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SUBJECT: Ordinance adopting amendments to the Capital Facilities Chapter and Transportation Chapter of the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan.
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SUMMARY STATEMENT: Revising the Capital Facilities chapter of the Comprehensive Plan (chapter 4). Amendments include:

- Establishing specific level of service standards for roads in city urban growth areas.
- Referencing the transportation impact fee ordinance the County is in the process of formulating.
- Referencing the facilities master plan the County is in the process of formulating.
- Deleting an action item that the County should adopt by reference the capital facility plans of other jurisdictions.

Establishing level of service standards for roads in city urban growth areas in the Transportation chapter (chapter 6) consistent with the Capital Facilities chapter.

Note: The subject proposal is one of a number of comprehensive plan amendments initiated this year. In most cases, the County Council must consider these amendments concurrently so that the cumulative effect of the various proposals can be evaluated (RCW 36.70A.130). Capital facility amendments are exempt from the concurrent review provisions when adopted along with the County budget, but the subject proposal also includes related amendments to the transportation chapter, which are not exempt from concurrent review.
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ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE CAPITAL FACILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION CHAPTERS OF THE WHATCOM COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, The Growth Management Act requires counties and cities to review and, if needed, revise comprehensive plans to ensure continued compliance with the GMA (RCW 36.70A.130); and

WHEREAS, Review of the capital facilities chapter occurred in the 2004 review cycle; and

WHEREAS, Legal notice was published in the Bellingham Herald; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposal; and

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission has evaluated the proposed amendments and made modifications; and

WHEREAS, the County Council has considered the Planning Commission’s Findings of Fact & Reasons for Action, Conclusions and Recommendations.

The Council makes the following findings of fact and conclusions:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Notice of the Planning Commission hearing was posted on the County’s website on August 16, 2004.


3. A determination of non-significance was issued under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) on September 9, 2004.

5. Growth Management Act (GMA) planning goal # 12 is 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” (RCW 36.70A.020(12)).

6. The GMA requires that the Comprehensive Plan must include a capital facilities plan element (RCW 36.70A.070(3)). This element must consist of an inventory of existing capital facilities, a forecast of the future needs for capital facilities, the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities, and a six-year plan that will finance capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identify sources of public money for such purposes. It must also contain 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. Finally, park and recreation facilities must be included in the capital facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan.

7. County-Wide Planning Policy K-1 indicates that, as part of the comprehensive planning process, the County must identify appropriate land for public facilities that meets the needs of the community, including recreation, transportation and human service facilities.

8. The Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan was originally adopted in May of 1997. Since adoption, Whatcom County has updated inventories of existing County facilities and evaluated the need for future capital facilities based upon adopted level of service standards and new population projections. Based upon the identified capital facility needs, a Six-Year Capital Improvement Program for the years 2005 to 2010 has been formulated, to replace the existing Capital Improvement Program for the years 2003 to 2008.

9. The proposed six-year capital improvement program (2005-2010) contains an inventory of existing facilities, a forecast of future needs based upon the adopted level of service, proposed new capital facilities, costs and funding sources. Comprehensive Plan Policy 4A-4 addresses the GMA requirement to reassess the land use element of the Comprehensive Plan under certain circumstances. Parks and Recreation facilities are addressed in the Comprehensive Plan and the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program.


11. Whatcom County has several on-going and up-coming planning processes that will influence the development of future capital improvement programs. These include the County’s long-range facilities master plan and the update to the Parks & Recreation Open Space Plan.
12. The Lummi Island ferry did not meet the adopted level of service in the year 2000 and it would be difficult to meet the adopted level of service over the six-year planning period based upon current plans and operations. However, two planning documents will be prepared in the near future that will define how the level of service will be met: An update to the Lummi Island Subarea Plan (that will address planned land uses on the Island) and a Lummi Island 20-year Ferry Plan (that will address long-range ferry service to the Island).

13. The Growth Management Act requires counties to establish level of service (LOS) standards for locally owned transportation systems to gauge system performance. The existing level of service standard for city urban growth areas (UGAs) is ambiguous and open to interpretation. The Whatcom County Technical Advisory Committee recommended specific LOS standards for city UGAs after considering LOS standards for County unincorporated UGAs, LOS standards in city comprehensive plans, comments from city planning/engineering representatives, the fact that Bellingham is a larger city with more traffic and the desirability of a uniform LOS for smaller cities. Specific LOS standards should be established in the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan for city urban growth areas to aid evaluation of traffic impacts from future growth in these areas.

