



# Capital Facilities Element

# Capital Facilities

This Capital Facilities Element has been developed in accordance with Section 36.780A.070 of the Growth Management Act to address the capital facilities needs in the city of Langley Urban Growth Area. It represents the community's policy plan for public facilities for the next 20 years, and includes a six year financing plan for capital facilities. The policies and objectives in this plan will be used to guide public decisions on the use of capital funds. They will also indirectly guide private development decisions by providing a strategy of planning public capital expenditures.

The element has also been developed in accordance with the County-Wide Planning Policies, and has been integrated with other planning elements to ensure consistency throughout the comprehensive plan. The element specifically evaluates the city's fiscal capability to provide the public facilities necessary to support the other comprehensive plan elements.

The Capital Facilities Element is the mechanism the city uses to coordinate its physical and fiscal planning. The Capital Facilities Element promotes efficiency by requiring the city to prioritize capital improvements for a longer period of time than the single budget year. Long range financial planning presents the opportunity to schedule projects so that the various steps in development logically follow one another, with regard to relative urgency, economic desirability, and community benefit. In addition, the identification of adequate funding sources, results in the prioritization of needs, and allows the trade offs between projects to be evaluated explicitly.

## **CAPITAL FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

The Capital ~~Facilities~~ Improvement Program (CIP) within this element is a six-year financing plan for capital expenditures to be incurred each year. It sets forth each capital project which the jurisdiction plans to undertake and presents estimates of the resources needed to finance the project. The first year of the Capital ~~Facilities~~ Improvement Program will be converted to the annual capital budget, while the remaining five-year program will provide long-term planning. Only the expenditures and appropriations in the annual budget are binding financial commitments. The 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 changing circumstances. The Capital ~~Facilities~~ Improvement Program is a six-year rolling plan that will be revised and extended annually to reflect changing circumstances.

### **Definition of Capital Improvement**

This Capital Facilities Element is concerned with needed improvements which are of relatively large scale, are generally non-recurring high cost, and may require multi-year financing.

For the purposes of capital facility planning, capital improvements are ~~major projects, activities, or maintenance, costing over \$10,000,~~ construction or maintenance projects

requiring the expenditure of public funds over and above annual operating expenses. ~~They~~ In general, capital improvement projects should have a life expectancy of more than ten years and result in an addition to the city's fixed assets and/or extend the life of the existing capital infrastructure. Other construction or maintenance projects and the purchase of capital outlay items such as equipment or rolling stock should not be considered capital improvements.

~~It does not include capital outlay items such as equipment. Minor projects, activities, or maintenance costing less than \$10,000 are considered minor maintenance and are not a part of capital improvements.~~

The project may include design, engineering ~~efforts~~, permitting, environmental analysis, land acquisition, construction, major maintenance, site improvements, energy conservation projects, landscaping, initial furnishings, and equipment.

### **Needs Identified in Other Comprehensive Plan Elements**

The capital improvements needed to satisfy future development are identified and listed in Table C-1. Table C-1 provides a brief description of each of the capital improvements projects, and provides an estimate of the total project costs. Capital improvement projects have been identified for public buildings, transportation, parks and recreation, wastewater, potable water, stormwater drainage facility improvements, and other public facilities.

