

Technical Memorandum

Date: October 29, 2009

To: Jan Ollivier, Project Manager, Kittitas County

From: Jennifer Barnes, PE

Subject: Kittitas County GMA Compliance – Steps for Capital Facilities Plan

Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide to Kittitas County (County) a summary of the steps that the County will need to take to amend its capital facilities element to support the recommendations of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan Compliance project related to Urban Growth Areas (UGAs).

Regulatory Framework

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), codified under RCW 36.70A, provides the following guidance related to capital facilities planning:

<p>RCW 36.70A.030 Definitions</p>	<p>Defines “public facilities” as transportation, water, stormwater, wastewater, parks and recreational facilities, and schools</p> <p>Defines “public services” as fire suppression, law enforcement, public health, education, recreation, environmental protection, and government/administrative services</p> <p>There are also definitions of “Urban governmental services” or “urban services” which include “those public services and public facilities at an intensity historically and typically provided in cities, specifically including storm and sanitary sewer systems, domestic water systems, street cleaning services, fire and police protection services, public transit services, and other public utilities associated with urban areas and normally not associated with rural areas.”</p>
<p>RCW 36.70A.115 Land Capacity</p>	<p>Requires UGAs to be sized adequately to accommodate planned growth: “accommodate ...allocated housing and employment growth, including the accommodation of, as appropriate, the medical, governmental, educational, institutional, commercial, and industrial facilities related to such growth, as adopted in the applicable countywide planning policies and consistent with the twenty-year population forecast from the office of financial management.”</p> <p>The County’s current long range planning year, based upon the date of the most recent population allocation, is 2025.</p>
<p>RCW 36.70A.110 Urban Growth Areas</p>	<p>(3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second</p>

	<p>in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas. Urban growth may also be located in designated new fully contained communities as defined by RCW 36.70A.350.</p> <p>(4) In general, cities are the units of local government most appropriate to provide urban governmental services.¹ In general, it is not appropriate that urban governmental services be extended to or expanded in rural areas except in those limited circumstances shown to be necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment and when such services are financially supportable at rural densities and do not permit urban development.</p>
<p>RCW 36.70A.020(12) Planning Goals</p>	<p>Goal 12 states that public services and facilities are to be adequate to support planned growth, at the time that development occurs: “Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.”</p> <p>“Adequacy” is typically measured by level of service (LOS) standards, which are adopted locally. Based on the current Comprehensive Plan, adequate facilities meeting standards or needs assessments must be demonstrated through the long-range planning year of 2025.</p>
<p>36.70A.070(3) Mandatory Elements</p>	<p>A capital facilities element is a mandatory part of a comprehensive plan and consists of five requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the location and capacities of the capital facilities 2. A forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities (Note, future needs are based upon what is needed to accommodate planned population and employment growth through the long range planning year, while still maintaining adopted LOS standards). 3. The proposed location and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities 4. At least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes 5. A requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent

Potential CFP Elements of Compliance Project

The components the compliance project for which a Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) would need to be considered are:

- If the decision is made to designate any of the former Urban Growth Node areas as UGAs, a capital facilities plan will need to be developed for those areas. Based upon analysis completed to date, the areas where UGA may be considered are Snoqualmie Pass and Ronald.
- Capital facilities assessment that was completed to support the City of Kittitas UGA recommendation will need to be adopted into the County Comprehensive Plan.

The recommended steps associated with each of these components are described below.

¹ This language has not been interpreted to limit UGAs to cities. There are unincorporated UGAs in other counties unassociated with cities. GMA does not prohibit services provided by private sources. See RCW 36.70A.110(3). However, the County should be prepared to show that the capital facility plans for proposed UGAs: 1) address the 20-year horizon and full urban growth area (UGA) boundaries; 2) include financial plans for at least a 6-year period; and 3) address un-served areas as well as served areas in the UGA boundaries.

CFP for Stand Alone County UGAs

Since the County does not currently have any UGAs that are not associated with cities, a new component of the Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Element would need to be adopted to support any new UGA designations. The County would need to consider adoption of an “urban” LOS standard for these areas. Of the public services and facilities that GMA identifies, the following would need to be considered for UGAs:

- Fire Projection
- Police Protection
- Parks and Recreation
- Schools
- Stormwater
- Wastewater
- Water System
- Transportation

In general, the development of a CFP would consist of the following steps (for each of the CFP elements):

1. Create inventory of facilities and services.
2. The County has the responsibility to identify how the adequacy of capital facilities is measured. The Capital Facilities Element of the County Comprehensive Plan provides LOS standards for many capital facilities. It is recommended that the County integrate into the Comprehensive Plan public process whether or not additional or refined LOS standards are desired to reflect urban LOS (see table below). Since the CFP would need to be completed and adopted as part of this year’s Comprehensive Plan compliance effort, the process would need to be integrated into the Board of County Commissioners deliberation.
3. Identify future needs, through 2025 – this is what is needed to accommodate planned population growth through 2025, while still maintaining LOS standards.
4. Identify projects (additional services and/or infrastructure) needed to accommodate identified future needs through 2025 needed to maintain LOS standards.
5. For projected needs within the next six years, develop a financial plan that identifies sources of funding to pay for those projects.

