



11. CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

Note: This Chapter contains supporting inventory information as well as the following essential Comprehensive Plan components: Capital Facilities Plan; goals, objectives, and policies; and implementation strategies. Supporting information may be updated periodically for informational purposes by City staff as authorized by the City Council. Amendments to essential components would require formal Comprehensive Plan amendment by the City Council in accordance with City regulations.

CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The Capital Facilities Element is intended to assist the City of Kenmore and its officials make the financial decisions to ensure that the public facilities and services City residents rely on will continue to adequately support City residents today and into the future. The Capital Facilities Element places particular focus on those facilities that the City is responsible for funding. This Element contains a six-year plan for capital improvements that support the City of Kenmore's current and future population and economy. The six-year capital improvements described here must be fully funded.

Another purpose of the Capital Facilities Element is to respond to Growth Management Act requirements to provide a process to review the potential siting of uses typically difficult to locate in most communities due to environmental, economic, or social costs. This Element provides policies that would guide local permit and public review of essential public facilities.

Growth Management Act Requirements

The Growth Management Act (GMA) establishes many of the requirements of the capital facilities element. It establishes an overall goal to "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." The GMA requires that capital facilities element include an inventory of existing publicly owned capital facilities, a forecast for the future needs for new or expanded facilities, and a six-year plan to indicate from what sources the identified future facilities will be financed. The GMA defines public facilities to include roadways, street lighting, sidewalks, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, parks and recreational facilities, and schools. Public services are defined to include fire protection, law enforcement, public health, education, recreation, environmental protection, and other government services. The Capital Facilities Element is intended to provide a general assessment of major public services which impact land use issues, rather than a detailed analysis of every service provided by government.

Another key GMA requirement is to include a process for identifying and siting essential public facilities. Essential public facilities include "those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities and state or regional transportation facilities as defined in RCW 47.06.140, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, and group homes." No local comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public facilities.

Countywide Planning Policies

The King County Countywide Planning Policies include general policies regarding adequate infrastructure for planned development for those areas within the Urban Growth Boundary. Growth is to be directed to centers and urbanized areas with existing infrastructure capacity. Policies also include several policy statements regarding water and wastewater. In summary, the policies address regional coordination of water supplies, water conservation, alternate sewer treatment technologies and systems, and preference for urban water and sewer systems to serve new construction in the areas identified for growth within 10 years.

The King County Countywide Planning Policies indicate that public capital facilities of a Countywide or statewide nature should be sited to support the Countywide land use patterns, support economic activities, mitigate environmental impacts, provide amenities, and minimize public costs. The policies require the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor to establish a process by which jurisdictions can cooperatively site public capital facilities of a Countywide or statewide nature. The process, when developed, should address definitions, inventories, economic and other incentives, public involvement strategies, environmental protection, health and safety protection, and consideration of alternatives. To date, this regional cooperative siting process has not been developed by the Growth Management Planning Council.

Sound Fiscal Management

Planning for major capital facilities and their costs will enable the City of Kenmore to demonstrate the need for facilities and the need for revenues to pay for them. It will also allow the City to estimate the future operation/maintenance costs of new facilities that will impact the annual budget. Additionally, it will help the City to take advantage of sources of revenue (i.e., grants, fees, real estate excise taxes) that require a CFP to qualify for the revenue. Lastly, it will help the City get better ratings on bond issues when the City borrows money for capital facilities.

Eligibility for Grants and Loans

The State Department of Community Development's Public Works Trust Fund requires that local governments have a Capital Facilities Plan in order to be eligible for grants and loans. Some other grants and loans have similar requirements (i.e., Interagency for Outdoor Recreation or the Department of Ecology's Centennial Clean Water Fund), or give preference to jurisdictions that have a Plan.

INVENTORY/FORECAST FUTURE NEEDS

General

The inventory and forecast of needs required in the Capital Facility Element have been met in other Elements as follows:

- Existing and future needs for transportation facilities, **Chapter 6, Transportation Element**
- Domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, **Chapter 10, Utilities Element**
- Parks and recreational facilities, **Chapter 7, Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element**
- Government services including City, fire, police, human, library, and school services, **Chapter 9, Public Services Element**

The focus of this Element is to identify the capital facility costs and timeframes for at least 6 years to support the Comprehensive Plan.

Essential Public Facilities

Existing Essential Public Facilities

Within Kenmore today, there are several existing facilities that would qualify as "essential public facilities" including, but not limited to:

- Kenmore Air, a private seaplane base, which is considered a “public use airport” by the Washington State Aviation System Plan
- SR-522 – Bothell Way, a state transportation facility (classified as a Highway of Statewide Significance)
- Several adult family homes and group homes as described in **Chapter 5, Housing Element**.

Although not specifically listed in the definition of essential public facilities, regional water and wastewater facilities could be considered essential public facilities, since the definition lists examples and is not a definitive list. Examples of regional water and wastewater facilities include:

- The Seattle Public Utilities Tolt Pipeline No. 1 crossing the City of Kenmore from east to west.
- King County Department of Natural Resources, Wastewater Treatment Division operates regional facilities within Kenmore. These include the Kenmore Pump Station/Logboom Regulator System, Swamp Creek Trunk, and Kenmore Interceptor. The Kenmore Pump Station/Logboom Regulator System controls flows in the Kenmore Lakeline, a 48-inch diameter, five-mile long pipeline constructed in Lake Washington between Kenmore and Matthew’s Beach. This system conveys sewage from King County’s North Service Area to Matthews Beach Pump Station and from there to the West Point Treatment Plant. The Kenmore Interceptor is a 72-inch diameter sewer within Kenmore that enters the City from the east.

Planned Essential Public Facilities

The State of Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM) is required to maintain a list of those essential state public facilities that are required or likely to be built within the next six years. The OFM has implemented the GMA requirement by interpreting that the Governor’s “10-year Plan by County” meets the requirement. At the time of inventory preparation (Fall 1999), the 10-Year Plan for King County included no planned facilities in Kenmore.

Although no State facilities are planned in the next 10 years, regional wastewater facilities in particular will impact Kenmore. King County has planned the following improvements:

- King County currently has three projects planned to occur within Kenmore. The Swamp Creek Trunk Extension consists of extending the existing 36-inch Swamp Creek Trunk north along 73rd Avenue NE to the Snohomish County boundary to connect with the Alderwood Sewer District 36-inch trunk. The Northlake Interceptor is a tunnel to be constructed between the McAleer/Lyon Trunk and Kenmore to convey flows northward to the Kenmore Pump Station. An extension from this system would convey flows to the proposed new north end treatment plant. The County also is planning to upgrade the Kenmore Pump Station in terms of the emergency generator.
- In late 1999 the King County Council adopted an update to the Regional Wastewater Comprehensive Plan. This includes several major wastewater projects that will have varying impacts on Kenmore. Following is a list of major projects that could affect Kenmore:
 - A major new secondary wastewater treatment plant could be located somewhere in the Swamp Creek or North Creek basin.¹
 - A new large pump station will be built in the Kenmore area to convey wastewater to the new treatment plant either directly or through another pump station in the North Creek basin. In either case, a large force main will in all likelihood have to be built through Kenmore.

¹ For more information, refer to the King County web site at <http://dnr.metrokc.gov/wtd/rwsp/rwsp.htm>.

- A large tunnel will be constructed from the new wastewater treatment plant to transport treated waste to Puget Sound. There could be construction impacts affecting Kenmore.

All of these regional wastewater facility projects will have the potential of impacting the City of Kenmore and its citizens both during construction and during on-going operations. The City will need to arrive at an agreement with King County regarding mitigation of these impacts.

CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

This section addresses 6-year improvement plans for City facilities including City Hall, parks and recreation, surface water and transportation. For transportation, 20-year improvement plans including revenues are addressed. Projects and schedules in the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan will be annually updated as part of the City's annual budget process. The Element also incorporates by reference the 6-year capital facility plans for other agencies or special districts that provide water, wastewater, and school services. As the police and fire protection services have not identified capital facility needs (refer to **Chapter 9, Public Services Element**), these services will not be addressed in the Capital Facilities Element, but may be addressed in future updates to the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Agencies or special districts, in accordance with the provisions of the Growth Management Act, may need to update their Comprehensive Plans and/or 6-year capital improvement plans in order to be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

TABLE CF-A
GENERAL GOVERNMENT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS
CITY OF KENMORE AND KING COUNTY LIBRARY DISTRICT
(All numbers are times \$1,000)

PROJECT DETAIL	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
Level of Service Projects							
1. Library -10,000 sq. ft. (includes land, construction costs, and additional collection materials)							
Cost		5,000.0					5,000.0
Rev - Library Capital Facility Area (\$0.237/\$1,000 levy)		5,000.0					5,000.0
2. City Hall (new)							
Land	3,165.0						3,165.0
Cost		5,687.5	11,342.5				17,030.0
Rev – Capital Projects Fund	3,165.0	5,687.5	11,342.5				20,195.0
Non-Level of Service Projects							
SUMMARY OF COSTS & REVENUES							
COSTS:							
Level of Service Projects	3,165.0	10,687.5	11,342.5				25,195.0
Non-Level of Service Projects		0.0	0.0				0.0
Total Costs	3,165.0	10,687.5	11,342.5				25,195.0
COMMITTED REVENUES:							
Rev - Subtotal							
NEW REVENUES:							
Rev - Library Capital Facility Area		5,000.0					5,000.0
Rev - City Capital Project Funds	3,165.0	5,687.5	11,342.5				20,195.0
Total Revenues	3,165.0	10,687.5	11,342.5				25,195.0
BALANCE:	0.0	0.0	0.0				0.0

Source: City of Kenmore 2008 - 2013 CIP

Notes:

1. The cost figures above are interim, and based on planning studies that included more guidance on space programming and needs. The cost figures will be revised once sites and designs are known, and decisions are made on the form of parking. Basic assumptions above include a 22,000 sq. ft. facility with 50 stalls underground.
2. The library project is still in the early stage; this is the most current estimate.

TABLE CF-B²
LOCAL PARK AND RECREATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS
CITY OF KENMORE
(All numbers are times \$1,000)

PROJECT DETAIL	2007 (Year End)	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
Level of Service Projects							
1. Park Acquisition –(see City of Kenmore Parks and Recreation Master Plan). Cost @ \$520,000 per acre.							
Cost	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rev - Voter-App. Levy/Bond	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2. Trails Acquisition –(Right-of-way, easements, etc.)							
Cost	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rev-Voter-App. Levy/Bond	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. Tolt Pipeline Trail Development (73rd to 80th)							
Cost				150.0	350.0		500.0
Rev-Park Impact Fees				150.0			150.0
Rev-Municipal Capital Fund (REET)					350.0		350.0
4. Other Trail Development							
Cost	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rev-Voter-App. Levy/Bond	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Park Planning Master Plans: Portal Project							
Cost	0.0	25.0	25.0				50.0
Rev-Park Impact Fees	0.0	25.0	25.0				50.0
Non-Level of Service Projects							
6. Log Boom Park Improvements (Phase 2)							
Cost	70.0	280.0	1,250.0				1,600.0
Rev - Park Impact Fees			75.0				75.0
Rev – Municipal Capital Fund (REET)	70.0	280.0	1,175.0				1,525.0
7. Log Boom Park Restroom							
Cost	250.0						250.0
Rev - Park Impact Fees	50.0						50.0
Rev - Capital Projects Fund	200.0						200.0
8. Ballfields							
St. Edwards Park	60.0	940.0					1,000.0
Rev - Municipal Capital Fund (REET)	60.0	690.0					750.0
Rev – Grants		250.0					

² This table will be updated as appropriate at the time of the City Budget or other Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle to incorporate Parks and Recreation Master Plan capital improvement recommendations.

PROJECT DETAIL	2007 (Year End)	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
9. Wallace Sw Cr Park Imp							
Cost	30.0	270.0					300.0
Rev-Park Impact Fees	30.0	170.0					200.0
Rev-Municipal Capital Fund (REET)		100.0					100.0
10. Rhododendron Park Improvements							
Cost	75.0	625.0					700.0
Rev-Park Impact Fees	75.0						75.0
Rev-Municipal Capital Funds (REET)	25.0	600.0					625.0
11. Moorlands Park Improvements							
Cost	50.0	350.0					400.0
Rev-Park Impact Fees	50.0	250.0					300.0
Rev-Municipal Capital Fund (REET)		100.0					100.0
12. Northshore Summit Park							
Cost			200.0				200.0
Rev-Park Impact Fees			200.0				200.0
SUMMARY OF COSTS & REVENUES	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
COSTS:							
Planning	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Park Acquisition	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Trail Acquisition	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Trail Development	0.0	0.0	0.0	150.0	350.0	0.0	500.0
Park Development	535.0	2,465.0	1,450.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4,450.0
Total Costs	535.0	2,490.0	1,475.0	150.0	350.0	0.0	5,000.0
COMMITTED REVENUES:							
Rev – Municipal Capital Fund (REET)	155.0	1,770.0	1,175.0	0.0	350.0	0.0	3,450.0
Rev - Capital Project Fund	200.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	200.0
Grants		250.0					250.0
Rev - Park Impact Fee	205.0	445.0	300.0	150.0	0.0	0.0	1,100.0
Subtotal	560.0	2,465.0	1,475.0	150.0	350.0	0.0	5,000.0
NEW REVENUES:							
Rev	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Revenues	560.0	2,465.0	1,475.0	150.0	350.0	0.0	5,000.0
BALANCE	25.0	(25.0)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: City of Kenmore 2008-2013 CIP

TABLE CF-C
SURFACE WATER FACILITIES CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS
CITY OF KENMORE
(All numbers are times \$1,000)

PROJECT DETAIL	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007- 2020	TOTAL
Level of Service Projects								
1. Tightline to NE 193rd Place (NLW-P3)								
Cost	50.0							50.0
Rev - SWM Utility	50.0							50.0
2. Harbour Village sediment pond (NLW-P2)								
Cost		70.0	100.0					170.0
Rev - SWM Utility		70.0	100.0					170.0
3. 74th Ave NE at NE 160th St HDPE outfall (SR-P5)*								
Cost					10.0	50.0		60.0
Rev - SWM Utility					10.0	50.0		60.0
4. 36-inch tightline system for Trib. 0222 at Juanita Dr. (SLW-P1)								
Cost				70.0	70.0			140.0
Rev - SWM Utility				70.0	70.0			140.0
5. Juanita Drive & NE 163rd St storm drain (SR-P1A)								
Cost					20.0	50.0		70.0
Rev - SWM Utility					20.0	50.0		70.0
6. Wallace Park Stream bank failure (SC-A1)								
Cost	60.0							60.0
Rev - KC Mitigations	60.0							60.0
7. Sediment Pond Overflow Spillway & Channel (SC-B1)								
Cost	20.0	50.0						70.0
Rev - KC Mitigations	20.0	50.0						70.0
8. Berm to Protect Muck Creek from Swamp Creek Flows (SC-B2)								
Cost	20.0	60.0						80.0
Rev - KC Mitigations	20.0	60.0						80.0
9. Swamp Creek main channel improvements (SC-C2)								
Cost	70.0	300.0						370.0
Rev - KC Mitigations	70.0	300.0						370.0
10. Berm Along North Side of School Access Road (SC-C3)								
Cost	300.0	80.0						380.0
Rev - KC Mitigations	300.0	80.0						380.0
11. Replace 73rd Avenue Bridge with 100 foot span (SC-C5)								
Cost	800.0	1,500.0	1,500.0					3,800.0
Rev - KC Mitigations	800.0	1,500.0	1,500.0					3,800.0

PROJECT DETAIL	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007- 2020	TOTAL
12. Elevate police parking and Park & Ride access road (SC-E2)								
Cost			390.0					390.0
Rev - KC Mitigations			390.0					390.0
13. Berming for properties east of Park & Ride (SC-E3)								
Cost			90.0					90.0
Rev - KC Mitigations			90.0					90.0
14. Remove debris jam in wetland #3, restore channel (SC-G1)								
Cost	40.0	160.0						200.0
Rev - KC Mitigations	40.0	160.0						200.0
15. Woody Debris Removal Structure (SC-G2)								
Cost	40.0	160.0						200.0
Rev - KC Mitigations	40.0	160.0						200.0
16. Muck Creek culverts (SC-H1)								
Cost	20.0	70.0						90.0
Rev - KC Mitigations	20.0	70.0						90.0
17. Replace NUD Culverts (SC-H2)								
Cost	20.0	220.0						240.0
Rev - KC Mitigations	20.0	220.0						240.0
18. Raise 73rd Ave NE at Muck Creek (SC-I1)								
Cost	60.0		480.0					540.0
Rev - KC Mitigations	60.0		480.0					540.0
19. Water quality retrofit for Bothell Way (NLW-WQ1)								
Cost							780.0	780.0
Rev - To be determined							780.0	780.0
20. Water quality retrofit for Bothell Way (SC-WQ1)								
Cost							650.0	650.0
Rev - To be determined							650.0	650.0
21. Water quality retrofit for Bothell Way & downtown (SR-WQ1)								
Cost							1,780.0	1,780.0
Rev - To be determined							1,780.0	1,780.0
22. Water quality retrofit for Juanita Drive (SR-WQ2)								
Cost							580.0	580.0
Rev - To be determined							580.0	580.0
Non-Level of Service Projects								