14. The Growth Management Act requires counties and cities to review and, if needed, revise comprehensive plans every seven years to ensure continued compliance with the GMA (RCW 36.70A.130).

15. Whatcom County has undertaken this seven-year review, evaluation and update in 2004 for the capital facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan. Whatcom County has identified the revisions shown on the attached exhibits, along with amendments to the six-year capital improvement program, to satisfy the mandatory capital facility provisions of the Growth Management Act.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The subject amendment is consistent with the Growth Management Act, County Wide Planning Policies, and Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan.

2. The subject amendment is consistent with the public interest because it plans for adequate capital facilities to serve the community and projected population growth.

3. The subject amendment complies with the approval criteria for comprehensive plan amendments of WCC 20.10.080.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Whatcom County Council that:

Section 1. Chapter 4 of the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan relating to capital facilities is hereby amended as shown on Exhibit A.

Section 2. Chapter 6 of the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan relating to transportation is hereby amended as shown on Exhibit B.

Section 3. Adjudication of invalidity of any of the sections, clauses, or provisions of this ordinance shall not affect or impair the validity of the ordinance as a whole or any part thereof other than the part so declared to be invalid.

ADOPTED this ______ day of ______, 2005

ATTEST:

WHATCOM COUNTY COUNCIL
WHATCOM COUNTY, WASHINGTON

APPROVED as to form:

Civil Deputy Prosecutor

 Date: 1-08-05

Pete Kremen, Executive
INTRODUCTION

Capital facilities as defined here, and for purposes of the plan, include all facilities owned by Whatcom County used directly or indirectly to serve the public interest. Those facilities typically have long useful lives, significant costs, and are not mobile. Whatcom County capital facilities include buildings, land, parks, and roads. Whereas some jurisdictions are also purveyors of public services such as water and sewer, Whatcom County currently is not and therefore has no capital facilities related to them.

Purpose

This chapter contains policies to guide Whatcom County in providing adequate public services within the county’s financial capability, and provides a unifying framework for facilities planning. It also establishes levels of service for county-owned and operated capital facilities. The cities and other public owners of capital facilities are encouraged to use the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan as a guide in preparing their own plans and capital improvement programs, particularly with respect to designated urban growth areas (UGAs).

Process

In 1991, the firm of Henderson, Young and Company (HYCo) was hired to obtain the necessary expertise in capital facilities planning to assist the county in preparing this chapter. Unlike most other chapters of this plan, Capital Facilities did not involve a citizen’s committee or a technical advisory committee per se. The functions assumed by committees for other chapters were not required for completion of this chapter. Methodology, however, was needed to bring together technical expertise concerning all county organizational divisions that manage the capital facilities of the county. HYCo provided that methodology. Department and division administrators have been called upon repeatedly to provide detailed information on existing facilities, levels of service, funding, projected improvements, and revenue sources. Through that process, they participated in the plan as an ad hoc technical committee. Because of the complexity of this topic, the County Council went through an exercise to establish preliminary levels of service after receiving recommendations from department heads. After review and input by the public, these preliminary levels of service were finalized.

HYCo was has been responsible for organizing the effort toward completion of this chapter in the original 1997 Comprehensive Plan, with much of the actual work performed by the Whatcom County Planning Division. This chapter was updated in 2004 as part of the seven-year review required under the Growth Management Act.
GMA Goals, County-Wide Planning Policies, and Visioning Community Value Statements

The goals, policies, and action plans in this chapter contribute to achievement of several of the GMA planning goals, including those considering urban growth, open space and recreation, and public facilities and services. The chapter has been written to satisfy those goals while also meeting the intent and requirements of the County-Wide Planning Policies (CWPP), and general guidelines of the Visioning Community Value Statements.

Although CWPPs do not separately address capital facilities, as defined in this chapter, they are addressed within a number of the policies. Policies requiring fiscal and physical ability to provide adequate public facilities, services, and infrastructure are satisfied in this chapter. The interlocal agreements specified in the policies must address reasonable criteria for annexation and ensure adequate public services including transportation, parks, administrative services and corrections facilities.

