:

a. The city has adequate funds for needed infrastructure, facilities and services to support new development associated with the proposed amendments; or

b. The city's projected revenues are sufficient to fund needed infrastructure, facilities and services, and such infrastructure, facilities and

services are included in the schedule of capital improvements in the city's capital facilities plan; or

c. Needed infrastructure, facilities and services will be funded by the developer under the terms of a development agreement associated with the comprehensive plan amendment; or

d. Adequate infrastructure, facilities and services are currently in place to serve expected development as a result of this comprehensive plan amendment based upon an assessment of land use assumptions; or

e. Land use assumptions have been reassessed, and required amendments to other sections of the comprehensive plan are being processed in conjunction with this amendment in order to ensure that adopted level of service standards will be met; and

2. For a land use map amendment, the subject parcels being redesignated are physically suitable for the allowed land uses in the designation being requested, including compatibility with existing and planned surrounding land uses; and

3. The proposed amendment will not create a demand to change land use designations of other properties, unless the change in land use designation for other properties is in the long-term interest of the community in general.

E. Applications. The City Council hereby enters the following findings and conclusions for each application:

1. PL-COMP-13-0004 – Capital Facilities Element

Summary: A text amendment to the Capital Facilities Element to update the Six Year Capital Improvement Program Project lists concurrently with the annual budget adoption. This amendment is sponsored by the City of Gig Harbor.

Findings:

a) The City's Comprehensive Plan seeks to keep pace with the population and commercial growth through the funding of capital improvements that manage and allow for the projected growth. The City Council finds that the amendments to the wastewater, water, parks and transportation project lists in the Capital Facilities Plan will allow the City to better address the planning area's needs by identifying capital projects and associated funding strategies.
b) The City Council finds that the proposed amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act, the countywide planning policies and multi-county planning policies.
c) The City Council finds that the amendments are necessary so as not to create significant adverse impacts to the City's infrastructure. Updating the wastewater, stormwater, transportation, water, and parks, recreation and open space project lists in the capital facilities plan allows the City to plan for and provide the necessary infrastructure to serve the development projected by the Comprehensive Plan.
d) The City Council finds that this amendment serves the public interest by creating a plan to provide the infrastructure needed to meet agreed upon

levels of service for citizens and ratepayers and to provide for the growth potential of the City in conjunction with the 2014 annual City Budget.

e) Criterion GHMC 19.06.170(e) does not apply to this process.

Conclusion: After consideration of the materials in the file, staff presentation, the City's Comprehensive Plan, criteria for approval found in Chapter 19.09 GHMC, applicable law, and public testimony, the City Council hereby **approves** application **PL-COMP-13-0004**, as identified in **Exhibit A** attached to this Ordinance.

Section 2. Transmittal to State. The Planning Director is directed to forward a copy of this Ordinance, together with all of the exhibits, to the Washington State Commerce Department within ten days of adoption, pursuant to RCW 36.70A.106.

Section 3. Severability. If any portion of this Ordinance or its application to any person or circumstances is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid or unconstitutional, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall not affect the remainder of the Ordinance or the application of the remainder to other persons or circumstances.

Section 4. Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect and be in full force five (5) days after passage and publication of an approved summary consisting of the title.

PASSED by the Council and approved by the Mayor of the City of Gig Harbor this 25th day of November 2013.

CITY OF GIG HARBOR

Mayor Charles L. Hunter

ATTEST/AUTHENTICATED:

Molly M. Towslee, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Office of the City Attorney

Angela G. Summerfield

FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK: 11/06/13
PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL: 11/25/13
PUBLISHED: 11/27/13
EFFECTIVE DATE: 12/02/13
ORDINANCE NO. 1277

Chapter 12
CAPITAL FACILITIES

INTRODUCTION

A Capital Facilities Plan is a required element under the State Growth Management Act, Section 36.70A.070 and it addresses the financing of capital facilities in the City of Gig Harbor and the adjacent urban growth area. It represents the City and community's policy plan for the financing of public facilities over the next twenty years and it includes a six-year financing plan for capital facilities. The policies and objectives in this plan are intended to guide public decisions on the use of capital funds. They will also be used to indirectly provide general guidance on private development decisions by providing a strategy of planned public capital expenditures.

The capital facilities element specifically evaluates the city's fiscal capability to provide public facilities necessary to support the other comprehensive plan elements. The capital facilities element includes:

- Inventory and Analysis
- Future Needs and Alternatives
- Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan
- Goals, Objectives and Policies
- Plan Implementation and Monitoring

Level of Service Standards

The Capital Facilities Element identifies a level of service (LOS) standard for public services that are dependent on specific facilities. Level of service establishes a minimum capacity of capital facilities that must be provided per unit of demand or other appropriate measure of need. These standards are then used to determine whether a need for capacity improvements currently exists and what improvements will be needed to maintain the policy levels of service under anticipated conditions over the life of the Comprehensive Plan. The projected levels of growth are identified in the Land Use and Housing Elements.

Major Capital Facilities Considerations and Goals

The Capital Facilities Element is the mechanism the city uses to coordinate its physical and fiscal planning. The element is a collaboration of various disciplines and interactions of city departments including public works, planning, finance and administration. The Capital Facilities Element serves as a method to help make choices among all of the possible projects and services that are demanded of the City. It is a basic tool that can help encourage rational decision-making rather than reaction to events as they occur.

The Capital Facilities Element promotes efficiency by requiring the local government to prioritize capital improvements for a longer period of time than the single budget year. Long range financial planning presents the opportunity to schedule capital projects so that the various steps in development logically follow one another respective to relative need, desirability and community benefit. In addition, the identification of adequate funding sources results in the prioritization of needs and allows the tradeoffs between funding sources to be evaluated explicitly. The Capital Facilities Plan will guide decision making to achieve the community goals as articulated in the Vision Statement of December, 1992.

INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS

The inventory provides information useful to the planning process. It also summarizes new capital improvement projects for the existing population, new capital improvement projects necessary to accommodate the growth projected through the year 2010 and the major repair, renovation or replacement of existing facilities.

Inventory of Existing Capital Facilities

WASTEWATER SYSTEM

Existing Capital Facilities

Gig Harbor's original collection system, constructed in 1974-1975, served the downtown area and an area south of downtown. The original system was called Utility Local Improvement District (ULID) #1 and included six lift stations. ULID #2 was constructed to the south of ULID #1 in 1988 to serve south Gig Harbor including portions of Soundview Drive, Harbor Country Drive, Point Fosdick Drive, and Olympic Drive. ULID #3 was constructed north of ULID #1 in 1992 to serve North Gig Harbor including the area along Burnham Drive north of Harborview Drive, the Washington State Women's Corrections Center off Bujacich Drive, and the Purdy area including the Peninsula School District campus in Purdy.

Further expansions of the City's collection system were built under development agreements and as mitigation conditions of proposed development through the state environmental policy act (SEPA) process. As of 2009 the City's collection system consisted of approximately 150,000 feet of gravity sewers, 32,000 feet of sewer force mains, and 15 lift stations.

The City's wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) is located on five acres, west of Harborview Drive at its intersection with North Harborview Drive. The original WWTP was brought online to provide secondary treatment of municipal sewage in 1975. The original WWTP had a design capacity of 0.45 million gallons per day (MGD) with an average organic loading of 700 lbs BOD_5/day. In 1988, the WWTP was expanded to treat 0.7 MGD and an average organic loading of 1,800 lbs BOD_5/day. The WWTP was expanded again in 1996 to treat 1.0 MGD and permitted to treat a capacity of 1.6 MGD and an average organic loading of 3,400 lbs BOD_5/day. In 2009 the City started construction of Phase I of additional improvements to the WWTP to

expand the treatment capacity to the permitted capacity.

The WWTP consists of the following major components: influent flow meter, influent screens, screening press, aeration basins, blowers, secondary clarifiers, return activated sludge pumps, waste activated sludge pump, aerobic digester, digested sludge pumps, sludge dewatering centrifuge, chlorinators, chlorine contact tanks, dechlorination system, and effluent discharge pumps. Effluent from the WWTP is piped through an outfall that discharges in to Gig Harbor.

In addition to sewer service within the Gig Harbor UGA, the City of Gig Harbor owns, operates, and maintains a septic system for the Shorecrest Development along Ray Nash Drive NW located about 5 miles west of the City. The Shorecrest septic system is a 12-unit development with an on-site septic system and pressurized drainfield.

Level of Service

The City introduced a requirement in May 2006 through Ordinance #1044 for most new development and redevelopment projects to request a portion of the treatment capacity at the City's wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) through the sewer capacity reservation certificate (CRC) process. Each CRC reserves a specific number of gallons per day for treatment at the wastewater treatment plant based on the current value of an equivalent residential unit (ERU) Since the WWTP has limited capacity to treat wastewater, the City identifies by way of the sewer CRC process those projects that the City's WWTP has adequate public wastewater facilities to treat.

In August 2007 the City released a statement indicating the City may not be able to grant any additional sewer CRCs until a planned expansion project at the WWTP is completed. The anticipated completion date of the planned expansion project is November 2010. At the time of completion, the projected wastewater treatment capacity will be increased to 1.6 million gallons per day (MGD). The net increase of capacity compared to the previous capacity is 0.4 MGD, or approximately 2,667 ERUs. Based on maximum monthly flow projections, the projected treatment capacity of 1.6 MGD will be adequate for the next six years.

Forecast of Future Needs

The City has used a demographics forecasting allocation model (DFAM) to forecast future population growth on undeveloped and underdeveloped parcels within the City's urban growth area (UGA). The primary input to the DFAM was a result of the City's Buildable Lands Analysis. The resulting population growth was then correlated to the generation of sewer flows to provide an estimate of the distribution of sewer flows throughout the City's UGA. These forecasted flows and descriptions of future wastewater needs are described further in the City's Wastewater Comprehensive Plan.