SUMMARY OF COSTS & REVENUES	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007-2020	TOTAL
COSTS:								
Level of Service Projects	1,500.0	2,670.0	2,560.0	70.0	100.0	100.0	3,790.0	10,790.0
Non-Level of Service Projects								
Total Costs	<u>1,500.0</u>	<u>2,670.0</u>	<u>2,560.0</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>3,790.0</u>	<u>10,790.0</u>
COMMITTED REVENUES:								
Rev - KC Mitigations Subtotal	1,450.0	2,600.0	2,460.0					6,510.0
NEW REVENUES:								
Rev - SWM Utility	50.0	70.0	100.0	70.0	100.0	100.0		490.0
Rev - To be determined Subtotal	50.0	70.0	100.0	70.0	100.0	100.0	3,790.0	4,280.0
Total Revenues	<u>1,500.0</u>	<u>2,670.0</u>	<u>2,560.0</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>3,790.0</u>	<u>10,790.0</u>
BALANCE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Note: *Continued monitoring and assessment recommended prior to implementing this solution.

Source: Final Surface Water Management Plan, 2001

TABLE CF-D.1 – TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

#	PROJECT	FROM	TO	DESCRIPTION	PURPOSE	ESTIMATED COST	FULLY FUNDED IN 2007 TIP	POSTPONE TO 2023 OR BEYOND	FEDERAL GRANT	STATE GRANT	OTHER AGENCY	ANTICIPATED AGENCY	IMPACT FEE	STREET FRONT NEW DEVELOPMENT	PETITION/LID LOCAL PROPERTY OWNER	DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTION AND/OR LATE COMERS AGREEMENT	OTHER CITY FUNDS
1	73 rd Ave. NE	181 st St. NE	181 st St. NE	New Signal	LOS	\$397,000	\$397,000										
2	Simonds Road NE	84 th Ave. NE	84 th Ave. NE	New Signal & Intersection	LOS	\$2,830,000				\$500,000					\$2,330,000		
3	Simonds Road NE	92 nd Ave. NE	92 nd Ave. NE	New Signal & Intersection	LOS	\$1,330,000				\$500,000					\$830,000		
4	61 st Ave. NE	NE 181 st St.	NE 181 st St.	New Signal & Intersection	LOS	\$1,330,000				\$500,000			\$202,588				\$627,412
5	61 st Ave. NE	NE 193 rd St.	NE 193 rd St.	Roundabout or Signal	LOS	\$1,710,000				\$500,000					\$1,210,000		
6A	Juanita Drive Stage One	NE 170 th St.	NE 155 th Place	Reconstruction with Bicycle Lanes, Sidewalks & Intersection Improvements	Capacity & Safety	\$5,600,00				\$2,500,000			\$1,720,994				\$1,379,000
6B	Juanita Drive Stage Two	NE 155 th Place	South City Limits	Reconstruction with Bicycle Lanes, Sidewalks & Intersection Improvements	Capacity & Safety	\$5,000,000				\$2,500,000			\$1,352,207				\$1,147,793
7	68 th Ave. NE	NE 185 th St.	61 st Place NE	Sidewalk	Mobility	\$7,700,000		\$7,700,000									
8	SR 522 Phase 1, Stage 1	65 th Ave. NE	73 rd Ave. NE	Reconstruction, Medians, intersections	Safety & Operational Improvements	\$21,270,000	\$21,270,000										
9	SR 522 Phase 1, Stage 2	65 th Ave. NE	West City Limits	Reconstruction, medians, intersections	Safety & Operational Improvements	\$23,056,000			\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$14,663,225	WSDOT	\$1,392,775				
10	SR 522 Phase 1, Stage 3	73 rd Ave. NE	73 rd Ave. NE	Burke Gilman Trail Underpass	Safety & Mobility	\$5,751,000	\$5,751,000										
11	SR 522 Phase II	73 rd Ave. NE	East City Limits	Reconstruction, Medians, BAT Lanes, Intersections	Capacity & Safety	\$27,960,000	\$27,960,000										
12	NE 185 th LID	68 th Ave. NE	73 rd Ave. NE	New Street	Connectivity	\$14,060,000								\$14,060,000			
13	61 st Ave. NE	NE 181 st St.	North City Limits	Widening	Capacity	\$12,980,000				\$4,500,000	\$3,318,083	Snohomish County Mitigation	\$3,172,722				\$1,989,195
14	NE 181 st St.	73 rd Ave. NE	65 th Ave. NE	Widening	Capacity	\$13,610,000				\$2,000,000			\$5,705,532			\$5,904,468	
15	LakePointe Way NE	65 th Ave. NE	68 th Ave. NE	Extension	LOS & Capacity	\$20,560,000			\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000			\$8,110,768			\$7,949,232	
16	LakePointe Way NE	68 th Ave. NE	73 rd Ave. NE	Extension	LOS\Capacity	\$25,090,000			\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000			\$12,655,442			\$7,934,558	

#	PROJECT	FROM	TO	DESCRIPTION	PURPOSE	ESTIMATED COST	FULLY FUNDED IN 2007 TIP	POSTPONE TO 2023 OR BEYOND	FEDERAL GRANT	STATE GRANT	OTHER AGENCY	ANTICIPATED AGENCY	IMPACT FEE	STREET FRONT NEW DEVELOPMENT	PETITION/LID LOCAL PROPERTY OWNER	DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTION AND/OR LATE COMERS AGREEMENT	OTHER CITY FUNDS
17	65 th Ave. NE	SR 522	NE 181 st St.	Widening	Capacity	\$2,320,000				\$750,000			\$704,649				\$865,351
18	73 rd Ave. NE	NE 181 st St.	SR 522	Widening	Capacity	In SR 522											
19	NE 145 th St.	75 th Ave. NE	78 th Ave. NE	New Street	Connectivity	\$5,020,000								\$5,020,000			
20	80 th Ave. NE	SR 522	North City Limits	Widening	Capacity	\$17,090,000		\$17,090,000									
21	68 th Ave. NE	NE 175 th St.	LakePointe Way	Turn Lane	Improve Access to LakePointe	\$990,000										\$990,000	
22	Inglemoor H.S.	Entrance		North Bound Right Turn Lane	Remove Right Turns from Through Lane	\$540,000					\$540,000	School District					
23	68 th Ave. NE	NE 175 th St.	Sammamish River	Add North Bound Lane	Capacity	\$3,100,000				\$2,400,000			\$370,581				\$1,729,419
24	NE 181 st St.	65 th Ave. NE	61 st Ave. NE	Widening	Capacity	\$7,270,000							\$710,967	\$6,559,033			
25	NE 175 th St.	68 th Ave. NE	68 th Ave. NE	Remove Signal & Prohibit Left Turns	LOS	\$220,000											\$220,000
26	Pedestrian Overpass 522 SR	Near 68 th Ave. NE		Construct Overpass	Improve Pedestrian Operations	\$3,000,000				\$150,000	\$2,850,000	Sound Transit					
Total						\$229,784,000	\$55,378,000	\$24,790,000	\$6,500,000	\$24,900,000	\$21,371,308		\$36,099,225	\$25,639,033	\$4,370,000	\$22,778,258	\$7,958,176