In relation to capital facilities, the Visioning Community Value Statements emphasize the importance of law enforcement, crime prevention, and other social services, as well as encourage retention and development of recreational opportunities.

Growth Management Goals, County-Wide Planning Policies, and Visioning Community Value Statements will be served by adoption of this chapter and implementation of its goals, policies, and action plans.

GMA Requirements

The Growth Management Act mandates that counties required to plan under the Act adopt comprehensive plans including an inventory of facilities, a forecast of future needs for such facilities, the proposed location and the capacities of expanded or new facilities, minimum levels of service of facility capacity, a six-year plan for financing those facilities with indication of sources for that funding, and a requirement to re-assess the Land Use chapter of this plan if there are funding shortfalls. The Land Use element must be consistent and coordinated with the capital facilities plan with respect to adopted minimum levels of service and adequacy of facilities to serve development. These Growth Management Act requirements are addressed in this chapter of the Comprehensive Plan and in the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program (Appendix F).

BACKGROUND SUMMARY

Once a level of service standard is established for a particular facility, then a cost can be assigned to achieve the desired level of service. The next step is to develop funding mechanisms to pay for the desired levels of service.

Levels of service for different facilities are defined differently. In this chapter, the level of service for most facilities is defined as a unit per population; for example, a fraction of a square foot of office space per capita or a number of jail beds or park acres per 1,000 population. The major exception is roads, for which level of service is measured as volume over capacity ratios, i.e. how many cars are anticipated to use a particular section of road (volume) divided by how many cars the road can theoretically accommodate over a specific period of time (capacity).
One of the major issues confronting Whatcom County in relation to capital facilities is the question of availability of revenue versus ability to provide services. While it is generally desirable to provide high levels of service for roads, law enforcement, and other essential services, costs for those services continue to rise and, generally, new or additional taxes are undesirable.

Whatcom County has kept additions to its capital facilities to a minimum over the past ten years (1994-2004) in order to contain the cost of government operations. Whatcom County has relied on a pay-as-you-go approach for funding capital expenditures under one million dollars. Large capital acquisitions have been financed with general obligation debt. The 2004 budget for debt service is $2,487,000, or two per cent of 2004 budgeted revenues of $114,635,799.

In recent years, Whatcom County has relied on a pay-as-you-go approach to financing its capital facility needs. As a result, the county's outstanding debt is very low. Just four percent ($1 million) of the county's 1999 budget was required to be set aside for debt retirement. This approach has placed the county on a sound financial footing, but has resulted in deferral of some major capital projects.

With current (1994) low interest rates and favorable bond rates, the county could make greater use of its bonding capability to address financing its facility needs. Total county 1994 debt service was approximately $2.4M for General Obligation debt and road improvement out of a total net cash income of about $61M.

Both revenue and general obligation bonds are available to the county for specific capital projects. Also, enterprise funds, such as those supporting solid waste can be used to retire revenue bond debt. User fees can also contribute to a revenue bonding approach.

**Rationale for proposed amendment:** The Finance Manager for Whatcom County recommended the above language in an e-mail of August 9, 2004 in order to update the capital facilities element to reflect the County’s current financial situation.

The GMA expressly authorizes cities and counties to impose impact fees on new development to help finance the capital facilities required to serve new development. This authorization applies only to parks, schools and transportation. Whatcom County is in the process of formulating a transportation impact fee ordinance in 2004. Certain background information that must be included in a capital facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan in order to collect transportation impact fees is included in Appendix G. Whatcom County has been assessing road mitigation payments as part of the SEPA process. This may be converted to a GMA-based impact fee program upon adoption of the county comprehensive plan. Under this new program, SEPA would no longer be used to assess fees associated with development other than as a measurement for costs of direct environmental impacts.