Future Wastewater Collection Needs

The City's collection system is planned at full build-out to expand to the limits of the UGA. The

collection system has been divided into a total of 21 topographic basins, also known as sewer basins. At build-out each sewer basin will have one sewer pump station and a mixture of sewer gravity mains and sewer force mains. The design and construction of undeveloped and under-developed sewer basins may be financed by developers as conditions of SEPA or land use approval, and/or utility local improvement districts (ULIDs).

As noted above in the description of the existing capital facilities, the City's core area has an established sewer collection system. Some areas within the City's UGA are capable of having sewer flows conveyed through the use of gravity to existing sewer lift stations. However, in most areas the future development of the City's sewer collection system will occur in areas beyond the City's core area. These areas have a topographic low point where wastewater must be collected and pumped and may require construction of a new sewer pump station, also known as a lift station. Only one lift station shall be utilized in each sewer basin.

In situations where a new sewer lift station must be constructed two scenarios exist. The first scenario is where no lift station is located in the sewer basin. The proposed development activity shall design and construct a new lift station that will collect sewer flows from the proposed development and all future development upstream in the sewer basin.

The second scenario is where an existing lift station is already located in the sewer basin but the proposed development activity is located lower in elevation than the existing lift station. The proposed development activity shall design and construct a new lift station that will collect sewer flows from the existing lift station, the proposed development and all future development upstream in the sewer basin. The existing lift station would then be demolished.
Due to the likely potential for mechanical and electrical failures and the complications that arise when these failures occur, developments shall maximize gravity flows while minimizing the use of lift stations and grinder pumps.

Only developments lower in elevation than an existing lift station or gravity main AND lower in elevation that the path of sewer main construction may, upon approval of the Public Works Director, use grinder pumps in lieu of constructing a new lift station.

The City's Public Works Department provides continuous maintenance of the existing collection system. Future needs of the existing collection system are mostly limited to projects requiring rehabilitation of the lift stations. However, through the modeling of projected wastewater flows, no projects have been identified in the short term as necessary to increase the capacity of a gravity sewer main. Funding for the ongoing maintenance of the existing collection system, including rehabilitation of existing lift stations and replacement of existing sewer mains may be funded by utility connection fees and utility rates.

Specific facility improvements anticipated to accommodate the upcoming six year planning period are listed in Table 12.5.

Future Wastewater Treatment Plant Needs

To treat wastewater flows and waste load projections for the anticipated 20 year planning horizon the City will need to increase the permitted capacity of the treatment plant. With the construction of the Phase I improvements to the WWTP scheduled to be completed in 2010, the City anticipates the need for completing the design and construction of the Phase II WWP improvements and extending the marine portion of the wastewater outfall into Colvos Passage to receive approval on an increased wastewater discharge.

Reclaimed Water Investigation.

The State has identified reclaimed water as an important water resource management strategy that can offer benefits related to potable water supply, wastewater management, and environmental enhancement. The City has acknowledged the State's acceptance and promotion of reclaimed water as being a viable and important water resource management tool through the adoption of a comprehensive plan goal for the wastewater utility to explore options to create reclaimed water. Table 12.5 identifies an annual project for the study and investigation of wastewater reuse and reclaimed water.

WATER SYSTEM

Existing Capital Facilities

The City of Gig Harbor Water System, limited by its retail water service area (RWSA), is unique in that many residents within the City limits and the City's UGA receive water service from adjacent water purveyors. Approximately 35% of the population within the City limits and City's UGA receives water from the City, and the remainder within the City limits and City's UGA receive water from other water purveyors or from private wells.

The City of Gig Harbor Water System was originally built in the late 1940's. Today, the City's RWSA encompasses approximately 4.4 square miles with 1,927 service connections serving approximately 4,700 people. The City operates six groundwater wells that supply water to its water service customers, and has more than 37 miles of pipeline and six reservoirs located around the City. Summaries of the City's well source supply and storage facilities are provided in Table 12.1 and Table 12.2, respectively, below. The City also provides wholesale water service to multiple customers outside the City's RWSA, and has an emergency intertie with one purveyor.

Table 12.1 - Summary of Well Source Supply

Well No.	Location (Sec-Twnshp-Rge)	Date Drilled	Capacity (GPM)	Depth (Ft.)	Status
1	8-21N-2E	1949	120	246 ~~320~~	Inactive
2	32-22N-2E	1962	280	116	Active
3	17-21N-2E	1978	750	745	Active
4	8-21N-2E	1988	200	399	Active
5	7-21N-2E	1990	543	705	Active
6	7-21N-2E	1991	975	566	Active
7	31-22N-2E	N/A	40	393	Inactive
8	17-21N-2E	1965	20	231	Active

Source: City of Gig Harbor Water Facilities Inventory (WFI) Report, 2008; DOE Water Right Certificates

Table 12.2 - Summary of Storage Facilities

Storage Facility	Associated with Well No.	Total Capacity (gallons)	Base Elevation (ft)	Overflow Elevation (ft)
East Tank	2	250,000	304	320
Harbor Heights Tank 1	4	250,000	290	320
Harbor Heights Tank 2	4	250,000	290	320
Shurgard Tank	3	590,000	339	450
Skansie Tank	5 & 6	1,000,000	338	450
Gig Harbor North Tank	None	2,300,000	301	450
Total		4,640,000		

Source: City of Gig Harbor 2009_Water System Plan

As with most municipalities, the City's water distribution system has developed continuously as demands and the customer base have grown. This evolution has created a distribution system comprised of pipes of various materials, sizes, and ages. Some areas of the City have pipe materials, sizes, and age that do not meet current construction standards or underperform. A detailed description of the existing water supply system may be found in the City of Gig Harbor Water System Plan.

Level of Service

The City introduced a code requirement in January 2001 through Ordinance #862 for most new development and redevelopment projects to request a portion of capacity of the City's water system through the water capacity reservation certificate (CRC) process. Each CRC reserves a specific number of gallons per day based on the current value of an equivalent residential unit (ERU) Since the City has limited capacity to withdraw water, the City identifies by way of the water CRC process those projects that the City's water system has capacity to provide water.

The City's Water System Plan identifies the City's current annual water rights at 10,110 ERUs and a projected water demand in 2018 at 7,012 ERUs. Based on annual water rights the City has capacity to serve water beyond the next six years.

Analysis of the existing storage facilities in the City of Gig Harbor Water System Plan indicates that the City can meet all of its storage needs through the 20-year planning horizon with existing facilities by nesting standby storage and fireflow storage. Consequently the City is not currently planning for additional storage facilities in the 20-year planning horizon.

Forecast of Future Needs

The City has used a demographics forecasting allocation model (DFAM) to forecast future population growth on undeveloped and underdeveloped parcels within the City's RWSA. The primary input to the DFAM was a result of the City's Buildable Lands Analysis. The resulting population growth was then correlated to the generation of water demands to provide an estimate of the water demands throughout the City's UGA. These forecasted water demands are described further in the City's Water System Plan.

The City has used results of the DFAM and water system modeling to analyze future demands and the resulting impacts to the City's water supply, distribution system, and storage.

The City's planned water supply meets the short-term projected demands. However, it is the City's goal to meet the maximum day water demand with the largest source out of service. This increases the City's reliability and redundancy of their water supply system. Currently the City's water system cannot meet this goal. Therefore additional sources, including up to two new deep aquifer wells and one shallow aquifer well, are planned to meet this goal. The deep aquifer wells may produce up to 1,000 acre-ft per year and 1,000 gallons per minute each and are denoted as Well No. 9 (adjacent to the Gig Harbor North reservoir), Well 11 (location undetermined) or Well 12 (location undetermined).

The City's water distribution system is generally strong. The strong water system is, in part, due to the replacement of undersized pipes and the replacement of older asbestos cement (AC) water mains. As a result the programming is continued for systematic replacement of undersized pipes to meet minimum fire flows and replacing older AC water mains with either ductile iron pipe or polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe.

Specific facility improvements required to accommodate the upcoming six-year planning period are listed in Table 12.5.

PARKS, RECREATION & OPEN SPACE FACILITIES

Existing Facilities

The City of Gig Harbor owns 18 parks ranging in size from 0.10 of an acre to 17.74 acres. Included in that total are four designated trails that range from 0.2 of a mile to 4 miles in length. Park profiles on each city park facility are included in the 2010 Park Recreation and Open Space Plan as Appendix A to that plan.

The Gig Harbor park classification system includes: neighborhood parks, waterfront parks, natural parks and trails. Open spaces are designated as open space properties, undeveloped park lands, or other properties. Table 12.3 documents the City's existing park facilities.

Neighborhood Parks are developed for both passive and active recreation, and are accessible by walking, biking, or driving. They have support facilities such as restrooms and parking. These parks may typically include athletic fields, sports courts, trails, playgrounds, open space and picnicking facilities. Gig Harbor has three neighborhood parks totaling 21.91 acres. City Park at Crescent Creek, Kenneth Leo Marvin Veterans Memorial Park, and the Civic Center are all designated as Neighborhood Parks.

Waterfront Parks are located on the shoreline and generally provide a mix of water related uses and forms of access to the shoreline. These parks typically include historic structures or uses that are planned for preservation in keeping with the City's maritime heritage. The City actively works to balance uses within these parks to provide a mix of recreation opportunities, historic preservation, and community gathering spaces. Gig Harbor has six waterfront parks totaling 7.69 acres. Austin Estuary, Bogue Viewing Platform, Eddon Boat Park, Old Ferry Landing (Harborview Drive Street End), Jerisich Dock, and Skansie Brothers Park are all designated as Waterfront Parks.