TABLE CF-D.2 – SIX-YEAR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

CF-D.2: Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)							
<u>Sources of Funds</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2009 - 2014 Total</u>
City Sources							
Motor Fuel Tax	\$ 450,265	\$ 454,768	\$ 459,315	\$ 463,908	\$ 468,548	\$ 473,233	\$ 2,770,037
SWM Fund (ROW Maintenance)	\$ 288,444	\$ 299,982	\$ 311,981	\$ 324,460	\$ 337,439	\$ 350,936	\$ 1,913,242
Real Estate Excise Tax	\$ 3,290,000	\$ 909,000	\$ 568,090	\$ 927,271	\$ 936,544	\$ 945,909	\$ 7,576,814
General Fund	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 3,000,000
Interest Income	\$ 96,800	\$ 96,800	\$ 96,800	\$ 96,800	\$ 96,800	\$ 96,800	\$ 580,800
Impact Fee Revenue	\$ 429,609	\$ 451,089	\$ 910,000	\$ 1,088,724	\$ 1,302,549	\$ 1,558,370	\$ 5,740,342
One Time SWM Fund Contribution to Juanita (1/2 in this stage)					\$ 500,000		\$ 500,000
Arts Fund, Transfer In	\$ 130,300						\$ 130,300
Total - City Sources	\$ 5,185,418	\$ 2,711,639	\$ 2,846,186	\$ 3,401,164	\$ 4,141,879	\$ 3,925,249	\$ 22,211,535
Non-City Sources - Committed							
Grants, SR 522 Phase 1	\$ 2,638,462	\$ 8,012,833	\$ 9,833,818	\$ 110,000			\$ 20,595,113
WSDOT SR 522 Asphalt Overlay - Phase I		\$ 221,566					\$ 221,566
Total Non-City Sources - Committed	\$ 2,638,462	\$ 8,234,399	\$ 9,833,818	\$ 110,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,816,679
Total Committed Sources	\$ 7,823,880	\$ 10,946,038	\$ 12,680,004	\$ 3,511,164	\$ 4,141,879	\$ 3,925,249	\$ 43,028,214
Non-City Sources - Not As Yet Committed							
TIB Grant, 68th Ave. NE, 175th St. to Slough*	\$ 2,400,000						\$ 2,400,000
TIB Grant, 61st Ave NE & NE 181st Street Intersection			\$ 500,000				\$ 500,000
TIB Grant, SR 522 Phase One, Stage 2					\$ 3,500,000		\$ 3,500,000
TIB Grant, Juanita Drive NE 170th St. to NE 155th Place						\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000
STP Grant, SR 522, Phase One, Stage 2				\$ 3,500,000			\$ 3,500,000
WSDOT Agency Contribution, SR 522 Phase One, Stage 2				\$ 4,600,000	\$ 4,600,000	\$ 4,590,000	\$ 13,790,000
Total Non-City Sources - Not As Yet Committed	\$ 2,400,000	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ 8,100,000	\$ 8,100,000	\$ 7,090,000	\$ 26,190,000
Total - Non-City Sources	\$ 5,038,462	\$ 8,234,399	\$ 10,333,818	\$ 8,210,000	\$ 8,100,000	\$ 7,090,000	\$ 47,006,679
Total All Sources	\$ 10,223,880	\$ 10,946,038	\$ 13,180,004	\$ 11,611,164	\$ 12,241,879	\$ 11,015,249	\$ 69,218,214
Operating Expenses							
Personnel Costs	\$ 150,390	\$ 159,390	\$ 168,970	\$ 179,110	\$ 189,860	\$ 201,252	\$ 1,048,972
Commodities & Equipment	\$ 23,850	\$ 24,570	\$ 25,310	\$ 26,070	\$ 26,850	\$ 27,656	\$ 154,306
Overlay Program	\$ 607,000	\$ 364,140	\$ 371,423	\$ 378,851	\$ 386,428	\$ 394,157	\$ 2,501,999
King County	\$ 197,600	\$ 205,504	\$ 213,344	\$ 221,878	\$ 230,753	\$ 239,983	\$ 1,309,062
Lake Forest Park	\$ 447,006	\$ 469,356	\$ 492,824	\$ 517,465	\$ 543,338	\$ 570,505	\$ 3,040,494
Other Services	\$ 197,248	\$ 205,138	\$ 213,344	\$ 221,878	\$ 230,753	\$ 239,983	\$ 1,308,344
Transfer to General Fund	\$ 32,400	\$ 34,020	\$ 35,721	\$ 37,507	\$ 39,382	\$ -	\$ 179,030
Equipment & Added Maintenance for SR 522	\$ 62,100	\$ 64,000	\$ 66,000	\$ 66,000	\$ 66,000	\$ 66,000	\$ 390,100
Total Operating Expenses	\$ 1,717,594	\$ 1,526,118	\$ 1,586,936	\$ 1,648,759	\$ 1,713,364	\$ 1,739,536	\$ 9,932,307
Total Revenue - Operating Expenses	\$ 8,506,286	\$ 9,419,920	\$ 11,593,068	\$ 9,962,405	\$ 10,528,515	\$ 9,275,713	\$ 59,285,907
Project List							
Project List	Total Project Cost	Previous Years Expenditures					
SR 522 Transfer to Arts Fund	\$ 130,300	\$ -	\$ 130,300				\$ 130,300
SR522 Phase I Corridor Impr. w/ undergrounding	\$23,513,606	\$ 1,173,533	\$ 2,995,199	\$ 9,341,056	\$ 9,893,818	\$ 110,000	\$ 22,340,073
SR522 Phase II Corridor Impr. w/ undergrounding	\$ 27,725,232	\$ 26,470,838	\$ 1,246,749	\$ 7,645			\$ 1,254,394
68th Ave NE, NE 175th St. - Sammamish Slough	\$ 3,100,000	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 2,100,000			\$ 3,100,000
61st Ave NE & NE 181st St. - Intersection Improvement	\$ 1,330,000	\$ -	\$ 250,000	\$ 1,080,000			\$ 1,330,000
SR 522 Phase One, Stage 2	\$ 23,056,000	\$ -			\$ 2,250,000	\$ 9,891,000	\$ 23,056,000
Juanita Drive NE 170th St. to NE 155th Place (Stage One)	\$ 6,135,700	\$ 535,700			\$ 775,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 5,600,000
Total All Projects	\$ 84,860,538	\$ 28,180,071	\$ 5,372,248	\$ 11,698,701	\$ 10,973,818	\$ 3,135,000	\$ 10,191,000
Revenue-Projects	\$ 3,134,038	\$ (2,278,781)	\$ 619,250	\$ 6,827,405	\$ 337,515	\$ (6,164,287)	\$ 2,475,140
TIP Ending Year Balance	\$ 3,134,038	\$ 855,257	\$ 1,474,507	\$ 8,301,912	\$ 8,639,427	\$ 2,475,140	

December 1, 2008

* A \$1 million dollar grant was included in the impact fee calculation; Otak assisted with a \$2.4 million application.

TABLE CF-E
SCHOOL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS IN KENMORE
NORTHSHORE SCHOOL DISTRICT
(All numbers are times \$1,000)

PROJECT DETAIL	2005- 2006	2006- 2007	2007- 2008	2008- 2009	2009- 2010	2010- 2011	TOTAL
Level of Service Projects							
1. Cottage Lake Modernization							
Cost	500.0						500.0
Rev – Bond Issue	100.0						500.0
2. Bothell High Modernization Phase II							
Cost		500.0					500.0
Rev - Bond Issue		500.0					500.0
3. Canyon Creek Modernization							
Cost				100.0	6,175.0		6,275.0
Rev - Bond Issue				100.0	6,175.0		6,275.0
4. Fernwood Modernization							
Cost				100.0	6,175.0		6,275.0
Rev - Bond Issue				100.0	6,175.0		6,275.0
5. Canyon Park Jr. High Modernization Phase II							
Cost	14,100.0	2,000.0					16,100.0
Rev – Bond Issue	14,100.0	2,000.0					16,100.0
6. Kenmore Jr. High Modernization Phase II							
Cost			100.0	9,000.0	4,900.0		14,000.0
Rev – Bond Issue			100.0	9,000.0	4,900.0		14,000.0
7. Bothell High Modernization Phase III							
Cost	3,000.0	30,000.0	2,000.0				35,000.0
Rev – Bond Issue	3,000.0	30,000.0	2,000.0				35,000.0
8. Woodinville High Modernization Phase I							
Cost			100.0	8,900.0	9,000.0		18,000.0
Rev – Bond Issue			100.0	8,900.0	9,000.0		18,000.0
9. Woodinville High Modernization Phase II							