**Rationale for proposed amendment:** On July 1, 2004, the SEPA Official for Whatcom County indicated that there is not a standard system under SEPA for collecting mitigation fees. For large projects, road improvements are often required, but mitigation fees are not typically charged through the SEPA process. However, the County Council has given direction to develop a transportation impact fee program (see Ordinances 2003-012 and 2003-033). Additionally, the GMA requires that certain information must be included in a capital facilities element to collect impact fees. This information is provided in Appendix G of the Comp Plan.
If the desired level of service cannot be achieved without acquiring major debt, raising taxes beyond acceptable levels or establishing unacceptable impact fees, then the level of service standard must be adjusted, facility costs must be reduced, or growth must be curtailed until a balance is achieved. Adjusting land use to meet the ability to achieve desirable levels of service is one means of attaining concurrency. Concurrency, as required by the GMA, means that adequate facilities as defined by adopted levels of service are available at the time that the impacts of development occur or within a specified time thereafter. The GMA, at minimum, requires concurrency for transportation facilities. Concurrency is obviously desirable for all other capital facilities as well if the overall goal is to provide for new development while maintaining a quality of life that people desire. More detailed information is available in the following background documents: Whatcom County Financial Resource Projections for Growth Management and Whatcom County Financial Capacity Analysis for Capital Facilities and Capital Facility Requirements 1995-2000 and to 2014.

Rationale for proposed amendment: The Whatcom County Financial Capacity Analysis for Capital Facilities addressed revenues for the six-year period from 1996-2001. Since this period is past, it should be deleted from the list of referenced documents.

A September 1994 poll of County Council preferences for new revenue sources revealed a partiality, in order of preference, for grants, new sources, 0.1% criminal justice sales tax, impact fees, special purpose districts, and debt financing or bonds as sources for new revenue.

Rationale for proposed amendment: Only two of the members of the 1994 County Council remain on the current Council and 10 years has past since this poll was taken. Therefore, this text should be deleted (or updated to reflect the current Council’s priorities) because it represents an outdated expression of the legislature’s will.

ISSUES, GOALS, AND POLICIES

Adopted The general levels of service initially preferred by the County Council as of September 1994 are incorporated within the following goals, policies, and action plans.

GOAL 4A: Within the county's financial capacity, adopt a carefully planned program of county services and facilities.

Policy 4A-1: Establish appropriate level of service standards for county facilities commensurate with the ability of the county to fund them.

Policy 4A-2: Extend County facilities and services in a manner that supports future urban growth in urban growth areas (UGAs).

Policy 4A-3: Evaluate all types of facilities to determine whether they should be provided at county-wide, or strictly unincorporated levels of service. Transportation facility levels of service should be evaluated for appropriateness as to adopted urban or rural levels of service.
Policy 4A-4: The land use element of the comprehensive plan must be reassessed to ensure that land use is coordinated and consistent with the financing plan within the capital facilities element and to ensure probable funding does not fall short of meeting existing needs.

GOAL 4B: Develop a six-year financing program for capital facilities that meets the requirements of the GMA, achieves the county's levels-of-service, and is within financial capability as determined by projected financial resources.

Policy 4B-1: Maintain and update, on at least a biennial basis, a six-year capital improvement program (CIP) that identifies projects, outlines a schedule, and designates realistic funding sources for all county capital projects based on a review of population and revenue conditions existing at that time.

GOAL 4C: Locate county facilities which require urban infrastructure, serve primarily urban populations, and are urban in character within identified urban growth areas (UGAs).

Policy 4C-1: Evaluate all new capital facilities requiring a new site for urban characteristics and limit selection of sites for urban projects to designated UGAs.

GOAL 4D: Develop and implement a coordinated program of facility expansion for the departments and agencies which together carry out the county's law enforcement and corrections functions.

Policy 4D-1: Complete those capital improvement projects necessary to eliminate existing space deficiencies in law enforcement facilities including those created by passage of the 1994 DUI law.

Rationale for proposed amendment: In an e-mail message of July 2, 2004, the Chief of Corrections for the Whatcom County Jail recommended deleting the reference to the 1994 DUI law because "... there are actually a multiple of factors influencing the jail usage rate--biggest right now are 1) the domestic violence laws and 2) methamphetamine labs."

GOAL 4E: Develop and carry out a realistic long-range program of facility expansion or improvement to accommodate the county's projected staffing requirements for departments and agencies.

Policy 4E-1: Include in the facilities master plan review of the six-year CIP, a program of building and space improvements to efficiently provide quality work space for projected staffing levels through the year 2024.

Rationale for proposed amendment: The six-year CIP, by definition, only covers a six-year period of time. However, Whatcom County has contracted with HDR Engineering, Inc., Stewart + King Partnership, and the Omni-Group, Inc. to
perform master facilities planning for the County. Part of this planning effort, with oversight and review by the County Executive and County Council, is to create a 20-year plan for necessary buildings, facilities, and lands in Whatcom County.