**TABLE C-1**  
**SIX YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**  
**2011-2016**

Projects	Year	Estimated Cost	Notes	Funding Source(s)
<b>BUILDING PROJECTS</b>				
CITY HALL (112 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street)				
POST OFFICE (115 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street)				
Contract expires in 2026				
LIBRARY (104 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street)				
City share of carpet replacement	2011	5,000		Capital Fund
Replace eave brackets, braces and barge boards	2012	7,500		Capital Fund
Replace trellis over entry	2012	2,500		Capital Fund
Paint exterior	2012	9,000		Capital Fund
Re-roof	2014	8,000		Capital Fund
VISITORS CENTER (208 Anthes Avenue)				
Paint exterior	2012	6,000		VIC Imp. Fund
OLD LANGLEY FIRE HALL (179 2 <sup>nd</sup> Street)				
Paint exterior	2012	6,000		Capital Fund
WATER PUMP HOUSE (818 Dalton Lane)				
PUBLIC WORKS SHOP (999 Coles Road)				
WASTEWATER LAB/ PUBLIC WORKS OFFICE (999 Coles Road)				
<b>PARKS/OPEN SPACE PROJECTS</b>				
Acquire fee-simple ownership or a conservation easement	2012	Varies	1	Capital Fund/Grant
Cascade Overlook Enhancement	2012	TBD	1	Capital Fund/Grant
Middle Langley Trail	2012	\$100,000	1	Conservation Futures
Hladky Park Expansion	2012	TBD	1	Capital Fund/Grant
Cedars Park Upgrade	2013	TBD	1	Capital Fund/Grant
<b>TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS</b>				
Municipal Park and Ride	2011	\$420,000		STP/Street Fund/CMA match
Second Street Reconstruction (public outreach, P.E., permitting)	2011	\$250,000		STP/TIB/Wtr. Imp. Fund/Storm Imp. Fund
Second Street Reconstruction (construction)	2012	\$1,200,000		STP/TIB/Wtr. Imp. Fund/Storm Imp. Fund
Anthes Avenue Reconstruction	2012	\$135,000		STP/TIB/Storm Imp. Fun
North side of Sixth Street Improvements	2013	\$246,000		STP/Enhancement Fund/TIB
Edgecliff Roadway Upgrade and Walkway	2013	\$270,000		STP/Enhancement Fund/TIB
Wharf Street Widening	2013	\$240,000		Rural Development .09
Waterfront Accessibility Improvements	2014	\$346,000		STP/OTHER
Trail System	2015	\$500,000		STP/TIB
Downtown Sidewalk/Walkway Improvements	2016	\$150,000		STP/TIB
Street Overlay Program	2011-2016	\$50,000/yr		Capron/Ad Valorem Taxes
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$4,157,000</b>		

Projects	Year	Estimated Cost	Notes	Funding Source
<b>WATER PROJECTS</b>				
2 <sup>nd</sup> Street Phase I - Design	2011	\$33,750		Wtr. Imp. Fund
Water System Plan Update	2011	\$30,000		Wtr. Imp. Fund
1 <sup>st</sup> Street – Anthes to Wharf Street/Cascade Avenue	2013	\$175,000	2	USDA/Wtr. Imp. Fund
1 <sup>st</sup> Street – Debruyne Ave. to existing water main	2013	\$180,000	2	USDA/Wtr. Imp. Fund
Park Avenue WM – 1 <sup>st</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street	2013	\$132,000	2	USDA/Wtr. Imp. Fund
2 <sup>nd</sup> Street – Debruyne to Park Avenue	2013	\$140,000	2	USDA/Wtr. Imp. Fund
Decker Avenue WM Inter-tie – Sandy Point Road to Edgecliff Drive	2013	\$240,000	2	USDA/Wtr. Imp. Fund
Sandy Point Road WM	2013	\$560,000	2	USDA/Wtr. Imp. Fund
2 <sup>nd</sup> Street Phase 2 - Construction	2013	\$210,938		Wtr. Imp. Fund
See Table C-3.3 for complete plan and details				
<b>WATER SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,701,688</b>		
<b>SANITARY SEWER PROJECTS</b>				
Replace Leaking Manhole Lids/Cleanout Caps	2011	\$2,500		R/GFC
Reduce Side Sewer Infiltration/Manhole Leaks	2011	\$15,000		R/GFC
Expand Covered Compost Area	2013	\$96,000	2	USDA/GFC
Construct Garage for Plant Vehicles	2013	\$22,500	2	USDA/GFC
Edgecliff Drive – pressure sewer	2013	\$260,000	2	USDA/LFC
Furman Avenue – pressure sewer	2013	\$63,000	2	USDA/LFC
Decker Avenue – pressure sewer	2013	\$63,000	2	USDA/LFC
Cedar Circle/Cedar Acres Loop – pressure sewer	2013	\$227,700	2	USDA/LFC
Saratoga Road – pressure sewer	2013	\$38,900	2	USDA/LFC
Brackenwood Road – pressure sewer	2013	\$78,200	2	USDA/LFC
See Table C-3.2 for complete plan and details				
<b>SANITARY SEWER SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$866,800</b>		
<b>STORMWATER PROJECTS</b>				
2 <sup>nd</sup> Street/Cascade	2012	\$180,000		Storm Imp. Fund
Sixth Street – East of Anthes Avenue to Brookhaven Creek	2013	\$190,000	2	USDA/Storm Imp. Fund
Edgecliff Drive west of Furman Avenue and east of Furman Avenue to City Limits	2013	\$400,000	2	USDA/Storm Imp. Fund
Furman Avenue and Decker Avenue	2013	\$490,000	2	USDA/Storm Imp. Fund
Intersection of Anthes Avenue and First Street	2013	\$20,000	2	USDA/Storm Imp. Fund
Melson Alley (4 <sup>th</sup> to 6 <sup>th</sup> )	2013	\$130,000	2	USDA/Storm Imp. Fund
Water Quality Treatment at Existing Outfalls	2013	\$200,000	2	DOE/USDA/Storm Imp. Fund
Wharf Street	2013	\$60,000	2	DOE/USDA/Storm Imp. Fund
See Table C-3.1 for complete plan and details				
<b>STORMWATER SUBTOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,670,000</b>		
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>\$8,395,488</b>		