PROJECT DETAIL	2005- 2006	2006- 2007	2007- 2008	2008- 2009	2009- 2010	2010- 2011	TOTAL
Cost						2,000.0	2,000.0
Rev – Bond Issue						2,000.0	2,000.0
10. Secondary Academy for Success (SAS)							
Cost		7,000.0	1,000.0				
Rev		7,000.0*	1,000.0*				
11. Transportation Center (New Construction)							
Cost	500.0	10,000.0	4,500.0				
Rev	500.0*	10,000.0*	4,500.0*				
12. Building Improvement Program							
Cost		2,937.5		2,937.5	2,937.5	2,937.5	11,750.0
Rev		2,937.5		2,937.5	2,937.5	2,937.5	11,750.0
13. Small Works							
Cost	883.3	883.3	883.3	883.3	883.3	883.3	529.9
Rev	883.3	883.3	883.3	883.3	883.3	883.3	529.9
14. Technology							
Cost	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	6,000.0
Rev	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	1,000.0	6,000.0
15. Fields							
Cost	1,750.0	900.0	700.0	800.0	800.0	800.0	5,750.0
Rev	1,750.0*	900.0*	700.0	800.0	800.0	800.0	5,750.0
16. Code Compliance/ Safety/ Security/ Energy							
Cost		600.0	600.0	600.0	600.0	600.0	3,000.0
Rev		600.0	600.0	600.0	600.0	600.0	3,000.0
17. Site Purchase							
Cost	8,000.0*	2,000.0					10,000.0
Rev	8,000.0*	2,000.0					10,000.0
18. Overhead							
Cost	528.3	528.3	528.3	528.3	528.3	528.3	3,170.0
Rev	528.3	528.3	528.3	528.3	528.3	528.3	3,170.0
19. Bond Expense							
Cost	830.0			400.0			1,230.0
Rev	830.0			400.0			1,230.0
20. Special Projects							
Cost	1,000.0*	1,000.0*	1,000.0*	1,000.0*	1,000.0*	1,000.0*	6,000.0*
Rev	1,000.0*	1,000.0*	1,000.0*	1,000.0*	1,000.0*	1,000.0*	6,000.0*

SUMMARY OF COSTS & REVENUES	2005- 2006	2006- 2007	2007- 2008	2008- 2009	2009- 2010	2010- 2011	TOTAL
COSTS:							
Level of Service Projects	32,591.7	58,849.2	12,411.7	26,249.2	33,999.2	9,749.2	173,850.2
Non-Level of Service Projects							
Total Costs	32,591.7	58,849.2	12,411.7	26,249.2	33,999.2	9,749.2	173,850.2
COMMITTED REVENUES:							
Rev - Bond Issue	32,591.7	58,849.2	12,411.7	26,249.2	33,999.2	9,749.2	173,850.2
Subtotal	32,591.7	58,849.2	12,411.7	26,249.2	33,999.2	9,749.2	173,850.2
NEW REVENUES:							
Rev - Bond Issue	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Revenues	32,591.7	58,849.2	12,411.7	26,249.2	33,999.2	9,749.2	173,850.2
BALANCE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: Northshore School District 2006 Capital Facilities Plan

TABLE CF-F
SCHOOL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS IN KENMORE AREA
LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
(All numbers are times \$1,000)

PROJECT DETAIL	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	TOTAL
Level of Service Projects							
1. Mod - Rose Hill							
Elementary							
Cost	14,481.2						14,481.2
Rev - State Schools	1,493.4						1,493.4
Funding							
Rev - Bond Issue	12,987.8						12,987.8
2. New - Rosa Parks							
Elementary							
Cost	18,137.3						18,137.3
Rev - State Schools	1,100.0						1,100.0
Funding							
Rev - Bond Issue	10,537.3						10,537.3
Rev -	6,500.0						6,500.0
Impact/Mitigation							
3. Addition - Inglewood							
Junior High							
Cost	7,625.0						7,625.0
Rev - State Schools	5,231.03						5,231.03
Funding							
Rev -	2,393.97						2,393.97
Impact/Mitigation							
4. New - Sammamish							
Plateau Elementary							
Cost			20,072.25				20,072.25
Rev - Bond Issue			17,072.25				17,072.25
Rev -			3,000.0				3,000.0
Impact/.Mitigation							
5. Mod - Frost							
Elementary							
Cost				21,342.21			21,342.21
Rev - Bond Issue				19,742.21			19,742.21
Rev - State Schools				1,600.0			1,600.0
Funding							
6. Mod - Finn Hill Jr.							
Cost					52,607.06		52,607.06
Rev - Bond Issues					49,607.06		49,607.06
Rev - State Schools					3,000.0		3,000.0
Funding							
7. Mod - Muir							
Elementary							
Cost					22,807.14		22,807.14

PROJECT DETAIL	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	TOTAL
Rev - Bond Issues					21,107.14		21,107.14
Rev - State Schools Funding					1,700.0		1,700.0
8. Mod - Lake Washington High Cost						87,708.06	87,708.06
Rev - Bond Issues						81,108.06	81,108.06
Rev - State Schools Funding						6,000.0	6,000.0
9. New - Redmond Ridge East Elem Cost						29,289.6	29,289.6
Rev - Bond Issues						19,289.6	19,289.6
Rev - Impact/.Mitigation						10,000.0	10,000.0
10. Mod - Rush Elementary Cost						23,917.66	23,917.66
Rev - Bond Issues						22,117.66	22,117.66
Rev - State Schools Funding						1,800.0	1,800.0
SUMMARY OF COSTS & REVENUES	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	TOTAL
COSTS:							
Total Costs	40,243.6	0.0	20,072.25	21,342.21	75,414.19	140,915.3	297,387.57
COMMITTED REVENUES:							
Rev - State Schools Funding Subtotal	2,593.47			1,600.0	4,700.0	7,800.0	16,693.47
	2,593.47			1,600.0	4,700.0	7,800.0	16,693.47
NEW REVENUES:							
Rev - Bond Issue	28,756.16		17,072.25	19,742.21	70,714.2	122,515.32	258,800.14
Rev - Impact/.Mitigation Subtotal	8,893.97		3,000.0			10,000.0	21,893.97
	37,650.13		20,072.25	19,742.21	70,714.2	132,515.32	280,694.11
Total Revenues	40,243.6	0.0	20,072.25	21,342.21	75,414.2	140,315.32	297,387.58
BALANCE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: Lake Washington School District #414, Six Year Capital Facilities Plan 2006-2011

TABLE CF-G
WATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS
NORTHSHORE UTILITY DISTRICT
(All numbers are times \$1,000)

PROJECT DETAIL	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
Non-Level of Service Projects							
1. Repair & Replacement							
Cost	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	3,000.0
Rev	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	500.0	3,000.0
2. LFP Reservoir – Seismic and Operational Analysis							
Cost	500.0						500.0
Rev	500.0						500.0
3. Distribution System Seismic and Operational Analysis							
Cost		125.0					125.0
Rev		125.0					125.0
4. Booster Station Seismic Rehab Evaluation							
Cost			300.0				300.0
Rev			300.0				300.0
5. Leak Detection Study							
Cost				70.0			70.0
Rev				70.0			70.0
SUMMARY OF COSTS & REVENUES	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
COSTS:							
Level of Service Projects	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-Level of Service Projects	1,000.0	625.0	800.0	570.0	500.0	500.0	3,995.0
Total Costs	1,000.0	625.0	800.0	570.0	500.0	500.0	3,995.0
COMMITTED REVENUES:							
Rev	1,000.0	625.0	800.0	570.0	500.0	500.0	3,995.0
Subtotal	1,000.0	625.0	800.0	570.0	500.0	500.0	3,995.0
NEW REVENUES:							
Rev - PWTF	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Revenues	1,000.0	625.0	800.0	570.0	500.0	500.0	3,995.0
BALANCE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: Northshore Utility District, 2006 Water System Comprehensive Plan (Excerpted from 2007-2012 timeframe).

TABLE CF-H
WASTEWATER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS
NORTHSHORE UTILITY DISTRICT
(All numbers are times \$1,000)

PROJECT DETAIL	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
Non-Level of Service Projects							
1. 118/72 Sewer							
Cost	695.5						695.5
Rev	695.5						695.5
2. 68/HPD Sewer							
Cost	239.1						239.1
Rev	239.1						239.1
3. 186/80 Sewer							
Cost	66.2						66.2
Rev	66.2						66.2
4. Tolt/91 Sewer							
Cost	208.1						208.1
Rev	208.1						208.1
5. 134/108 Sewer							
Cost		819.1					819.1
Rev		819.1					819.1
6. 165/77 Sewer							
Cost		84.6					84.6
Rev		84.6					84.6
7. 147/Simonds Sewer							
Cost		85.8					85.8
Rev		85.8					85.8
8. 144/123 Sewer							
Cost		225.0					225.0
Rev		225.0					225.0
9. 120/89 Sewer							
Cost			693.6				693.6
Rev			693.6				693.6
10. 175/89 Sewer							
Cost			89.7				89.7
Rev			89.7				89.7
11. 178/86 Sewer							
Cost			178.0				178.0
Rev			178.0				178.0
12. 204/80 Sewer							
Cost			246.6				246.6
Rev			246.6				246.6
13. 117/82 Sewer							
Cost				476.4			476.4
Rev				476.4			476.4