Natural Parks preserve critical areas, urban forests and historic sites for future generations and include low impact recreational uses. Such sites are often developed with ancillary uses that are compatible with or support the primary preservation of the sites key features, such as the garden program located at Wilkinson Farm Park or the hatchery program located at Donkey Creek Park. Gig Harbor has four natural parks totaling 39.46 acres. Adam Tallman Park, Donkey Creek Park, Grandview Forest Park, and Wilkinson Farm Park are all designated as Natural Parks.

Trails include both linear trails (measured in miles) and trail support facilities (measured in acres). Trails are generally off-street transportation and recreation options either paved or unpaved that connect two points and are often located in a utility or undeveloped road right of way. While many of the City's parks provide access trails that loop through a park site, trails are linear in nature. The City has also designated one on-street trail, Harborview Trail, due to the importance of this corridor for recreational use and as a connector between waterfront parks. Gig Harbor has four designated trails totaling 6.25 miles. Additionally these trails are served by three support facilities totaling 1.37 acres. The Cushman Trail, Finholm View Climb, Harborview Trail, and Stanich Trail are all designated trails within the City.

Undeveloped Park Lands are properties acquired or owned by the City for park purposes, which have not yet been developed. These properties are anticipated to be developed into parks in the future and will be move to the appropriate classification as they are developed. The City presently owns six undeveloped park lands totaling 8.03 acres.

Open Space Properties are natural lands set aside for preservation of significant natural resources, open space or buffering. These lands are typically characterized by critical areas such as wetlands, slopes and shorelines; significant natural vegetation, shorelines, or other environmentally sensitive areas. This classification is used for preserved lands which are not currently planned for development into parks due to physical constraints or other limitations. The City of Gig Harbor has four designated open space properties totaling 25.79 acres.

Other Properties include lands which do not presently provide park, recreation or open space amenities but are in City ownership and possibly could be redeveloped for such uses in the future. These sites are not presently planned for redevelopment. Two other properties are listed in the City's PROS inventory totaling 0.41 acres.

It should be noted that this inventory includes only City of Gig Harbor parks and open spaces; the Gig Harbor Peninsula is served by a variety of park and recreation service providers, and a detailed inventory of all public facilities on the Peninsula is not included in this plan. Information taken from the County's geographic information system indicates more than 900 acres of park, recreation and open space lands exist in public ownership on the Gig Harbor Peninsula. The City's system represents a little over 10% of the public lands set aside on the Peninsula for park, recreation and open space uses.

Table 12.3. Existing Park Facilities

	Name of Facility	Location	Size	Park Classification
Parks	**City Park at Crescent Creek**	3303 Vernhardson Street 9702 Crescent Valley Drive NW	9.79	Neighborhood
	Kenneth Leo Marvin Veterans Memorial Park	3580 50th Street	5.57	Neighborhood
	Civic Center (includes Greens and Skate Park)	3510 Grandview Street	6.55	Neighborhood
		Total Neighborhood Parks		**21.91**
	Austin Estuary*	4009 Harborview Drive	1.38	Waterfront
	Bogue Viewing Platform	8803 North Harborview Drive	0.10	Waterfront
	Eddon Boat Park	3805 Harborview Drive	2.89	Waterfront
	Jerisich Dock	3211 Harborview Drive	0.56	Waterfront
	Old Ferry Landing (Harborview Street End)	2700 Harborview Drive	0.17	Waterfront
	Skansie Brothers Park	3207 Harborview Drive	2.59	Waterfront
		Total Waterfront Parks		**7.69**
	Adam Tallman Park	6626 Wagner Way	11.84	Natural
	Donkey Creek Park	8714 North Harborview Drive	1.30	Natural
	Grandview Forest Park	3488 Grandview Street	8.58	Natural
	Wilkinson Farm Park	4118 Rosedale Street NW	17.74	Natural

		Total Natural Parks		**39.46**
	Cushman Trail		4 miles	Trail
	Trailhead at Grandview	3908 Grandview	0.45 acres	Trail
	Trailhead at Hollycroft	2626 Hollycroft Street	0.60 acres	Trail
	Finholm View Climb	8826 North Harborview Drive (bottom) 8917 Franklin Avenue (top)	0.05 miles 0.32 acres	Trail
	Harborview Trail	Harborview and North Harborview Streets	2 miles	Trail
	Stanich Trail	Undeveloped portion of Erickson Street	0.2 miles	Trail
		Total Trails (by area)		**1.37**
		Total Trails (by length)		**6.25**
		Total Parks		**70.43**
Other Properties	**Cushman Trailhead at Borgen**	5280 Borgen (not yet constructed)	0.18	Undeveloped
	BB-16 Mitigation bonus site	WEST of Burnham interchange	0.45	Undeveloped
	Museum (Donkey Creek) Easement	Harbor History Museum shoreline area	0.43	Undeveloped
	Rushmore Park (outside City Limits)	In Plat of Rushmore	1.07	Undeveloped
	Wheeler Street End	Wheeler (undeveloped)	0.08	Undeveloped
	WWTP Park/Open Space	4212 Harborview Drive	5.82	Undeveloped
		Total Undeveloped Park Lands		**8.03**
	Austin Estuary Tidelands	4009 Harborview Drive	7.07	Open Space
	BB-16 Wetland Mitigation Site	SE corner of Burnham and Borgen	10.49	Open Space
	Harbor Hill Open Space	Gig Harbor North Area	8.09	Open Space
	Old Ferry Landing (adjacent bluff)	Adjacent to Old Ferry Landing	0.14	Open Space
		Total Open Space		**25.79**
	Bogue Visitors Center	3125 Judson Street	0.15	Other
	Soundview Street End	End of Soundview	0.26	Other
		Total Other Uses		**0.41**
		Total Other Properties		**34.22**

* Austin Estuary tidelands are included under open space

TOTAL PARK RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE LANDS 104.65

Level of Service

The City established levels of service for the park system in Ordinance # 1191, 2010 Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan (2010 Park Plan) to maintain and improve upon existing levels of service (ELOS). Planned levels of service (PLOS) were established for each category of park, and for the system as a whole to assure a variety of recreation opportunities will be available as the City grows. The level of service standards adopted by the City for the park system are expressed as the number of acres (or miles) per 1000 residents for a particular classification of park. Table 12.4 documents existing levels of service (ELOS) and proposed levels of service (PLOS).

Forecast of Future Needs

The Park Plan utilized levels of service based on the total City population and considered both current and projected levels of service based on anticipated population growth. The population projection, used in this section, reflects the City's most recent population allocation of 10,500 residents in the year 2030. This population projection reflects the slowdown in growth that has occurred since 2008 and reflects a change in regional population allocations designed to locate future housing near employment centers. The 2030 population allocation in combination with the PLOS allows the City to calculate the amount of park land needed to achieve the planned service level (Table 12.4).

Table 12.4 Existing and Proposed Level of Service Standards

Park Type	Existing Acres	2010 Existing Level of Service	2030 Planned Level of Service	2030 Additional Area Needed
Neighborhood Parks	21.91	2.91	5.00	30.59
Waterfront Parks	7.69	1.02	1.00	2.81
Natural Parks	39.46	5.25	5.25	15.63
Total Parks	70.43	9.36	12.00	55.57
Trails (in miles)	6.25	0.83	1.17	6.04

Future needs for park, recreation and open spaces are also tied to achieving the expressed desires of this community. In the 2010 Park Plan update process several, key themes emerged which guided the creation of the acquisition and development plan. Key themes included trail development, expanding partnerships to leverage City funds, pursuing the acquisition of additional land in developing areas, and improving public access to natural features.

To meet the future demand the City plans for park improvements include both land acquisitions and development projects within existing parks or undeveloped lands. Specific facility improvements required to accommodate the upcoming six-year planning period are listed in Table 12.5.

STORMWATER SYSTEM

Existing Facilities

The Puget Sound and in particular Gig Harbor, Henderson Bay, and Wollochet Bay are the receiving water bodies of the City of Gig Harbor's storm system. The storm system consists of catch basins, pipe, drainage ditches, natural streams such as Donkey Creek and McCormick Creek, wetlands, ponds, and stormwater detention and water quality facilities. The Operations and Maintenance Department is responsible for approximately 30 stormwater ponds, 1,650 catch basins, 12 miles of drainage ditches and over 33 miles of storm pipe. Annually these numbers will increase as development continues to occur, CIP projects are constructed and new areas are annexed by the City. With the approximately 45 miles of pipe and drainage ditches discharging to the receiving waters of the Puget Sound, which is habitat to various fish and wildlife such as Chinook, coho, steelhead, bald eagles and herons. It is important to protect and improve the water quality of the various water bodies in the City.

The objective of the City's stormwater operation and maintenance program is to assure that all the elements of the stormwater system are functioning properly to avoid any impacts to the environment and properties. The program includes operation and maintenance of storm systems being performed by many entities, including the City's Public Works Department, homeowners association, and property management companies. Scheduled maintenance tasks and inspections are regularly performed and are essential to the program. Major system problems are avoided when defects are identified and addressed in a timely manner.

Through the Clean Water Act and other legislation at the federal level, the Washington State Department of Ecology has been delegated the authority to implement rules and regulations that meet the goals of the Clean Water Act. As part of these rules and regulations, the Department of Ecology issued the Western Washington Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit (Permit) to the City of Gig Harbor in January 2007. The Permit authorizes the discharge of stormwater to surface waters and to ground waters of the State from Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) owned or operated by the City of Gig Harbor. By being identified as a Permittee the City is required to satisfy many obligations during the five-year permit period.

The City has been proactive in satisfying the requirements of this Permit. In 2006, the City prepared a gap analysis comparing the existing City stormwater program to the Permit requirements. According to the gap analysis, public participation, City staff training and stormwater policies appear to be the areas that the City will need to focus their efforts. Other obligations required by the Permit include the development of a stormwater management program and development of an enforceable mechanism, such as an ordinance, controlling runoff from development and construction sites, including adoption of a new stormwater technical manual. The City's stormwater management program along with the City's stormwater-related ordinances establishes a level of service for both public and private development projects.