STP – Surface Transportation Program (federal)  
TIB – Transportation Improvement Board (state)  
USDA – United States Department of Agriculture

R/GFC – Utility Rates/General Facility Charge  
LFC – Local Facility Charge  
DOE – Department of Ecology

NOTES:

1. Parks and open space projects are subject to funding through grants.
2. Projects involve reliance on grant funding from the United States Department of Agriculture. The grant application is due to be submitted in late 2010.

**TABLE C-1.1**  
**STORMWATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS**  
(Project List Derived from 2009 Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan Table 6-2, 6-3)

<b>Project Location</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>Est. Year of Construction</b>	<b>Estimated Cost (2009 dollars)</b>
Second Street to Cascade Avenue to the Extension of Third Street	12-inch storm drain; 890 LF	2012	\$180,000
Sixth Street - East of Anthes Ave. to Brookhaven Creek	12-inch storm drain; 950 LF	2013	\$190,000
Edgecliff Drive west of Furman Avenue	Ditch and 12- to 18-inch culverts/storm drains; 1,340 LF	2013	\$280,000
Furman Avenue and Decker Avenue	12-inch storm drain; 2,450 LF	2013	\$490,000
Intersection of Anthes Avenue and First Street	Replace four existing catch basins with Type I structures	2013	\$20,000
Melsen Alley (4th to 6th)	12-inch storm drain; 665 LF	2013	\$130,000
Water Quality Treatment at existing outfalls	Replace four existing manholes with water quality treatment unit inside new manhole	2013	\$200,000
Wharf Street	12-inch storm drain and water quality treatment unit; 225 LF	2013	\$60,000
Edgecliff Drive East of Furman Avenue to City Limits	Install new and maintain existing ditches, use 12-inch minimum driveway culverts; 1,375 LF	2013	\$120,000
Northview Subdivision Drainage and Detention Pond	Install riser with orifice, re-route existing 15-inch outfall to detention pond with a new 15-inch storm drain; 395 LF	Beyond 2017	\$70,000
Sixth Street from Anthes Avenue to Park Avenue	12-inch storm drain; 880 LF	Beyond 2017	\$190,000
Second Street – Park Avenue to Melsen Alley	12-inch storm drain; 565 LF	Beyond 2017	\$110,000
First Street and DeBruyn Avenue	12-inch storm drain; 700 LF	Beyond 2017	\$130,000
Second Street and DeBruyn Avenue	12-inch storm drain; 730 LF	Beyond 2017	\$150,000
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$2,331,000</b>

**TABLE C-1.2**  
**SANITARY SEWER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS**  
 (Project List Derived from 2006 Comprehensive Sewer System Plan Table 6-6)