PROJECT DETAIL	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
14. 159/82 Sewer							
Cost				165.4			165.4
Rev				165.4			165.4
15. 133/88 Sewer							
Cost				389.0			389.0
Rev				389.0			389.0
16. 156/74 Sewer							
Cost				141.9			141.9
Rev				141.9			141.9
17. 132/68 Sewer							
Cost					113.3		113.3
Rev					113.3		113.3
18. 110/85 Sewer							
Cost					437.7		437.7
Rev					437.7		437.7
19. 163/74 Sewer							
Cost					715.7		715.7
Rev					715.7		715.7
20. 124/68 Sewer							
Cost						483.1	483.1
Rev						483.1	483.1
21. 152/105 Sewer							
Cost						732.8	732.8
Rev						732.8	732.8
SUMMARY OF COSTS & REVENUES							
COSTS:							
Level of Service Projects	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-Level of Service Projects	1,208.9	1,214.5	1,207.9	1,172.7	1,266.7	1,215.9	7,286.6
Total Costs	1,208.9	1,214.5	1,207.9	1,172.7	1,266.7	1,215.9	7,286.6
COMMITTED REVENUES (includes Connection fees, Connection Svc. Fees, and PWTF):							
Rev	1,208.9	1,214.5	1,207.9	1,172.7	1,266.7	1,215.9	7,286.6
NEW REVENUES:							
Rev -PWTF	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Subtotal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Revenues	1,208.9	1,214.5	1,207.9	1,172.7	1,266.7	1,215.9	7,286.6
BALANCE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: Northshore Utility District, 2006 Wastewater System Comprehensive Plan (CFP projects are excerpted from 2006 Plan for the 2007 – 2012 time frame).

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

Following are the goals, objectives and policies addressing capital facility planning and financing. These are applicable to Kenmore as well as to other agencies planning public capital facilities and services in Kenmore.

GOAL 52. ESTABLISH APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF SERVICE FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES TO ADEQUATELY SERVE EXISTING AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT.

Objective 52.1 Identify and define types of public facilities.

Policy CF-52.1.1 Maintain an inventory of existing public facilities owned or operated by the City, County, State, special districts, or other public entities within Kenmore. Include in the inventory the locations and capacities of such facilities and systems. "Public facilities" means the capital improvements and systems of each of the following:

General

- City of Kenmore:
General Government
Law enforcement
Local parks and recreation services
Stormwater
Streets
- City of Seattle
Regional water supply
- Metropolitan King County
Regional parks and recreation services
Regional sewer service
Transit
- State of Washington
State parks and recreation services
SR-522

Special District

- Northshore Fire District 16
- Northshore Utility District
Local water service
Local sewer service
- Northshore School District
- Lake Washington School District
- King County Library System
- Sound Transit

Objective 52.2 **Establish standards for levels of service for each public facility, and determine what additional public facilities are needed in order to achieve and maintain the desired quality of life and vision for the City of Kenmore.**

Policy CF-52.2.1 Establish level of service standards which 1) measure the quality of life based on the City’s vision of its future and values, 2) can be achieved and maintained for existing development and growth anticipated in the land use plan, and 3) are achievable with the financing plan of this Capital Facilities Element.

CITY-OWNED PUBLIC FACILITIES	
Facility	Standard
General Government Services	0.63 square feet per capita (assumes 22,000 square foot facility serving growth in City and Joint Planning Area)
Local Parks	Levels of service consistent with adopted City of Kenmore Park and Recreation Master Plan
Police Services	Provide a level of service of 0.89 officers per 1,000 residents. (Based upon level of service upon incorporation including 9 deputies and support services.)
Surface Water	Conveyance - minimum 25 year design storm implemented in accordance with the Surface Water Management Plan
Streets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Arterials shall be LOS “E” or better (except SR-522 – see State of Washington below); • Minor Arterials shall be LOS “D” or better; and • Collectors shall be LOS “C” or better.

PUBLIC FACILITIES PROVIDED BY OTHERS	
Facility	Standard
King County Metro	
Transit	<p>High medium urban density standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service to activity centers or urban centers via transit hub, including Park and Ride lots. • Circulation within neighborhoods • Transfer connections to other neighborhoods • Span of service 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. • Weekday peak service frequency: 30 minutes or better, also express service • Weekday off-peak service frequency: 30 minutes or better • 90 percent of the population should have less than a 0.5 mile to walk.

PUBLIC FACILITIES PROVIDED BY OTHERS	
Facility	Standard
Northshore Fire District 16	1 firefighter per 900 persons (year 2001 ratio) Meet State/Federal guidelines for minimum number of firefighters at scene of an emergency without reliance on automatic aid
Northshore Utility District	
Water	90 gallons per capita per day
Wastewater	74 gallons per capita per day
Northshore School District	Average students per class room (see Table PS-G)
Lake Washington School District	Maximum class room size (see Table PS-K)
King County Library System	0.32 square feet per capita (assumes 10,000 square feet serving future growth in City limits)
State of Washington	
SR-522	Monitoring LOS: LOS D – Mitigated Concurrency LOS: Not required as a Highway of Statewide Significance

Policy CF-52.2.2 Use the level of service standards to 1) determine the need for public facilities and 2) test the adequacy of such facilities to serve proposed development. In addition, use the level of service standards for city-owned public facilities to develop the City’s annual budget and 6-year Capital Improvements Program.

Policy CF-52.2.3 Reassess the Capital Facility Element annually to ensure that public facilities needs, financing, and level of service are consistent with the land use plan. The annual update should be coordinated with the annual budget process, and the annual amendment of the Comprehensive Plan.

GOAL 53. PROVIDE ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILITIES CONCURRENT WITH THE IMPACT OF NEW DEVELOPMENT.

Objective 53.1 Provide a variety of responses to the demands of growth on capital facilities.

Policy CF-53.1.1 Ensure City public facilities and services are provided concurrent with the impact of new development or redevelopment, including stormwater, roads, and local parks. Require that non-City public facilities are provided concurrent with the impact of new development or redevelopment including, water and sewer. Consistent with the Growth Management Act, road improvements may be provided at the time of or within 6-years of development. Local parkland to serve new development may be in place at the time of or within 6-years of development.

- Policy CF-53.1.2 Make the most efficient use of existing public facilities, including techniques such as:
- Conservation
 - Demand management
 - Improved scheduling
 - Encourage development that uses existing facilities
 - Contracting for services
 - Other methods of improved efficiency.
- Policy CF-53.1.3 Provide additional public facility capacity when existing facilities are used to their maximum level of efficiency consistent with adopted standards for levels of service.
- Policy CF-53.1.4 Encourage development where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.

GOAL 54. COORDINATE CAPITAL FACILITY PLANS WITH STATE, COUNTY, AND LOCAL AGENCIES AND DISTRICTS.

Objective 54.1 Coordinate the land use planning and decisions with plans for public facility capital improvements.

- Policy CF-54.1.1 Coordinate with non-City providers of public facilities on a joint program for maintaining adopted levels of service standards, funding, and construction of capital improvements. Work in partnership with non-City public facility providers to prepare functional plans consistent with the City of Kenmore Comprehensive Plan as provided in Objective 2.7 and associated policies in the Land Use Element.
- Policy CF-54.1.2 Establish interagency planning mechanisms to assure coordinated and mutually supportive capital facility plans from non-City providers of public facilities.
- a. Establish priority areas for infrastructure improvements consistent with the City's vision as provided in Policy LU-2.4.1.
 - b. Annually assess development trends and infrastructure provision to identify and remedy deficiencies or need to reassess the land use plan as provided in Policy LU-2.4.2.

GOAL 55. MAINTAIN A SIX-YEAR CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN TO IMPLEMENT THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Objective 55.1 Annually develop a six-year Capital Facilities Plan to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy CF-55.1.1 Prepare and utilize the six-year Capital Facilities Plan to identify City capital projects and Special District capital projects necessary to respond to the planned growth of the community and maintain desired levels of service.

Policy CF-55.1.2 Prepare and utilize the six-year Capital Facilities Plan to integrate all of the community's capital project resources such as grants, bonds, city funds, donations, impact fees and other available funding.