The Permit requirements are being phased in over the course of the life of the permit. At the end of the permit, or sooner if required by law, the City will likely be issued a new permit with new permit requirements that are additive to the existing permit requirements.

Level of Service

In connection with the preparation of the City's Stormwater Comprehensive Plan, storm system modeling was performed at a planning level to identify system needs under future full build-out land use conditions. The City selected seven storm trunklines to be analyzed. These trunklines were selected based on known past conveyance and/or sedimentation problems and possible future system impacts due to development.

In general, the City's stormwater infrastructure is sufficient to convey stormwater runoff. And the stormwater management and development guidelines for future developments require runoff rates at developed conditions to meet runoff rates of undeveloped conditions. Therefore little to no net increase in stormwater runoff rates should occur as development continues and the level of service provided by the stormwater utility will remain adequate.

However, a list of recommended storm system capital improvement projects is identified in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) of the Stormwater Comprehensive Plan. In March 2008 the City initiated a Stormwater General Facility Charge for funding these stormwater CIP projects.

The types of improvements identified and the implementation scheduled provided in the Stormwater Comprehensive Plan primarily include NPDES Phase 2 permitting requirements, maintenance projects, and habitat projects. Storm system and habitat improvement projects identified in the CIP are based on the Staff's knowledge of the service area, past studies and the hydrologic/hydraulic system analysis.

Forecast of Future Needs

Specific facility improvements required to accommodate the upcoming six-year planning period are listed in Table 12.5.

CAPITAL FACILITIES PROGRAM

A Capital Facilities Program (CFP) is a six-year plan for capital improvements that are supportive of the City's population and economic base as well as near-term (within six years) growth. Capital facilities are funded through several funding sources which can consist of a combination of local, state and federal tax revenues.

The Capital Facilities Program works in concert generally with the land-use element. In essence, the land use plan establishes the "community vision" while the capital facilities plan provides for the essential resources to attain that vision. An important linkage exists between the capital facilities plan, land-use and transportation elements of the plan. A variation (change) in one element (i.e. a change in land use or housing density) would significantly affect the other plan elements, particularly the capital facilities plan. It is this dynamic linkage that requires all elements of the plan to be internally consistent. Internal consistency of the plan's elements imparts a degree of control (checks and balances) for the successful implementation of the

Comprehensive Plan. This is the concurrence mechanism that makes the plan work as intended.

The first year of the Capital Facilities Program will be converted to the annual capital budget, while the remaining five year program will provide long-term planning. It is important to note that only the expenditures and appropriations in the annual budget are binding financial commitments. Projections for the remaining five years are not binding and the capital projects recommended for future development may be altered or not developed due to cost or changed conditions and circumstances.

Definition of Capital Improvement

The Capital Facilities Element is concerned with needed improvements which are of relatively large scale, are generally non-recurring high cost and which may require financing over several years. The list of improvements is limited to major components in order to analyze development trends and impacts at a level of detail which is both manageable and reasonably accurate.

Smaller scale improvements of less than $25,000 are addressed in the annual budget as they occur over time. For the purposes of capital facility planning, capital improvements are major projects, activities or maintenance, costing over $25,000 and requiring the expenditure of public funds over and above annual operating expenses. They have a useful life of over ten years and result in an addition to the city's fixed assets and/or extend the life of the existing infrastructure. Capital improvements do not include items such as equipment or "rolling stock" or projects, activities or maintenance which cost less than $25,000 or which regularly are not part of capital improvements.

Capital improvements may include the design, engineering, permitting and the environmental analysis of a capital project. Land acquisition, construction, major maintenance, site improvements, energy conservation projects, landscaping, initial furnishings and equipment may also be included.

Capital Facilities Needs Projections

The City Departments of Public Works, Planning, Building and Fire Safety, Finance and Administration have identified various capital improvements and projects based upon recent surveys and planning programs authorized by the Gig Harbor City Council. Suggested revenue sources were also considered and compiled.

Currently, six functional plans have been completed:

- City of Gig Harbor Water System Plan (April 2009), as may later be amended by resolution.
- City of Gig Harbor Wastewater Comprehensive Plan (November 2009), as may later be amended by resolution.
- City of Gig Harbor Wastewater Treatment Plan Improvements Engineering Report (April 2003)

- City of Gig Harbor Phase 1 Wastewater Treatment Plan Improvements Technical Memorandum (August 2007)
- City of Gig Harbor Stormwater Comprehensive Plan (October 2009), as may later be amended by resolution.
- The City of Gig Harbor 2010 Park, Recreation, & Open Space Plan (adopted June 2010)

All the plans identify current system configurations and capacities and proposed financing for improvements, and provide the technical information needed to develop the capital facility project lists for this Comprehensive Plan.

Prioritization of Projected Needs

The identified capital improvement needs listed were developed by the City Community Development Director, Finance Director, and the City Administrator. The following criteria were applied informally in developing the final listing of proposed projects:

Economics
- Potential for Financing
- Impact on Future Operating Budgets
- Benefit to Economy and Tax Base

Service Consideration
- Safety, Health and Welfare
- Environmental Impact
- Effect on Service Quality

Feasibility
- Legal Mandates
- Citizen Support
- 1992 Community Vision Survey

Consistency
- Goals and Objectives in Other Elements
- Linkage to Other Planned Projects
- Plans of Other Jurisdictions

Cost Estimates for Projected Needs

The majority of the cost estimates in this element are presented in ~~2009~~ 2010 dollars and were derived from various federal and state documents, published cost estimates, records of past expenditures and information from various private contractors.

FUTURE NEEDS AND ALTERNATIVES

The Capital Facility Plan for the City of Gig Harbor is developed based upon the following analysis:

- Current Revenue Sources
- Financial Resources
- Capital Facilities Policies
- Method for Addressing Shortfalls

Current Revenue Sources

The major sources of revenue for the City's major funds are as follows:

Fund	Source	Projected (2011)
General Fund	Sales tax	$4,554,000
	Utility tax	$1,309,000
	Property tax	$1,798,000
Street Fund- Operations	Property tax	$0
Water Operating Fund	Customer charges	$1,192,000
Sewer Operating Fund	Customer charges	$3,201,000
Storm Drainage Fund	Customer charges	$717,000

Financial Resources

In order to ensure that the city is using the most effective means of collecting revenue, the city inventoried the various sources of funding currently available. Financial regulations and available mechanisms are subject to change. Additionally, changing market conditions influence the city's choice of financial mechanism. The following list of sources include all major financial resources available and is not limited to those sources which are currently in use or which would be used in the six-year schedule of improvements. The list includes the following categories:

- Debt Financing
- Local Levies
- Local Non-Levy Financing
- State Grants and Loans
- Federal Grants and Loans

Debt Financing Method

Short-Term Borrowing: Utilization of short-term financing through local banks is a means to finance the high-cost of capital improvements.

Revenue Bonds: Bonds can be financed directly by those benefiting from the capital

improvement. Revenue obtained from these bonds is used to finance publicly-owned facilities, such as new or expanded water systems or improvement to the waste water treatment facility. The debt is retired using charges collected from the users of these facilities. In this respect, the capital project is self supporting. Interest rates tend to be higher than for general obligation bonds and the issuance of the bonds may be approved by voter referendum.

General Obligation Bonds: These are bonds which are backed by the full faith and credit of the city. Voter-approved bonds increase property tax rate and dedicate the increased revenue to repay bondholders. Councilmanic bonds do not increase taxes and are repaid with general revenues. Revenue may be used for new capital facilities or maintenance and operations at an existing facility. These bonds should be used for projects that benefit the City as a whole.

Local Multi-Purpose Levies

Ad Valorem Property Taxes: The tax rate is in mills (1/10 cent per dollar of taxable value). The maximum rate is $1.60 per $1,000 assessed valuation. In 2010, the City's tax rate is $0.9274 per $1,000 assessed valuation. The City is prohibited from raising its levy more than one percent. A temporary or permanent excess levy may be assessed with voter approval. Revenue may be used for new capital facilities or maintenance and operation of existing facilities.

Business and Occupation (B and O) Tax: This is a tax of no more that 0.2% of the gross value of business activity on the gross or net income of a business. Assessment increases require voter approval. The City does not currently use a B and O tax. Revenue may be used for new capital facilities or maintenance and operation of existing facilities.

Local Option Sales Tax: The city has levied the maximum of tax of 1%. Revenue may be used for new capital facilities or maintenance and operation of existing facilities.

Utility Tax: This is a tax on the gross receipts of electric, gas, telephone, cable TV, water/sewer, and stormwater utilities. Local discretion up to 6% of gross receipts with voter approval required for an increase above this maximum. Revenue may be used for new capital facilities or maintenance and operation of existing facilities. The city currently levies a 5% utility tax.

Real Estate Excise Tax: The real estate excise tax is levied on all sales of real estate, measured by the full selling price. In addition to the state rate of 1.28 percent, a locally-imposed tax is also authorized. The city may levy a quarter percent tax and additional quarter percent tax. These funds may only be used to finance eligible capital facilities.

Local Single-Purpose Levies

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax – "Gas Tax": The state currently levies a tax of 37.5 cents per gallon on motor vehicle fuel under RCW 82.36.025(1) through (6) and on special fuel (diesel) under RCW 82.38.030(1) through (6). Cities receive 10.6961 percent of the 23 cents per gallon tax levied under RCW 82.36.025(1). These funds are distributed monthly on a per capita basis and are to be placed in a city street fund to be spent for street construction, maintenance or repair.