For facilities and services provided by entities other than the County, the County may incorporate their plans by reference, as long as they include all of the elements listed above; however, some of the service providers may not have adopted capital facility plans. For facilities and services provided by the County, the CFP would need to identify how the County would deliver what is needed. The following table summarizes the current status for each of the potential CFP elements.

CFP Element	Snoqualmie Pass	Ronald
Fire	Covered by Fire District 51 (Snoqualmie Pass), an all volunteer district. The plan for this district could be incorporated by reference into the County Comprehensive Plan (Snoqualmie Pass Fire & Rescue, 2007. Snoqualmie Pass Fire & Rescue Long Range Plan: 2006-2016. Snoqualmie Pass, WA. Adopted 13 August 2007). Coordination with the fire district and supplemental analysis is needed to determine if future projects are needed to accommodate additional future growth planned for the UGA.	Covered by Fire District 6 (Roslyn), an all volunteer district. The September 2009 “Assessment of Five County Areas for Land Use Designations” summarizes current facilities and general future facilities. Coordination with the fire district and supplemental analysis is needed to determine if future projects are needed to accommodate additional future growth planned for the UGA.
Police**	County is service provider. Analysis completed to date indicates that the average police response time in Snoqualmie Pass is over 40 minutes, and in Ronald is over 25 minutes. The County has the responsibility of determining the standard for adequacy of police service, and may opt to adopt a higher standard for urban areas. Supplemental analysis would be needed to determine future investments in staff or facilities needed to accommodate future demand. This requires additional effort beyond the analysis prepared to date.	
Parks and Recreation**	Provider may be a combination of County and other public or private agencies. LOS standards for parks and trails are identified in the Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Element.	
Schools	Snoqualmie Pass area is part of the Easton School District with a current enrollment of 89 students. Coordination with the school district and assessment would be needed to determine if capital plans are available and if future projects are needed to accommodate additional future growth planned for the UGA.	Ronald is part of the Roslyn-Cle Elum School District. The District has a needs analysis and has identified a need for additional facilities and a bond measure which has not passed to date. Coordination with the school district and supplemental analysis is needed to determine if future projects are needed to accommodate additional future growth planned for the UGA.
Stormwater**	The County is the provider. No standards have been adopted by the County. The County should consider incorporating by reference the Dept of Ecology Eastern Washington Stormwater Manual, or equivalent.	
Wastewater	Covered by the Snoqualmie Pass Utility District (SPUD). The County can incorporate by reference the plans developed by SPUD. SPUD is in the process of preparing an updated plan based on build-out conditions. County has already adopted an LOS standard for water and wastewater, which basically indicates that capacity must be available to accommodate all planned future growth. The UGA size may need to be adjusted to ensure that the land capacity is not greater than the future capacity that can be accommodated by water and sewer.	Covered by a combination of private and public providers with plans that have been approved by the state. The County can incorporate by reference the plans developed by these providers. County has already adopted an LOS standard for water and wastewater, which basically indicates that capacity must be available to accommodate all planned future growth. The UGA size may need to be adjusted to ensure that the land capacity is not greater than the future capacity that can be accommodated by water and sewer.
Water System		
Transportation	County is the provider. The existing Transportation Plan and 6-Year Transportation Improvement Plan can serve as the starting point for the transportation component of a CFP. County has already adopted an urban standard of LOS D (compared to a rural standard of LOS C) for transportation. Supplemental analysis would need to be done to make sure that existing and planned future transportation facilities are adequate to serve additional planned population that would result from a UGA designation. In addition, roads in urban areas typically have higher design standards than roads in rural areas – and typically include sidewalks. It is recommended that the County include in its CFP how urban design	

CFP Element	Snoqualmie Pass	Ronald
	standards would applied within UGAs	

**Element in which identification and adoption of an urban LOS standard is recommended.

Key Policy Questions

As outlined in the steps above, to support a UGA designation in Snoqualmie Pass or Ronald, a CFP would need to be developed, and could potentially indicate a need for additional capital facility investment. However, there are some fundamental policy questions that should be considered, before making a UGA recommendation:

- Based upon the County’s vision, are these areas where growth should be focused? Do you see them as small rural communities, tourist destinations, or urban areas?
- To date, the County has not been an urban service provider. Does the County want to be responsible for ensuring urban services are available?
- Does the County want to develop LOS standards for UGAs at this time?
- Does the County want to make a long-term commitment – planning, administration, and financial – to provide urban services in the UGAs?

If the answer to the first question is that the County does envision one or both areas as urban, and the answer to the other three questions is “yes”, then the steps outlined above to establish a capital facilities plan for urban areas should be initiated.

CFP for City of Kittitas UGA

Capital facilities analysis has been completed for the City of Kittitas UGA, as part of this compliance project. Three technical memorandums have been prepared:

- City of Kittitas Land Capacity Analysis Evaluation (ICF Jones & Stokes, September 24, 2009)
- City of Kittitas Capital Facilities Needs Analysis (Berk & Associates, September 21, 2009)
- City of Kittitas Transportation Assessment (ICF Jones & Stokes, September 24, 2009)

The latter two memorandums provide capital facilities assessments needed for the City of Kittitas. We recommend that the County incorporate these two documents by reference into its Comprehensive Plan. The Berk memorandum also identifies City of Kittitas policies related to its CFP that we also recommend be adopted as a subsection to the County CFP policies (this would be an addition to Attachment B of the October 26, 2009 staff recommendations report).