<b>Project and Location</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Estimated Year of Construction</b>	<b>Estimated Cost (2006 dollars)</b>
Reduce Side Sewer Infiltration, Manhole Leaks	Assume approximately 15 locations. Repair by grouting at \$1,000 per location.	2011	\$15,000
Replace Leaking Manhole Lids and Cleanout Caps	5 manhole lids and 5 cleanout caps to be replaced - cost to replace MH lids is \$300 and \$200 each respectively	2011	\$2,500
Disconnect Roof Drains	Approximately 10 buildings with roof drains connected to sanitary sewer. Cost to approx. \$500/building	2012	\$5,000
Disconnect Storm Drain Cross-Connections	One location in downtown area where SD is connected to sanitary sewer.	2012	\$3,000
Reduce Sewer Main Infiltration	Approximately 30 locations. Repair/grout at \$500 ea.	2012	\$15,000
Repair Manhole Channels	Assume 10 channels requiring repair at \$600 per channel	2012	\$6,000
Cut Protruding Side Sewers	Assume 4 locations requiring cutting at \$1,000 per location	2012	\$4,000
Covered Compost Area	Expand area by 2,400 ft <sup>2</sup>	2013	\$96,000
Construct Garage for Plant Vehicles	Pole-type building, 2,500 ft <sup>2</sup> Total estimated cost \$75,000. 30% to be paid by sewer	2013	\$22,500 (\$75,000 total )
Saratoga Road	600 LF of pressure sewer	2013	\$38,900
Brackenwood Avenue	1,300 LF of pressure sewer	2013	\$78,200
Cedar Circle/Cedar Acres Loop	4,260 LF of pressure sewer	2013	\$227,700
Furman Avenue	1,200 LF of pressure sewer	2013	\$63,000
Edgecliff Drive	3,300 LF of pressure sewer	2013	\$260,000
Decker Avenue	1,200 LF of pressure sewer	2013	\$63,000
Install Septage Acceptance Plant	Needed if significant quantities of septage is accepted	Beyond 2017	\$100,000
Construct Aerobic Digester	5,000 gallons of septage per day	Beyond 2017	\$440,000
Replace Pumps in Pump Station No. 2	Increase pump capacity to 500 gpm.	Beyond 2017	\$50,000
Replace Interim Pump Station on Sandy Point Road.	Assume (2) 400 gpm pumps, building, electrical/controls, generator, site civil, design, 950 LF of 8" force main	Beyond 2017	\$550,000
Replace Telemetry and Electrical Controls Sunrise Beach Pump Station	Assume all new equipment	Beyond 2017	\$45,000
Camano Ave.	2,050 LF of 12" gravity sewer	Beyond 2017	\$260,000
Noble Pl.	650 LF of 12" gravity sewer	Beyond 2017	\$82,200
E. Sixth St., Brookhaven Creek, Anthes Ave.	3,300 LF of 16" gravity sewer	Beyond 2017	\$455,000
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$3,342,400</b>

**TABLE C-1.3**  
**WATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS**  
(Project List Derived from 2002 Comprehensive Water Plan Tables 8-1, 8-2, 8-3)

<b>Project and Location</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Est. Cost (2011 dollars)</b>	<b>Est. Year of Const.</b>
2 <sup>nd</sup> Street – Phase I	Design and permitting	\$33,750	2011
Water System Plan Update	Mandated by State	\$30,000	2011
2 <sup>nd</sup> Street – Phase 2	Construction – 1,320 LF of 8-inch WM	\$210,938	2013
1 <sup>st</sup> Street – Debruyne to Existing Water Main (in conjunction with sewer ext.)	900 LF of 8-inch WM	\$175,000	2013
1 <sup>st</sup> Street – Anthes to Wharf Street/Cascade	850 LF of 8-inch WM	\$180,000	2013
Park Avenue WM – 1 <sup>st</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue	660 LF of 8-inch WM	\$132,000	2013
2 <sup>nd</sup> Street – Debruyne to Park Avenue	700 LF of 8-inch WM	\$140,000	2013
Decker Ave. WM Inter-tie – Sandy Pt. Rd. to Edgecliff	Loop Main (1,150 ft, 8-inch)	\$240,000	2013
Sandy Point Road WM	New WM to loop the supply to Sandy Pt. sub-service area	\$560,000	2013
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,701,688</b>	
<b>Longer Term Projects</b>			
		<b>(2001 dollars)</b>	
Mid-block tie WM – Sandy Pt. Rd. to Edgecliff	Loop main (1,150 ft, 8-inch)	\$35,840	Beyond 2017
Wilkenson Court, WM	New WM to loop the supply to Sandy Pt. sub-service	\$24,640	Beyond 2017
Maple Cove WM	New WM to loop the supply to Sandy Pt. sub-service	\$33,600	Beyond 2017
1-MG standpipe water storage tank for Upper Pressure Zone		\$2,100,000	Beyond 2017
Al Anderson Ave. Water Main	Replaces old 4-inch and 1 ½ inch – inch WM to end of public road	\$72,800	Beyond 2017
Upper Grid tie to East	New WM that interties the Anderson Rd. BP sub-service w/ Cedars BP sub-service	\$294,000	Beyond 2017
Northview PZ Transfer and WM	200 LF 12-inch WM, 350LF 8-inch WM (Suzanne CT. to ex. 12-inch Trans. WM)	\$68,051	Beyond 2017
Cascade Ave WM Ext.	850 LF 8-inch WM	\$42,500	Beyond 2017
4 <sup>th</sup> Street WM – Debruyne to Park Ave.	650 LF 8-inch WM	\$32,500	Beyond 2017
Debruyne WM ext. – South to SE-6	2,300 LF 8-inch WM	\$115,000	Beyond 2017
6 <sup>th</sup> St. WM ext. – Debruyne to Coles	1,100 LF 12-inch WM	\$60,500	Beyond 2017
Brackenwood WM ext. – Brooks Hill to Saratoga	900 LF 8-inch WM	\$45,000	Beyond 2017
Upper Grid West Tie WM – STP to Anderson Rd	3,000 LF 12-inch WM	\$165,000	Beyond 2017
Upper Grid East Tie WM – Cedars to Wilkinson Rd.	2,900 LF 12-inch WM	\$159,500	Beyond 2017
Wilkenson Court WM Ext.	1,400 LF 8-inch WM	\$70,000	Beyond 2017
6 <sup>th</sup> Street – Park to Anthes	650 LF 8-inch WM	\$32,500	Beyond 2017
Park Ave – 6 <sup>th</sup> to 4 <sup>th</sup>	650 LF 8-inch WM	\$32,500	Beyond 2017
Debruyne Ave – 6 <sup>th</sup> to 3 <sup>rd</sup>	950 LF 8-inch WM	\$47,500	Beyond 2017
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$3,405,377</b>	