Local Option Motor Vehicle Fuel Excise Tax: Upon a vote of the people, a local option gas tax can be levied countywide at a rate equal to 10 percent of the state rate. Since the state rate is 37.5 cents per gallon, 10 percent currently would be 3.75 cents per gallon. The tax may be implemented only on the first day of January, April, July, or October and expenditure of these funds is limited solely to transportation purposes.

Local Option Commercial Parking Tax: This tax may be levied by a city within its boundaries and by a county in the unincorporated areas. There is no limit on the tax rate and many ways of assessing the tax are allowed. If the city chooses to levy it on parking businesses, it can tax gross proceeds or charge a fixed fee per stall. If the tax is assessed on the driver of a car, the tax rate can be a flat fee or a percentage amount. Rates can vary by any reasonable factor, including location of the facility, time of entry and exit, duration of parking, and type or use of vehicle. The parking business operator is responsible for collecting the tax and remitting it to the city, which must administer it. This tax is subject to a voter referendum. At the present time, Bainbridge Island, Bremerton, Mukilteo, SeaTac, and Tukwila are the only cities that we know are levying this tax. Expenditure of these funds is limited solely to transportation purposes.

Transportation Benefit Districts: Cities, along with counties, may form transportation benefit districts to acquire, construct, improve, provide, and fund transportation improvements in the district that is consistent with any existing state, regional, and local transportation plans and necessitated by existing or reasonably foreseeable congestion levels. The area may include other cities and counties, as well as port and transit districts through interlocal agreements.

Any city passing on ordinance to form a transportation benefit district must also identify revenue options for financing improvements in the district. A district that has coterminous boundaries with a city may levy a $20 per vehicle license fee or impose transportation impact fees on commercial or industrial buildings, both without voter approval. A credit must be provided for any transportation impact fee on commercial or industrial buildings that the city has already imposed. Similarly, any district that imposes a fee that, in combination with another district's fee, totals more than $20, must provide a credit for the previously levied fee.

Voter-approved revenue options include a license fee of up to $100 per vehicle and a 0.2 percent sales tax. Like many other special districts, transportation benefit districts may levy a one-year O&M levy under RCW 84.52.052 and do an excess levy for capital purposes under RCW 85.52.056. The funds must be spent on transportation improvements as set forth in the district's plan.

Local Non-Levy Financing Mechanisms

Reserve Funds: Revenue that is accumulated in advance and earmarked for capital improvements. Sources of the funds can be surplus revenues, funds in depreciation revenues, or funds resulting from the sale of capital assets.

Fines, Forfeitures and Charges for Services: This includes various administrative fees and user charges for services and facilities operated by the jurisdiction. Examples are franchise fees, sales

of public documents, property appraisal fees, fines, forfeitures, licenses, permits, income received as interest from various funds, sale of public property, rental income and private contributions to the jurisdiction. Revenue from these sources may be restricted in use.

User and Program Fees: These are fees or charges for using park and recreational facilities, sewer services, water services and surface drainage facilities. Fees may be based on a measure of usage on a flat rate or on design features. Revenues may be used for new capital facilities or maintenance and operation of existing facilities.

Street Utility Charges: A fee of up to 50% of actual costs of street construction, maintenance and operations may be charged to households. Owners or occupants of residential property are charged a fee per household that cannot exceed $2.00 per month. The fee charged to businesses is based on the number of employees and cannot exceed $2.00 per employee per month. Both businesses and households must be charged. Revenue may be used for activities such as street lighting, traffic control devices, sidewalks, curbs, gutters, parking facilities and drainage facilities.

Special Assessment District: Special assessment districts are created to service entities completely or partially outside of the jurisdiction. Special assessments are levied against those who directly benefit from the new service or facility. The districts include Local Improvement Districts, Road Improvement Districts, Utility Improvement Districts and the collection of development fees. Funds must be used solely to finance the purpose for which the special assessment district was created.

Impact Fees: Impact fees are paid by new development based upon the development's impact to the delivery of services. Impact fees must be used for capital facilities needed by growth and not to correct current deficiencies in levels of service nor for operating expenses. These fees must be equitably allocated to the specific entities which will directly benefit from the capital improvement and the assessment levied must fairly reflect the true costs of these improvements. Impact fees may be imposed for public streets, parks, open space, recreational facilities, and school facilities.

State Grants and Loans

Public Works Trust Fund: Low interest loans to finance capital facility construction, public works emergency planning, and capital improvement planning. To apply for the loans the city must have a capital facilities plan in place and must be levying the original 1/4% real estate excise tax. Funds are distributed by the Department of Community Development. Loans for construction projects require matching funds generated only from local revenues or state shared entitlement revenues. Revenue may be used to finance new capital facilities, or maintenance and operations at existing facilities.

State Parks and Recreation Commission Grants: Grants for parks capital facilities acquisition and construction. They are distributed by the Parks and Recreation Commission to applicants

with a 50% match requirement.

Urban Transportation Improvement Programs: The State Transportation Improvement Board offers three grant programs to cities exceeding a population of 5,000. Urban Arterial Program for roadway projects which improve safety and mobility; Urban Corridor Program, for roadway projects that expand capacity; and, Sidewalk Program for sidewalk projects that improve safety and connectivity.

Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA-LU): SAFETEA-LU represents the largest surface transportation investment in our Nation's history with guaranteed funding for highways, highway safety, and public transportation totaling $244.1 billion. SAFETEA-LU supplies funds for investments needed to maintain and grow vital transportation infrastructure.

Centennial Clean Water Fund: Grants and loans for the design, acquisition, construction, and improvement of Water Pollution Control Facilities, and related activities to meet state and federal water pollution control requirements. Grants and loans distributed by the Department of Ecology with a 75%-25% matching share. Use of funds is limited to planning, design, and construction of Water Pollution Control Facilities, stormwater management, ground water protection, and related projects.

Water Pollution Control State Revolving Fund: Low interest loans and loan guarantees for water pollution control projects. Loans are distributed by the Department of Ecology. The applicant must show water quality need, have a facility plan for treatment works, and show a dedicated source of funding for repayment.

Federal Grants and Loans

Department of Health Water Systems Support: Grants for upgrading existing water systems, ensuring effective management, and achieving maximum conservation of safe drinking water. Grants are distributed by the state Department of Health through intergovernmental review and with a 60% local match requirement.

Capital Facility Strategies

In order to realistically project available revenues and expected expenditures on capital facilities, the city must consider all current policies that influence decisions about the funding mechanisms as well as policies affecting the city's obligation for public facilities. The most relevant of these are described below. These policies, along with the goals and policies articulated in the other elements were the basis for the development of various funding scenarios.

Mechanisms to Provide Capital Facilities

Increase Local Government Appropriations: The city will investigate the impact of increasing current taxing rates, and will actively seek new revenue sources. In addition, on an annual basis,

the city will review the implications of the current tax system as a whole.

Use of Uncommitted Resources: The city has developed and adopted its Six-Year capital improvement schedules. With the exception of sewer facilities, however, projects have been identified on the 20-year project lists with uncommitted or unsecured resources.

Analysis of Debt Capacity: Generally, Washington state law permits a city to ensure a general obligation bonded debt equal to 3/4 of 1% of its property valuation without voter approval. By a 60% majority vote of its citizens, a city may assume an additional general obligation bonded debt of 1.7570%, bringing the total for general purposes up to 2.5% of the value of taxable property. The value of taxable property is defined by law as being equal to 100% of the value of assessed valuation. For the purpose of applying municipally-owned electric, water, or sewer service and with voter approval, a city may incur another general obligation bonded debt equal to 2.5% of the value of taxable property. With voter approval, cities may also incur an additional general obligation bonded debt equal to 2.5% of the value of taxable property for parks and open space. Thus, under state law, the maximum general obligation bonded debt which the city may incur cannot exceed 7.5% of the assessed property valuation.

Municipal revenue bonds are not subject to a limitation on the maximum amount of debt which can be incurred. These bonds have no effect on the city's tax revenues because they are repaid from revenues derived from the sale of service.

The City of Gig Harbor has used general obligation bonds and municipal revenue bonds very infrequently. Therefore, under state debt limitation, it has ample debt capacity to issue bonds for new capital improvement projects.

User Charges and Connection Fees: User charges are designed to recoup the costs of public facilities or services by charging those who benefit from such services. As a tool for affecting the pace and pattern of development, user fees may be designed to vary for the quantity and location of the service provided. Thus, charges could be greater for providing services further distances from urban areas.

Mandatory Dedications or Fees in Lieu of: The jurisdiction may require, as a condition of plat approval, that subdivision developers dedicate a certain portion of the land in the development to be used for public purposes, such as roads, parks, or schools. Dedication may be made to the local government or to a private group. When a subdivision is too small or because of topographical conditions a land dedication cannot reasonably be required, the jurisdiction may require the developer to pay an equivalent fee in lieu of dedication.

The provision of public services through subdivision dedications not only makes it more feasible to service the subdivision, but may make it more feasible to provide public facilities and services to adjacent areas. This tool may be used to direct growth into certain areas.

Negotiated Agreement: An agreement whereby a developer studies the impact of development and proposes mitigation for the city's approval. These agreements rely on the expertise of the

developer to assess the impacts and costs of development. Such agreements are enforceable by the jurisdiction. The negotiated agreement will require lower administrative and enforcement costs than impact fees.

Impact Fees: Impact fees may be used to affect the location and timing of infill development. Infill development usually occurs in areas with excess capacity of capital facilities. If the local government chooses not to recoup the costs of capital facilities in underutilized service areas then infill development may be encouraged by the absence of impact fees on development(s) proposed within such service areas. Impact fees may be particularly useful for a small community which is facing rapid growth and whose new residents desire a higher level of service than the community has traditionally fostered and expected.