Policy 4E-2: Investigate alternatives to Capital Facility construction through the private sector, and pursue technologically feasible alternatives.

GOAL 4F: Achieve level of service targets for park and recreational facilities identified in this chapter and which support objectives and priorities identified in the Comprehensive Park and Recreation Open Space Plan, in the Natural Heritage Plan, and in this plan.

Policy 4F-1: Seek non-capital opportunities to acquire, enhance and maintain park lands, trails, and other recreational facilities.

Policy 4F-2: Include acquisition and development costs in the six-year CIP for future trails projects.

Policy 4F-3: Develop a recreational facilities program that achieves and maintains the level of service for athletic fields and courts, trails, and support facilities for shoreline access, picnicking, and camping without adding to capital costs.

Policy 4F-4: Place a high priority on improvements to existing county recreational sites and facilities and using them to their full potential, including those outlined in the Whatcom County Comprehensive Park and Recreation Open Space Plan, before investing capital in the acquisition and development of new facilities.

Policy 4F-5: Continue to provide centers for use by senior citizens and others.

GOAL 4G: Establish levels of service for roads, parks, corrections, and administrative services.

Policy 4G-1: Adopt the following level of service (LOS) standards for transportation facilities:

- A volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.75 (LOS of C-minus) during p.m. peak hours for county arterials and collectors located outside of City UGAs.

Rationale for proposed amendment: This LOS applies to areas outside of all UGAs, not just city UGAs. Unincorporated UGAs such as Birch Bay, Cherry Point and Columbia Valley have an LOS of .8 (see next bullet). Therefore, this provision should be modified to reflect the fact that it does not apply within unincorporated UGAs.
• A volume-to-capacity ratio that offers a reasonable transition for roads located within City UGAs.

  **Rationale for proposed amendment:** Specific level of service standards are proposed for city UGAs below.

• A volume-to-capacity ratio of 0.8 (LOS of D) during p.m. peak hours for county arterials and collectors within County Unincorporated UGAs.

  **Rationale for proposed amendment:** The primary concern with congestion occurs during rush hour, which is represented by p.m. peak hour traffic. Additionally, measuring level of service during the p.m. peak hour in unincorporated UGAs (such as Birch Bay, Cherry Point and Columbia Valley) would be consistent with the method of measuring it for County roads in other parts of the County.

• The state has adopted an “index value” of 6 (equivalent to LOS C) for highways of state-wide significance in rural areas. An LOS of C has been established for other rural state routes in Whatcom County.

• The state has adopted an “index value” of 10 (equivalent to LOS D) for highways of state-wide significance in urban areas. An LOS of D has been adopted for other urban state routes in Whatcom County.

• A level of service for county arterials and collectors roads located within city urban growth areas shown below; consistent with those set by the city.
  
  o **All city UGAs** – A volume to capacity ratio of less than 0.9 during p.m. peak hours (equivalent to LOS D).

  **Rationale for proposed amendment:**

  (1) The Growth Management Act, at RCW 36.70A.070(6) requires counties to establish levels of service standards for locally owned transportation systems to gauge system performance. The existing levels of service for city UGAs is ambiguous and open to interpretation.

  (2) Additionally, the County Council requested the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to develop a transportation impact fee ordinance. Before the County can adopt an impact fee ordinance, the County must identify deficiencies in the existing transportation system and additional demands on the transportation system caused by future growth (RCW 82.02.050). In order to identify existing deficiencies and project future problem areas, a specific level of service must be adopted.
(3) In a letter of August 5, 2004, the TAC recommended LOS E for the City of Bellingham UGA and LOS D for all other city UGAs. The TAC considered LOS standards for County unincorporated UGAs, LOS standards in city comprehensive plans, comments from city planning/engineering representatives, the fact that Bellingham is a larger city with more traffic and the desirability of a uniform LOS for smaller cities. The Planning Commission modified the Bellingham UGA standard to LOS D.

- A level of service for arterials and collectors that is adequate to accommodate efficient transit service.

- 513 ferry passenger trips annually per capita Lummi Island population.