Policy CF-55.1.3 Maintain the Capital Facilities Plan as follows:

- a. Provide for annual review of the Capital Facilities Plan contained in this Capital Facilities Element by the City Council and incorporate a citizen participation process.
- b. Ensure that the Capital Facilities Plan:
 - Is consistent with the overall Comprehensive Plan
 - Defines the projects' need and links to levels of service and facility plans
 - Includes construction costs, timing, and funding sources, and considers operations and maintenance impacts where appropriate
 - Establishes priorities for capital project development
 - Incorporates or adopts by reference annual updates of the Northshore School District Capital Facilities Plan, Lake Washington School District Capital Facilities Plan if appropriate, Northshore Utility District water and sewer plans, and Northshore Fire District 16 facility plans if any.

GOAL 56. PREPARE AND MAINTAIN A CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN THAT IS FULLY FUNDED AND FINANCIALLY FEASIBLE.

Objective 56.1 Establish mechanisms to ensure that the required public facilities are financially feasible.

Policy CF-56.1.1 Base the financing plan for public facilities on realistic estimates of current local revenues and external revenues that are reasonably anticipated to be received by the City.

Policy CF-56.1.2 Finance the six-year Capital Improvements Program within the City's financial capacity to achieve a balance between available revenue and needed public facilities. If the projected funding is inadequate to finance needed public facilities based on adopted level of service standards and forecasted growth, the City could do one or more of the following:

- Lower the level of service standard
- Change the Land Use Plan
- Increase the amount of revenue from existing sources
- Adopt new sources of revenue

Objective 56.2 **Establish mechanisms to ensure that the required public facilities are fully funded.**

Policy CF-56.2.1 Match revenue sources to capital improvements on the basis of sound fiscal policies.

Policy CF-56.2.2 Revise the financing plan in the event that revenue sources for capital improvements, which require voter approval in a local referendum, are not approved.

Policy CF-56.2.3 Ensure that the ongoing operating and maintenance costs of a public facility are financially feasible prior to constructing the facility.

GOAL 57. ENSURE GROWTH PAYS PROPORTIONATE COSTS OF CAPITAL FACILITIES REQUIRED TO SERVE THE GROWTH

Objective 57.1 **Ensure existing and future development pay for the costs of needed capital improvements.**

Policy CF-57.1.1 Ensure that existing development pays for capital improvements that reduce or eliminate existing deficiencies, and pays for some or all of the cost to replace obsolete or worn out facilities. Existing development may also pay a portion of the cost of capital improvements needed by future development. Existing development's payments may take the form of user fees, charges for services, special assessments, and taxes.

Policy CF-57.1.2 Ensure that future development pays a proportionate share of the cost of new facilities that it requires. Future development may also pay a portion of the cost to replace obsolete or worn-out facilities. Future development's payments may take the form of voluntary contributions for the benefit of any public facility, impact fees, mitigation payments, capacity fees, dedications of land, provision of public facilities, and future payments of users fees, charges for services, special assessments, and taxes.

GOAL 58. LOCATE AND DESIGN CAPITAL FACILITIES TO REALIZE THE VISION STATEMENT, AND TO BE COMPATIBLE WITH SURROUNDING LAND USES AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

Objective 58.1 Promote capital facilities that protect the public health, safety and welfare, and that serve as models for function, design, and environmental protection.

- Policy CF-58.1.1 Consider the quality of public facilities in planning for capital improvements.
- Ensure that public facilities design meets appropriate policies in the Community Design Sub-Element, complies with City design standards, and is compatible with the surrounding areas.
 - Maintain public spaces and enhance their appearance.
- Policy CF-58.1.2 Encourage public amenities and facilities which serve as catalysts for beneficial development.
- Policy CF-58.1.3 Protect public health and environmental quality through the appropriate design and installation of public facilities.
- Promote conservation of energy, water, and other natural resources in the location and design of public facilities.
 - Practice efficient and environmentally responsible maintenance and operating procedures for public facilities.
 - Preserve existing significant natural vegetation and features in the development of public facilities.

GOAL 59. ENSURE COMPARABLE LEVELS OF SERVICE ARE PROVIDED IN POTENTIAL ANNEXATION AREAS.

Objective 59.1 Coordinate with service providers in adjacent cities and unincorporated areas.

- Policy CF-59.1.1 Regularly coordinate with King County, Snohomish County, Lake Forest Park, Bothell, and Kirkland to ensure levels of service for facilities and services are compatible, such as roads, surface water, and others.
- Policy CF-59.1.2 If Joint Study Areas identified in the Land Use Element become Potential Annexation Areas, ensure that appropriate levels of service are established consistent with Policy LU-2.8.3.

GOAL 60. ALLOW FOR THE APPROPRIATE SITING OF ESSENTIAL PUBLIC CAPITAL FACILITIES OF A STATE-WIDE OR COUNTY-WIDE NATURE.

OBJECTIVE 60.1 Participate in a cooperative inter-jurisdictional approach to the siting of essential public facilities in accordance with the King County Countywide Planning Policies. The approach shall address definitions, inventories, incentives, compensation, public involvement, environmental protection, and alternative sites analysis.

Policy CF-60.1.1 Identify essential public facilities based upon the Growth Management Act, State Office of Financial Management list of essential public facilities required or likely to be built, King County Countywide Planning Policies, and any City lists which may be developed.

Policy CF-60.1.2 Classify a facility as an essential public facility if it has one or more of the following characteristics:

- a. The facility meets the Growth Management Act definition of an essential public facility;
- b. The facility is on a State, County or City list of essential public facilities;
- c. The facility serves a significant portion of the County or metropolitan region or is part of a Countywide service system; or
- d. The facility is the sole existing facility in the County for providing that essential public service.

OBJECTIVE 60.2 Establish a local public review and permit process for essential public facilities.

Policy CF-60.2.1 Require a siting analysis for proposed new or expansions to existing essential public facilities consisting of the following:

- a. An inventory of similar existing essential public facilities in King County and neighboring counties, including their locations and capacities;
- b. A forecast of the future needs for the essential public facility, and definition of a logical service area;
- c. An analysis of the potential social and economic benefits to jurisdictions receiving or surrounding the facilities;
- d. An analysis of environmental, social, and economic impacts, including mitigation, of any existing essential public facility, as well as of any new site(s) under consideration as an alternative to expansion of an existing facility;
- e. An analysis of alternatives to the facility, including decentralization, conservation, demand management and other strategies;
- f. Consideration of any applicable prior review conducted by a public agency, local government, or citizen's group.

- g. An analysis of the consistency with Comprehensive Plan policies and designations; and,
- h. Consideration of other standards and criteria as outlined in the King County Countywide Planning Policies and other locally defined plans and ordinances.

Policy CF-60.2.2 Require a public process by which citizens have a reasonable opportunity to participate in the site selection process.

Policy CF-60.2.3 Siting criteria for essential public facilities which are not difficult to site should provide for site design and buffering techniques to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses, and enable the facility to be permitted outright in appropriate zoning classifications whenever feasible.

Policy CF-60.2.4 Work with King County and other municipalities to standardize review procedures and criteria for the siting of Statewide and Countywide essential public facilities and incorporate these procedures within interlocal agreements.

OBJECTIVE 60.3 Cooperate regionally to ensure appropriate and equitable siting of essential public facilities.

Policy CF-60.3.1 Encourage the State and County to site essential public facilities equitably among communities. No single community should absorb an inequitable share of these facilities and their impacts. Siting should consider environmental equity and environmental, economic, technical, and service area factors. The net impact of siting new essential public facilities should be weighted against the net impact of expansion of existing essential public facilities, with appropriate buffering and mitigation.

Policy CF-60.3.2 Participate in a cooperative interjurisdictional approach to the siting of essential public facilities in accordance with the King County Countywide Planning Policies. Joint planning agreements should be sought where appropriate.

OBJECTIVE 60.4 Seek to mitigate disproportionate financial burdens to the City due to the siting of essential public facilities.

Policy CF-60.4.1 Through joint planning or interlocal agreements, the City should seek to mitigate disproportionate financial burdens due to the siting of essential public facilities

Policy CF-60.4.2 Seek amenities or incentives for neighborhoods in which the facilities are located, and require compensation for adverse impacts.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Overview

The primary means of implementing the Capital Facilities Element will be the application of level of service and concurrency standards to new development, and the maintenance of a 6-Year Capital Facilities Plan (contained in the Element). These would require amendments of existing regulations or preparation of new regulations. The steps the City will consider in preparing and implementing development regulations and Capital Facility Element amendments are described more fully below.

Specific Implementation Suggestions

Review of Applications for Development Permits

The City will amend its land development regulations to provide for a system of review of various applications for development permits which, if approved, would impact the levels of service of certain public facilities. Such system of review would assure that development permits are not issued if there would be a reduction in the levels of service below the standards adopted in Policies CF-52.2.1 and CF-53.1.1 for certain public facilities (e.g. stormwater, roads, parks, water, and sewer).