Obligation to Provide Capital Facilities

Coordination with Other Public Service Providers: Local goals and policies as described in the other comprehensive plan elements are used to guide the location and timing of development. However, many local decisions are influenced by state agencies and utilities that provide public facilities within the Urban Growth Area and the City of Gig Harbor. The planned capacity of public facilities operated by other jurisdictions must be considered when making development decisions. Coordination with other entities is essential not only for the location and timing of public services, but also in the financing of such services.

The city's plan for working with the natural gas, electric, and telecommunication providers is detailed in the Utilities Element. This plan includes policies for sharing information and a procedure for negotiating agreement for provision of new services in a timely manner.

Other public service providers such as school districts and private water providers are not addressed in the Utilities Element. However, the city's policy is to exchange information with these entities and to provide them with the assistance they need to ensure that public services are available and that the quality of the service is maintained.

Level of Service Standards: Level of service standards are an indicator of the extent or quality of service provided by a facility that are related to the operational characteristics of the facility. They are a summary of existing or desired public service conditions. The process of establishing level of service standards requires the city to make quality of service decisions explicit. The types of public services for which the city has adopted level of service standards will be improved to accommodate the impacts of development and maintain existing service in a timely manner with new development.

Level of service standards will influence the timing and location of development, by clarifying which locations have excess capacity that may easily support new development, and by delaying new development until it is feasible to provide the needed public facilities. In addition, to avoid over-extending public facilities, the provision of public services may be phased over time to ensure that new development and projected public revenues keep pace with public planning. The

city has adopted level of service standards for six public services. These standards are to be identified in Section V of this element.

Urban Growth Area Boundaries: The Urban Growth Area Boundary was selected in order to ensure that urban services will be available to all development. The location of the boundary was based on the following: environmental constraints, the concentrations of existing development, the existing infrastructure and services, and the location of prime agricultural lands. New and existing development requiring urban services will be located in the Urban Growth Area. Central sewer and water, drainage facilities, utilities, telecommunication lines, and local roads will be extended to development in these areas. The city is committed to serving development within this boundary at adopted level of service standards. Therefore, prior to approval of new development within the Urban Growth Area the city should review the six-year Capital Facilities Program and the plan in this element to ensure the financial resources exist to provide the services to support such new development.

Methods for Addressing Shortfalls

The city has identified options available for addressing shortfalls and how these options will be exercised. The city evaluates capital facility projects on an individual basis rather than a system-wide basis. This method involves lower administrative costs and can be employed in a timely manner. However, this method will not maximize the capital available for the system as a whole. In deciding how to address a particular shortfall the city will balance the equity and efficiency considerations associated with each of these options. When evaluation of a project identifies shortfall, the following options would be available:

- Increase revenue
- Decrease level of service
- Decrease the cost of a facility
- Decrease the demand for the public service or facility
- Reassess the land use assumptions in the Comprehensive Plan

SIX-YEAR CAPITAL FACILITY PLAN

In addition to the direct costs for capital improvements, this section analyzes cost for additional personnel and routine operation and maintenance activities. Although the capital facilities program does not include operating and maintenance costs, and such an analysis is not required under the Growth Management Act, it is an important part of the long-term financial planning. The six-year capital facilities program for the City of Gig Harbor was based upon the following analysis:

- Financial Assumptions
- Projected Revenues
- Projected Expenditures
- Future Needs

Financial Assumptions

The following assumptions about the future operating conditions in the city operations and market conditions were used in the development of the six-year capital facilities program:

1. The city will maintain its current fund accounting system to handle its financial affairs.

2. The cost of running local government will continue to increase due to inflation and other growth factors while revenues will also increase.

3. New revenue sources, including new taxes, may be necessary to maintain and improve city services and facilities.

4. Capital investment will be needed to maintain, repair and rehabilitate portions of the city's aging infrastructure and to accommodate growth anticipated over the next twenty years.

5. Public investment in capital facilities is the primary tool of local government to support and encourage economic growth.

6. A consistent and reliable revenue source to fund necessary capital expenditures is desirable.
7. A comprehensive approach to review, consider, and evaluate capital funding requests is needed to aid decision makers and the citizenry in understanding the capital needs of the city.

Capital improvements will be financed through the following funds:

- General Fund
- Capital Improvement Fund
- Transportation Improvement Fund
- Enterprise Funds

Projected Revenues

Tax Base

The City's tax base is projected to increase at a rate of 2% in 2010 and 1-2% in 2011 for the adjusted taxable value of the property, including new construction. The City's assessment ratio is projected to remain constant at 100%. Although this is important to the overall fiscal health of the city, capital improvements are funded primarily through non-tax resources.

Revenue by Fund

General Fund: The General Fund is the basic operating fund for the city. The General Fund is allocated 25 percent of the annual tax yield from ad valorem property values. Since 2000, the average annual increase in tax levy was 6%. This was mostly due to new construction and annexations as regular growth in property tax levy is limited to 1 percent a year. The city is projecting a 1 to 2 percent increase in tax base for 2010 and 2011 due to the current economy. The City has a maximum rate of $1.60 per $1,000 ad valorem. The actually rate collected by the city has fallen from $1.58 in 1999 to $0.9294 in 2010.

Capital Improvement Funds: In the City of Gig Harbor, the Capital Improvement Funds accounts for the proceeds of the first and second quarter percent of the locally-imposed real estate excise tax. Permitted uses are defined as "public works projects for planning, acquisition, construction, reconstruction, repair, replacement, rehabilitation or improvements of streets, roads, highways, sidewalks street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, bridges, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, and planning, acquisition, construction, reconstruction, repair, replacement, rehabilitation or improvements of parks. These revenues are committed to annual debt service and expenditures from this account are expected to remain constant, based upon the existing debt structure. The revenues in these funds represent continued capture of a dedicated portion of the ad valorem revenues necessary to meet annual debt service obligations on outstanding general obligation bonds. In 2018, the City is scheduled to repay the 2008 LTGO Bonds.

Street and Street Capital Funds: Expenditures from these funds include direct annual outlays for capital improvement projects. The revenues in this fund represent total receipts from state and local gas taxes and 75% of property taxes collected. The projected revenues are based upon state projections for gasoline consumption, current state gas tax revenue sharing and continued utilization of local option gas taxes at current levels. This fund also includes state and federal grant monies dedicated to transportation improvements.

Enterprise Funds: The revenue these funds are used for the annual capital and operating expenditures for services that are operated and financed similar to private business enterprises. The projected revenues depend upon the income from user charges, connection fees, bond issues, state or federal grants and carry-over reserves.

GOALS AND POLICIES

GOALS

GOAL12.1. PROVIDE NEEDED PUBLIC FACILITIES TO ALL OF THE CITY RESIDENTS IN A MANNER WHICH PROTECTS INVESTMENTS IN EXISTING FACILITIES, WHICH MAXIMIZES THE USE OF EXISTING

FACILITIES AND WHICH PROMOTE ORDERLY AND HIGH QUALITY URBAN GROWTH.

GOAL12.2. PROVIDE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT TO CORRECT EXISTING DEFICIENCIES, TO REPLACE WORN OUT OR OBSOLETE FACILITIES AND TO ACCOMMODATE FUTURE GROWTH, AS INDICATED IN THE SIX-YEAR SCHEDULE OF IMPROVEMENTS.

GOAL12.3. FUTURE DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BEAR ITS FAIR-SHARE OF FACILITY IMPROVEMENT COSTS NECESSITATED BY DEVELOPMENT IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE AND MAINTAIN THE CITY'S ADOPTED LEVEL OF STANDARDS AND MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES.

GOAL12.4. THE CITY SHOULD MANAGE ITS FISCAL RESOURCES TO SUPPORT THE PROVISION OF NEEDED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FOR ALL DEVELOPMENTS.

GOAL12.5. THE CITY SHOULD COORDINATE LAND USE DECISIONS AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES WITH A SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS TO MEET ADOPTED LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS, MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES AND PROVIDE EXISTING FUTURE FACILITY NEEDS.

GOAL12.6. THE CITY SHOULD PLAN FOR THE PROVISION OR EXTENSION OF CAPITAL FACILITIES IN SHORELINE MANAGEMENT AREAS, CONSISTENT WITH THE GOALS, POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE CITY OF GIG HARBOR SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM.

POLICIES

12.1.1. Capital improvement projects identified for implementation and costing more than $25,000 shall be included in the Six Year Schedule of Improvement of this element. Capital improvements costing less than $25,000 should be reviewed for inclusion in the six-year capital improvement program and the annual capital budget.

12.1.2. Proposed capital improvement projects shall be evaluated and prioritized using the following guidelines as to whether the proposed action would:

a. Be needed to correct existing deficiencies, replace needed facilities or to provide facilities required for future growth;

b. Contribute to lessening or eliminating a public hazard;

c. Contribute to minimizing or eliminating any existing condition of public facility

capacity deficits;

d. Be financially feasible;

e. Conform with future land uses and needs based upon projected growth;

f. Generate public facility demands that exceed capacity increase in the six-year schedule of improvements;

g. Have a detrimental impact on the local budget.

12.1.3. The City sewer and water connection fee revenues shall be allocated to capital improvements related to expansion of these facilities.

12.1.4. The City identifies its sanitary sewer service area to be the same as the urban growth area. Modifications to the urban growth boundary will constitute changes to the sewer service area.

12.1.5. Appropriate funding mechanisms for development's fair-share contribution toward other public facility improvements, such as transportation, parks/recreation, storm drainage, will be considered for implementation as these are developed by the City.

12.1.6. The City shall continue to adopt annual capital budget and six-year capital improvement program as part of its annual budgeting process.

12.1.7. Every reasonable effort shall be made to secure grants or private funds as available to finance the provision of capital improvements.

12.1.8. Fiscal policies to direct expenditures for capital improvements will be consistent with other Comprehensive Plan elements.