## **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.

### **MECHANISMS TO PROVIDE CAPITAL FACILITIES**

**Analysis of Debt Capacity:** Generally, Washington State law permits a city to ensure a general obligation bonded debt equal to 1-1/2% 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%, 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 supplying 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 a 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 Langley has used general obligation bonds and municipal revenue bonds infrequently. Therefore, under state debt limitations, it has debt capacity to issue bonds for new capital improvement projects. However, the city does not currently have policies in place regarding the acceptable level of debt and how that debt will be measured. Further guidelines, beyond the state statutory limits on debt capacity, are needed to ensure effective use of debt financing.

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

The provision of public services through development dedications not only makes it more feasible to serve the development, 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.

**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 under-utilized service areas, infill development may be encouraged by the absence of impact fees on developments proposed within such service areas.

## **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, special management districts, and utilities that provide public facilities within the city. 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 electric and telecommunication providers is detailed in the Utilities Element. This plan includes policies for sharing information and a procedure for negotiating agreements for provision of new services in a timely manner.

Other public service providers such as the school and port districts, Island Transit and Island County are important agencies to the city. 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.

**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, and the existing infrastructure and services. New and existing development requiring urban services will be located in the Urban Growth Area. The city is committed to serving development within the boundary; 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.

## **GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES**

### **Goal 1**

The city shall endeavor to adequately provide needed public facilities to all residents within its jurisdiction in a manner which protects investments in existing facilities, maximizes the use of existing facilities, and promotes orderly and compact growth.

**Objective A:** Capital improvements shall be provided to correct existing deficiencies, to replace worn out or obsolete facilities and to accommodate desired future growth.

### **Policies**

- 1.A.1 Improvement projects identified for implementation in the other elements of this plan and determined to ~~be of relatively large scale and cost \$10,000 or more~~ meet the definition of a capital improvement project shall be included in the six-year Capital Improvement Program.
- 1.A.2 Proposed capital improvement projects shall be evaluated and prioritized using all the following criteria:
  - a. whether the project is needed to correct existing deficiencies, replace needed facilities, or to provide facilities needed for future growth;
  - b. elimination of public hazards;
  - c. elimination of capacity deficits;
  - d. financial feasibility;
  - e. site needs based on projected growth patterns;
  - f. new development and redevelopment;
  - g. plans of state agencies; and
  - h. local budget impact.

**Objective B:** Future development shall bear its fair share of facility improvement costs.

### **Policies**

- 1.B.1 City sewer and water connection fee revenues shall be allocated primarily for capital improvements related to expansion.

1.B.2 The city shall verify that new development is responsible for the improvements necessitated by the new development.

**Objective C:** The city shall manage its fiscal resources to support the provision of needed capital improvements.

**Policies**

1.C.1 The city shall continue to adopt an annual capital budget and a six-year capital improvement program.

1.C.2 Efforts shall be made to secure grants or private funds whenever available to finance the provision of capital improvements.

1.C.3 Fiscal policies to direct expenditures for capital improvements will be consistent with other Comprehensive Plan Elements.

**Objective D:** The city shall coordinate land use decisions and financial resources with a schedule of capital improvements to provide existing and future facility needs.