The amended land development regulations would address the circumstances under which applicants may provide public facilities to mitigate the adverse effects of development proposals. Applicants for development permits may offer to provide public facilities at the applicant's own expense in order to insure sufficient capacity of certain public facilities. The City may issue development permits subject to the provision of public facilities. Two criteria for providing public facilities are described below for consideration in amending land development regulations:

- A. The City and the applicant enter into an enforceable development agreement which shall provide, at a minimum, a schedule for construction of the public facilities and mechanisms for monitoring to insure that the public facilities are completed concurrent with the impacts of the development, or the development will not be allowed to proceed.
- B. The public facilities to be provided by the applicant are contained in the schedule of capital improvements of the Comprehensive Plan and will achieve and maintain the adopted standard for levels of service concurrent with the impacts of development.

Impact Fees

Impact fee ordinances will be prepared to require the same standard for the level of service as is required by Policy CF-52.2.1 for City Facilities including parks and streets. In coordination with the school Districts (Northshore School District, and Lake Washington School District if appropriate), the City may continue to require impact fees for schools. As needed, the City will investigate appropriate mitigation for fire protection services within the limitations of SEPA and GMA.

Concurrency Implementation and Monitoring System

The City will establish and maintain Concurrency Implementation and Monitoring Systems. The Systems would address the following components:

- A. **Annual Report on the Capacity and Levels of Service of Public Facilities.** The report would summarize the actual capacity of public facilities compared to the standards for levels of service adopted in Policy CF-52.2.1, and forecast the capacity of public facilities for each of the six succeeding fiscal years. Capacity forecasts would specifically be made for items subject to concurrency tests listed in Policy CF-53.1.1 (i.e. stormwater, roads, parks, water, and sewer). The forecast would be based on the most recently updated schedule of capital improvements in the Capital Facilities Element. As needed, the City would coordinate with the Northshore Utility District to utilize their reports about capital facilities, forecasts, or other relevant information related to sewer and water. The annual report would provide the initial determination of the capacity and levels of service of public facilities for the purpose of issuing development permits during the 12 months following completion of the annual report. Each application would be analyzed separately for concurrency, as described in B, below.

- B. Public Facility Capacity Review of Development Applications.** The City will use the procedures specified in paragraph A, above, to enforce the requirements of Policy 53.1.1 at the time each application for development. Records would be maintained during each fiscal year to indicate the cumulative impacts of all development permits approved during the fiscal year-to-date on the capacity of public facilities as set forth in the most recent annual report on capacity and levels of service of public facilities.

The land development regulations of the City may provide that applications for development permits that are denied because of insufficient capacity of public facilities may be resubmitted after a time period to be specified in the land development regulations. Such time period would be in lieu of, and not in addition to, other minimum waiting periods imposed on applications for development permits that are denied for reasons other than lack of capacity of public facilities. Land development regulations may require that development commence within a specified time after a development permit is issued, or the development permit would expire, subject to reasonable extensions of time based on criteria included in the regulations.

- C. Review of Changes to Planned Capacity of Public Facilities.** The City will review each amendment to this Capital Improvement Element, in particular any changes in standards for levels of service and changes in the schedule of capital improvements, in order to enforce the requirements of Policy CF-53.1.1.

- D. Concurrency Implementation Strategies.** The City will annually review the concurrency implementation strategies that are developed to implement Policy CF-53.1.1 of this Capital Facilities Element. Such strategies may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (1) Standards for levels of service may be phased to reflect the City's financial ability to increase public facility capacity, and resulting levels of service, from year to year. Standards for levels of service may be phased to specific fiscal years in order to provide clear, unambiguous standards for issuance of development permits. Phased standards will appear in Policy CF-52.2.1.
- (2) Standards for levels of service may be applied according to the timing of the impacts of development on public facilities. Final development permits, which impact public facilities in a matter of months, are issued subject to the availability of public facilities prior to the issuance of the building permit (except transportation or park facilities which must be available within 6 years of the final development permit).

Preliminary development permits may be issued subject to public facility capacity, but the capacity determination would expire unless the applicant provides financial assurances to the City and obtains subsequent development permits before the expiration of the initial development permit. As an alternative, the determination of public facility capacity for preliminary development permits can be waived with an agreement that a capacity determination must be made prior to issuance of any final development permit for the subject property. Such a waiver specifically would preclude the acquisition of rights to a final development permit as a result of the issuance of the preliminary development permit.

- E. Capacity of Public Facilities for Development Permits Issued Prior to Adoption of the Plan.** The City may "reserve" capacity of public facilities for development permits for proposed development projects already "in the pipeline" that were issued by the City prior to the adoption of this Comprehensive Plan.

The City would recognize legitimate and substantial vested development rights obtained with some previous development permits. The City would identify properties, which have vested development rights pursuant to procedures to be adopted in the land development regulations. Properties not identified by the City as having vested development rights may petition for a determination of such rights.

The City would reserve capacity of public facilities to serve the needs of properties with vested development rights. In the event that there is not sufficient capacity to serve the vested properties, the City could create a "lien" on future capacity of public facilities in order to serve the vested property at the adopted level of service standard before allowing non-vested property to use future public facility capacity. In such circumstances, the vested development will be allowed to commence in order to avoid a "taking" of the vested rights.

The City intends to require vested properties to commence development and to continue in good faith in order to maintain the "reservation" of capacity of public facilities which are provided by the City. The City also intends to evaluate the timing and estimated density/intensity of vested properties in order to phase the reservation of capacity to meet the probable needs of such properties. Experience indicates that some vested development permits are not used to the maximum allowable uses, densities or intensities, or reach such development limits over extended periods of time.

The City may determine that it is not necessary to automatically "reserve" capacity of public facilities for non-vested development permits issued prior to the adoption of the plan. Such development permits should be subject to the concurrency requirement. The City finds that the population forecasts that are the basis for this plan are a reasonable prediction of the absorption rate for development, and that the capital facilities which are planned to serve the forecast development are available for that absorption rate. Reserving public facility capacity for non-vested previously issued development permits would deny new applicants access to public facilities, and would arbitrarily enhance the value of dormant development permits.

Contractor Performance System

The City may consider developing a system of monitoring the actual performance of contractors who design and/or construct public facilities for the City. The monitoring system would track such items as actual vs. planned time schedule and actual vs. bid cost. The performances of contractors would then be considered when the City awards contracts for public facilities.

Annual Budget

The City's annual budget will include in its capital appropriations all projects in the schedule of capital improvements that are planned for expenditure during the subsequent fiscal year.

Update of Capital Facilities Element

The Capital Facilities Element will be reviewed and updated annually in accordance with Policy CF-55.1.3. Portions of the Capital Facility Element that may be amended include, but are not limited to:

- Revision of population projections
- Update of inventory of public facilities
- Update of costs of public facilities

- Update of public facilities requirements analysis (actual levels of service compared to adopted standards)
- Update of revenue forecasts
- Revise and develop capital improvements projects for the next six fiscal years
- Update analysis of financial capacity
- Amendments to levels of service standards, capital projects, and/or the financing plan sources of revenue.

Evaluation Reports

Evaluation reports will address the implementation of the goals and policies of the Capital Facilities Element. The monitoring procedures necessary to enable the completion of evaluation include:

- A. Review of Annual Reports of the Concurrency Implementation and Monitoring System.
- B. Review of Annual Updates of this Capital Facilities Plan, including updated supporting documents.

Essential Public Facilities

The City of Kenmore will need to prepare specific regulations regarding the review of essential public facilities that may be sited in Kenmore. The regulations may differentiate between those that are particularly difficult to site and those that are less difficult to site. The City may also wish to participate with the Growth Management Planning Council in the formulation of more specific Countywide Planning Policies that have not yet been prepared.

REFERENCES

- City of Kenmore (March 2001). Final 2001 Surface Water Management Plan. Prepared by Kato & Warren, Inc.
- King County Growth Management Planning Council (December 31, 1995). Countywide Planning Policies. Seattle, WA.
- Lake Washington School District No. 414 (June 5, 2000). Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan: 2000-2005. Redmond, WA.
- Northshore School District No. 417 (May 23, 2000). 2000 Capital Facilities Plan. Bothell, WA.
- Northshore Utility District (January 2000). 2000 Water System Comprehensive Plan. Prepared by Gray and Osborne, Inc.
- Northshore Utility District (March 2000). 2000 Wastewater Comprehensive Plan. Prepared by Gray and Osborne, Inc.