12.1.9. The City and/ or developers of property within the City shall provide for the availability of public services needed to support development concurrent with the impacts of such development subsequent to the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. These facilities shall meet the adopted level of service standards.

12.1.10. The City will support and encourage joint development and use of cultural and community facilities with other governmental or community organizations in areas of mutual concern and benefit.

12.1.11. The City will emphasize capital improvement projects which promote the conservation, preservation or revitalization of commercial and residential areas within the downtown business area and along the shoreline area of Gig Harbor, landward of Harborview Drive and North Harborview Drive.

12.1.12. If probable funding falls short of meeting the identified needs of this plan, the City

will review and update the plan, as needed. The City will reassess improvement needs, priorities, level of service standards, revenue sources and the Land Use Element.

LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

The following Level of Service Standards (LOS) shall be utilized by the City in evaluating the impacts of new development or redevelopment upon public facility provisions:

1. Parks:
   Park level of service standards are addressed in the Parks, Recreation & Open Space Facilities "Inventory and Analysis" section of this Chapter.
2. Transportation/Circulation:
   Transportation Level of Service standards are addressed in the Transportation Element.
3. Sanitary Sewer:
   Sanitary sewer level of service standards are addressed in the Wastewater System "Inventory and Analysis" section of this Chapter.
4. Potable Water:
   Potable water level of service standards are addressed in the Water System "Inventory and Analysis" section of this Chapter.

Six Year Capital Improvement Program

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

Implementation

The six-year schedule of improvements shall be the mechanism the City will use to base its timing, location, projected cost and revenue sources for the capital improvements identified for implementation in the other comprehensive plan elements.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation are essential to ensuring the effectiveness of the Capital Facilities Plan element. This element will be reviewed annually and amended to verify that fiscal resources are available to provide public facilities needed to support LOS standards and plan objectives. The annual review will include an examination of the following considerations in order to determine their continued appropriateness:

a. Any corrections, updates and modifications concerning costs, revenue sources, acceptance of facilities pursuant to dedication which are consistent with this element, or to the date of construction of any facility enumerated in this element;
b. The Capital Facilities Element's continued consistency with the other element of the plan and its support of the land use element;
c. The priority assignment of existing public facility deficiencies;
d. The City's progress in meeting needs determined to be existing deficiencies;
e. The criteria used to evaluate capital improvement projects in order to ensure that projects are being ranked in their appropriate order or level of priority;
f. The City's effectiveness in maintaining the adopted LOS standard and objectives achieved;
g. The City's effectiveness in reviewing the impacts of plans of other state agencies that provide public facilities within the City's jurisdiction;
h. The effectiveness of impact fees or fees assessed new development for improvement costs;
i. Efforts made to secure grants or private funds, as available, to finance new capital improvements;
j. The criteria used to evaluate proposed plan amendments and requests for new development or redevelopment;
k. Capital improvements needed for the latter part of the planning period for updating the six-year schedule of improvements;
j. Concurrency status.

Table 12.5 Capital Facilities Projects

Wastewater System Projects

Project No.	Project	Projected Year	Cost	Plan	Primary Funding Sources
		Wastewater Treatment System			
~~T1~~	~~Outfall Construction Marine Portion (Bogue View Park to Colvos Passage)~~	~~2010-2011~~	~~$8,791,000~~	~~6-year~~	~~PWTF/ SRF/ revenue bonds /Connection Fees/Utility Rates~~
T2	WWTP Expansion Phase II	2011-2012	$8,210,000	6-year	PWTF/ SRF/ revenue bonds /Connection Fees/ Utility Rates
T3	Reuse and Reclamation Studies ($100,000/yr)	2010-2014	$500,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
T4	Annual Replacement, Rehabilitation and Renewal	2010-2014	$610,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
T5	Annual Water Quality Reporting	2010-2014	$400,000	6-year	PWTF/ SRF/ revenue bonds /Connection Fees/Sewer Rates
	Wastewater Treatment Subtotal		~~**$18,511,000**~~ **9,760,000**		
		Wastewater Collection System			
C1	Lift Station 1 Improvements (Crescent Creek Park)	2013	$130,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C2	Lift Station 3A Jockey Pump Replacement (Harborview Dr./N. Harborview Dr.)	2014	$156,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C3	Lift Station 4 Improvements (Harborview Dr./Rosedale St.)	2011-20~~13~~15	$2,595,100	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C4	Lift Station 5 Improvements (Harborview Ferry Landing)	2013	$130,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C5	Lift Station 6 Improvements (Ryan St./Cascade Ave)	2010-20~~11~~16	$700,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C6	Lift Station 7 Improvements (Ried Dr./Hollycroft St.)	2010	$203,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C7	Lift Station 8 Improvements (Harbor Country Dr.)	2012-2013	$532,800	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C8	Lift Station 9 Improvements (50th St./Reid Dr.)	2013	$127,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C9	Lift Station 11 Improvements (38th Ave./48th St.)	2014	$139,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C10	Lift Station 12 Improvements (Woodhill Dr./Burnham Dr.)	2012-2013	$1,502,500	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C11	Lift Station 13 Improvements (Purdy Dr/SR-302)	2012-2013	$400,900	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C12	Install Flow Meter at LS1	2011	$29,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C13	Install Flow Meter at LS2	2011	$31,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C14	Install Flow Meter at LS3A	2014	$38,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates

Project No.	Project	Projected Year	Cost	Plan	Primary Funding Sources
C15	Install Flow Meter at LS4	2011	$31,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C16	Install Flow Meter at LS5	2013	$36,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C17	Install Flow Meter at LS6	2010	$29,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C18	Install Flow Meter at LS7	2010	$29,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C19	Install Flow Meter at LS8	2013	$36,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C20	Install Flow Meter at LS9	2013	$36,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C21	Install Flow Meter at LS10	2011	$31,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C22	Install Flow Meter at LS11	2014	$38,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C23	Install Flow Meter at LS12	2011	$29,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C24	Install Flow Meter at LS13	2014	$38,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C25	Install Flow Meter at LS14	2013	$36,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C26	Install Flow Meter at LS5	2013	$36,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
C27	Install Future Lift Station 10A (56th St./36th Ave.) and Forcemain	2011	$1,206,000	6-year	Developer Funded
C28	Install Future Lift Station 17A (Skansie Ave./90th St.) and Forcemain	2011-2015	$1,581,000	6-year	Local/Developer Funded
C29	Install Future Lift Station 21A (Hunt St/Skansie Ave.) and Forcemain	2010	$1,518,000	6-year	Developer Funded
C30	Wastewater Comprehensive Plan	2014	225,100	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
	Wastewater Collection Subtotal		**$10,064,400**		
	Wastewater Total		**~~$28,575,400~~ 19,784,400**		

Notes: Estimated costs are based on dollars value in the estimated year of the project.

Water System Projects

Project No.	Project	Projected Year	Cost	Plan	Primary Funding Source
1	Asbestos Cement Water Line ~~R~~replacement Program ($75,000/yr)	2010-2014	$375,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
2	Water Systems Upgrades ($50,000/yr)	2009-2014	$300,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
3	Water Rights Annual Advocate for Permitting ($40,000)	2009-2012	$160,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
4	Well No. 11 – Deep Aquifer Well	2009-20~~13~~16	$4,174,600	6-year	Connection Fees /Utility Rates
5	Harbor Hill Drive Water Main Extension	2014	$450,200	6-year	Development Mitigation/Connection Fees/Utility Rates
6	Harborview Drive Loop	2011	$503,500	6-year	Development Mitigation/Connection Fees/Utility Rates
7	Tarabochia Street Water Main Replacement	2012	$44,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
8	Grandview Street Water Main Replacement	2012	$424,400	6-year	Development Mitigation/Connection Fees/Utility Rates
9	96th Street Water Main Extension	2014	$269,000	6-year	Development Mitigation/Connection Fees/Utility Rates
10	Woodworth Avenue Water Main Replacement	2013	$116,700	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
~~11~~	~~Shurgard East Tee and Water Main Replacement~~	~~2013~~	~~$437,100~~	~~6-year~~	~~Development Mitigation/Connection Fees/Utility Rates~~
12	Water System Plan Update	2014	$112,600	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
	Water Total		~~**$7,367,100**~~ **6,930,000**		