**Policies**

1.D.1 The city and/or developers shall provide for the availability of public facilities and services needed to support development concurrent with the impacts of such development subsequent to the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. These facilities shall meet adopted Level of Service standards and be consistent with the Concurrency Management System.

1.D.2 The city will support and encourage the joint development and use of cultural and community facilities with other governmental or community organizations in areas of mutual concern and benefit.

1.D.3 The city will emphasize capital improvement projects, which promote the conservation, preservation or revitalization of commercial and residential areas.

1.D.4 The city shall use the following LOS standards in reviewing the impacts of new development and redevelopment upon public facility provision:

- Recreation and Open Space
  - Neighborhood parks - 1.6 acres per 1,000 residents
  - Community parks - 2.6 acres per 1,000 residents
  - Open space - 25% of total city area
  
- Drainage

-- Drainage swales - 25-year, 24-hour storm event  
-- Stormwater management systems - Retain on-site the runoff from 25-year, 24-hour storm at peak discharge rates. Development will be regulated to ensure that its post-development run-off to city systems does not exceed the pre-developed discharge volume and/or rate to ensure the level of service of the existing stormwater system is not compromised.

- Traffic Circulation
  - Roadway link specific for all roadways in the city's jurisdiction. The LOS by segments is indicated in the Transportation Element.
  - Major arterial: LOS C at peak hour traffic
  - State highway and county road: LOS C over 24-hour period, off-season traffic
  - Collectors and local roads: Design standards
- Sanitary Sewer
  - 110 gallons per capita per day
- Potable Water
  - Yearly average 125 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) raw water source (dry season 154 gpcd) including a 10% contingency; 189 gpcd treatment and pumping capacity, plus 15 million gallons per day fire reserve.

1.D.4 Proposed plan amendments and requests for new development or redevelopment shall be evaluated according to the following guidelines as to whether the proposed action would:

- contribute to a condition of public hazards;
- exacerbate any existing condition of public facility capacity deficits;
- generate public facility demands that exceed capacity increase planning in the six-year Capital Improvement Program;
- conform with future land uses as shown on the future land use map of the Land Use Element;
- accommodate public facility demands based upon adopted LOS standards and attempt to meet specified measurable objectives, when public facilities are developer-provided;
- demonstrate financial feasibility, subject to this element, when public facilities are provided, in part or whole, by the city; and
- affect state agencies' facilities plans and siting of essential public facilities.

## Goal 2

The city shall reassess the land use element of this plan if the funding necessary to meet identified capital facility needs to support the anticipated growth is not available in a timely manner.

## **PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING**

### **Implementation**

Table C-1 lists the capital improvement project by facility type, indicates which projects are needed to correct existing deficiencies, and provides estimates of project costs by year. The distribution among years matches the years in which capital improvement work is planned in order to achieve or maintain the adopted Level of Service standards and measurable objectives for various public facilities. The notation "ED" has been used to indicate that the project is required to correct an existing deficiency, a situation where existing conditions are currently below Level of Service Standards being adopted in the Comprehensive Plan.

The planned expenditures and funding sources for each project from FY through FY are shown by year and as lump sums.

Top priority is generally given to projects which correct existing deficiencies, followed by those required for facility replacement and those needed for future growth.

### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

Monitoring and evaluation are essential in ensuring the effectiveness of the Capital Facilities Plan Element. This element will be annually reviewed and amended to verify that fiscal resources are available to provide public facilities needed to support adopted LOS standards and measurable objectives.

The annual review will include an examination of the following considerations in order to determine their continued appropriateness.

- Any corrections, updates, and modifications concerning costs, revenue sources, acceptance of facilities pursuant to dedication which are consistent with the element or the date of construction of any facility enumerated in the element;
- The Capital Facilities Element's continued consistency with the other elements and its support of the Land Use Element;
- The priority assignment of existing public facility deficiencies;
- The city's progress in meeting those needs determined to be existing deficiencies;
- The criteria used to evaluate capital improvement projects in order to ensure that projects are being ranked in their appropriate order of priority;

- The city's effectiveness in maintaining the adopted LOS standards and achieving measurable objectives;
- The effectiveness of impact fees, and mandatory dedications or fees in lieu of, for assessing new development the improvement costs which it generates;
- Efforts made to secure grants or private funds, whenever available, to finance the provision of capital improvements;
- The criteria used to evaluate proposed plan amendments and requests for new development or redevelopment;
- Capital improvements needed for the latter part of the planning period, for update of the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program; and
- Concurrency status.