Note: Estimated costs are in 2009 dollars

Park, Recreation & Open Space Projects

Project No.	Project	Projected Year	Cost	Plan	Primary Funding Sources
1	Harbor History Museum Donkey Creek Acquisition and Easement	2008-2012	$400,000	6 year	Local
2	Eddon Boatyard Dock Reconstruction	2010-2011	$250,000	6 year	Heritage Grant
3	Donkey Creek~~/Austin Estuary~~ Restoration and Roads Project*	2008-2016	$350,000	6 year	~~RCO~~ Federal Grant and Local ~~(Funded)~~
4	Boys and Girls Club/Senior Center	2010-2011	$1,000,000	6 year	Local ($250,000), Federal HUD (Funded $750,000)
5	Crescent Creek Park Playground Improvements	2010-2011	$50,000-$300,000	6 year	Grants, Local, Fundraising
6	Skansie Netshed Stabilization Project	2010-2014	$250,000	6 year	Heritage Grant, Local
7	Cushman Trail Phase III and IV - 96th St to Borgen	2010-20~~11~~15	$2,000,000	6 year	Local, County, RCO Grant, Federal
8	Eddon Boat Park Development	2011-2014	$300,000	6 year	RCO Grants, Local
9	Gig Harbor North Park	2008-2012	$5,000,000	6 year	Developer Mitigation, Grants
10	Gig Harbor North Trail System	2010-2014	$1,500,000	6 year	Local, Developer Mitigation, Grants
11	Wilkinson Farm Barn Restoration	2010-2014	$250,000	6 year	Heritage Barn Grant, Local Match
12	Jerisich Dock Utility Upgrades	2010-20~~13~~14	$170,000	6 year	Local, RCO Grant (BIG)
13	Skansie House Improvements	2010-2012	$60,000 - $100,000	6 year	PSRC Grant, Local
14	Jerisich Dock Float Extension	2010-2012	$300,000	6 year	Fees, Grants, Donations
15	Jerisich / Skansie Park Improvements	2009-2010	$150,000	6 year	Local, Donations/Volunteer
16	Seasonal Floats at Jerisich Dock	2010-2012	$200,000	6 year	Local, RCO Grant
17	Maritime Pier	2010-2012	$2,500,000-$5,000,000	6 year	Local, Grants, Fees
18	Develop Plan for Wilkinson Farm Park	2010-2011	$25,000	6 year	Grants, Local, Fundraising
19	Twawelkax Trail	2010-2012	$125,000	6 year	Local
20	Veterans Memorial Trail	2009-2014	$125,000	6 year	Local
21	Wilkinson Farm Park Development	2011-2013	$900,000	6 year	RCO Grant, Preservation Grants, Local Match
22	Develop Plan for Crescent Creek Park	2015	$25,000	6 year	Grants, Local, Fundraising
23	Harborview Waterfront Trail / Pioneer Way Streetscape	2010-2014	$500,000	6 year	Grants, Local, Fundraising
24	Kenneth Leo Marvin Veterans Memorial Park Phase 2	2010-2015	$250,000	6 year	RCO Grant, Local
25	Donkey Creek Corridor Conservation	2010-2016	$1,500,000	6 year plan	County Conservation Futures

Project No.	Project	Projected Year	Cost	Plan	Primary Funding Sources
26	Critical Area Enhancement	2012-2016	$100,000	6 year	Local, Volunteers, Grants
27	Wheeler Pocket Park	2010-2012	$70,000	6 year	Local
28	Ancich Waterfront Park Development	2013-2019	$5,000,000	6 year	Local, Grants
	Park Total		**$2318,250,000 to $2621,040,000**		

* The Donkey Creek/Austin Estuary Restoration and Roads Project benefits Stormwater, Parks and Transportation projects. The City has included portions of this project in each of these project lists; the total project amount is ~~$2,560,000~~ $4,900,000 .

Stormwater System-Projects

Project No.	Project	Projected Year	Cost	Plan	Primary Funding Source
1	Update storm facilities mapping ($50,000/yr)	Annually	$300,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
2	Garr Creek Tributary Channel (38th St)/WWTP Erosion Study	2010-2011	$50,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
3	38th /Quail Run Ave Storm Culverts	2014	$208,200	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
4	Donkey Creek~~/Austin Estuary~~ Restoration and Roads Project* ~~Daylighting~~	~~2013~~2008-2013	~~$1,236,000~~ $2,400,000	6-year	State/Federal ~~Salmon Recovery~~ Grants/Earmarks/Local
5	Donkey Creek Culvert under Harborview Drive	2013	$546,400	6-year	State/Federal Salmon Recovery Grants/Earmarks
6	Annual Storm Culvert Replacement Program ($50,000/yr)	2009-2014	$300,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
7	50th Street Box Culvert	2012	$371,300	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
8	Quail Run Water Quality System Improvements	2011~~10~~	$15,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
9	Annual NPDES Implementation Expenses	2009-2014	$100,000	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates /State Grant
10	Aquifer Re-charge - Spadoni Gravel Pit and adjacent property north of 96th street between SR-16 and Burnham Drive.	2011	$1,700,000	6-year	State/Federal Transportation Funding/Grant
11	Burnham Drive/96th Street Culvert Replacement	2014	$56,300	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
12	Borgen Boulevard/Peacock Hill Avenue Culvert Replacement	2014	$36,600	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
13	102nd Street Court Culvert Replacement	--	$20,000	6-year	Private Development

Project No.	Project	Projected Year	Cost	Plan	Primary Funding Source
14	Burnham Drive/Harborview Drive Rock Spall Pad Construction	--	$15,000	6-year	Private Development
15	101st Street Court Detention Pond Reconstruction	--	$25,000	6-year	Private Development
16	101st Street Court Culvert Replacement	--	$20,000	6-year	Private Development
17	Stormwater Comprehensive Plan Update	2014	$112,600	6-year	Connection Fees/Utility Rates
	Stormwater Total		**$5,112,400**		

Notes:

- Costs shown above are estimates and do not include such items as permitting costs, sales tax, right-of-way acquisition, utility relocations, trench dewatering, traffic control or other unforeseen complications.
- Private Development funding indicates the full cost for the project shall be borne by property owner(s) or developer(s).

* The Donkey Creek/Austin Estuary Restoration and Roads Project benefits Stormwater, Parks and Transportation projects. The City has included portions of this project in each of these project lists; the total project amount is~~$2,560,000~~ 4,900,000.

Transportation Improvement Projects

Project No.	Project Name	Projected Start Year	Estimated Cost	Plan	Funding Source
1	SR-16/Borgen/~~Canterwood Hospital Mitigation~~ Blvd Improvements (includes ancillary projects Roundabout Metering and Restripe Bridge)	2009	$11,000,000	6-Year	State/Local
2	50th St Ct NW Improvements Phase 2	~~2009~~ 2014-2018	$1,600,000	6-Year	State/Local
3	Harbor Hill and Borgen Intersection Improvements	~~2013~~ 2018-2021	$704,000	6-Year	Developer/Local
4	Rosedale and Stinson Intersection Improvements	~~2013~~ 2018-2019	$275,000	6-Year	Local
5	38th Ave Improvements Phase 1	~~2010~~ 2016-2019	$9,790,000	6-Year	State/Local
6	Harbor Hill Drive Extension	~~2014~~ 2013-2016	$5,500,000	6-Year	Developer/Local
7	Burnham Dr Phase 1	~~2014~~ 2017-2020	$11,360,000	6-Year	State/Local/Developer
8	Burnham Dr/Harbor Hill Drive Intersection Improvements	~~2011~~2015-2017	$2,200,000	6-Year	Developer/Local
9	Soundview and Hunt Intersection Improvements	~~2012~~2016-2017	$660,000	6-Year	Developer/Local
10	Olympic/Pt. Fosdick Intersection Improvements	2010	$440,000	6-Year	Developer/Local
11	Wollochet Dr Improvements	~~2013~~2018-2020	$660,000	6-Year	Developer/Local
~~12~~	~~Harborview/N Harborview Intersection Improvements (Note:~~	~~2010~~	~~$1,650,000~~	~~6-Year~~	~~Local~~

Project No.	Project Name	Projected Start Year	Estimated Cost	Plan	Funding Source
	~~included with Donkey Creek Project)~~				
13	SR 16/Olympic Drive	~~2012~~2018-2022	$825,000	6-Year	Developer/ State/Local
14	Rosedale St/Skansie Ave Intersection Improvements	~~2011~~2018-2022	$ 275,000	6-Year	Local
15	38th Ave Improvements Phase 2	~~2009~~2015-2018	$5,280,000	6-Year	State/Local
16	Skansie Ave Improvements	~~2010~~ 2018-2021	$9,460,000	6-Year	Local
17	Rosedale St Improvements	2010	$3,740,000	6-Year	State/Local
18	Olympic/Hollycroft Intersection Improvements	~~2013~~2016-2017	$26,000	6-Year	Local
19	Vernhardson St Improvements	~~2014~~2018-2022	$375,000	6-Year	Local
20	Point Fosdick Pedestrian Improvements	~~2011~~2013-2016	$300,000	6-Year	State/Local
21	Harborview Dr. Improvements ~~from N. Harborview Dr. to Pioneer Wy~~	~~2012~~2013-2018	~~$100,000~~750,000	6-Year	Federal/State/Local
22	Judson/Stanich/Uddenberg Improvements	2010	$2,090,000	6-Year	State/Local
23	Donkey Creek/~~Austin~~ Estuary Restoration and Roads Project*	2010	~~$974,000~~ $2,100,000	6-Year	Federal/State/Local
24	Wagner Way/Wollochet Drive Traffic Signal	~~2013~~ 2015-2018	$300,000	6-Year	Developer/Local
26~~25~~	Grandview Drive Phase 1 from Stinson to Pioneer	~~2014~~2017-2022	$500,000	6-Year	Developer
25~~26~~	Grandview Drive Phase 2 from Soundview to McDonald	~~2010~~2017-2022	$860,000	6-Year	Local
27	Pt Fosdick/56th Street Improvements	2012	$4,330,000	6-Year	State/Local/Developer
	Subtotal 6-Year:		**~~$79,558,000~~ $75,400,000**		
28	96th Street SR16 Crossing	2030	$8,000,000	Other	State/Local
29	Briarwood Lane Improvments	2020	$300,000	Other	Local
30	Franklin Ave Improvements	~~2015~~2020	$500,000	Other	Local
31	Street Connections - Point Fosdick Area	~~2015~~2020	$600,000	Other	Local
32	Crescent Valley Connector	2030	$2,000,000	Other	Local
33	Downtown Parking Lot Design	2015	$60,000	Other	Local
34	Downtown Parking Lot property acquisition	2015	n/a	Other	Local
35	Purchase land for ROW, stormwater improvements, wetland mitigation	2015	n/a	Other	Local
36	Public Works Operations Facility	2015	$1,125,000	Other	Local
	Subtotal Other:		**$12,585,000**		
	Transportation Total:		**~~$92,369,000~~ $87,985,000**		

* The Donkey Creek/Austin Estuary Restoration and Roads Project benefits Stormwater, Parks and Transportation projects. The City has included portions of this project in each of these project lists; the total project amount is ~~$2,560,000~~ 4,900,000.