Policy 4G-2: Adopt the following level of service standards for park facilities:

- developed parks ........................................ 9.6 acres per 1,000 population
- trails ......................................................... 0.75 of a mile per 1,000 population
- activity centers ........................................ six centers per 100,000 population

Policy 4G-3: Adopt the following level of service for correction facilities:

- jails .............................................................. 1.42 beds per 1,000 population
- juvenile detention .................................... 0.165 beds per 1,000 population

Policy 4G-4: Adopt the following levels of service for administrative facilities:

- office space (unincorporated) ...................... 0.51 sq. ft. per capita
- maintenance & operations (unincorporated) ........ 0.41 sq. ft. per capita
- sheriff's office (unincorporated) ..................... 0.26 sq. ft. per capita
- office space (county-wide) ......................... 0.71 sq. ft. per capita
- sheriff emergency ops (county-wide) ............. 0.011 sq. ft. per capita

GOAL 4H: Coordinate with non-county facility providers such as cities and special purpose districts to support the future land use pattern promoted by this plan.

Policy 4H-1: Establish interagency planning mechanisms and interlocal agreements to assure coordinated and mutually supportive capital facility plans from special districts, cities, and other major non-county facility providers which are consistent with this and other chapters of the comprehensive plan.
GOAL 4J: Attain effective concurrency measures and procedures for all facilities and services necessary for development.

Policy 4J-1: Based on established levels of service for all road segments under control of the county, develop a concurrency management program that provides for consistent and predictable evaluation of the impacts of future proposed development.

GOAL 4K: Consider alternative funding sources to assure levels of service adopted in the plan.

Policy 4K-1: After all other financing options have been exhausted, consider the use of bonded indebtedness to finance major capital investments in infrastructure consistent with the discussion in the Capital Facilities Plan support document: Financial Resource Projections for Growth Management (Chapter 11).

Rationale for proposed amendment: Chapter 11 of the Comprehensive Plan is "Environment." The referenced document is not a chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy 4K-2: Identify and promote public private partnerships to provide and enhance the provision of necessary services.

GOAL 4L: Ensure that capital facilities provide protection for threatened and endangered fish and wildlife species.

Policy 4L-1: Fish and wildlife habitat should be carefully considered when selecting projects for the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program.

Policy 4L-2: Projects selected for the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program shall not degrade habitat for threatened and endangered species.

Policy 4L-3: Projects selected for the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program should strive to restore degraded habitat for threatened and endangered species, when the projects are in direct contact with such habitat. The County Council will determine when such restoration is financially feasible through adoption of the six-year capital improvement program and the County budget.
CAPITAL FACILITIES - ACTION PLAN

1. Adopt a county six-year CIP to meet the GMA specifications including concurrency and all other capital needs for the six-year financing program component of the capital facilities element.

2. Identify appropriate levels of long-term bonded debt to finance major capital investments in infrastructure.

3. Explore alternative funding sources as authorized under the GMA to help fund the cost of infrastructure expansions required to serve new development.

4. Establish a concurrency management or monitoring process for transportation and adequacy reviews of new development as an integral part of land use and building permit review.

5. Explore alternative funding techniques for law and justice facilities and operations, including contracts for service with other agencies, private providers, and joint use of facilities.

6. Analyze probable future staffing and space requirements in conjunction with the budget process and updating of the capital facilities plan.

7. Pursue acquisition strategies for resource conservancy and linear parks (trails) on an other than fee simple basis to reduce cost without significant reduction in public use/benefit potential.

8. Pursue joint ventures with cities, school districts, and other potential partners in developing regional athletic parks as recommended in the Comprehensive Park and Recreation Open Space Plan.

9. Work with special districts, cities, and other major non-county facility providers including water and sewer districts, fire districts, public utility districts and others as appropriate to establish levels of service for urban growth areas. This must be done in order to assure facilities adequate to provide for anticipated population growth and development consistent with land use plan designations and zoning.

10. Adopt by reference, the capital facilities plans of cities and special districts, including water and sewer districts, fire districts, public utility districts, and others as appropriate.

Rationale for proposed amendment: Staff consulted with a representative of the County’s Prosecuting Attorney’s office, who indicated that adoption of another jurisdiction’s capital facility plan would not have any legal effect. Therefore, in order to avoid unnecessary paperwork, staff is recommending that this action item should be deleted.

11. Explore alternative technology to create cost savings for capital facility needs.

12. Establish public/private partnership alternatives to capital financing.
EXHIBIT B
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GOAL 6A: Provide for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods.

Policy 6A-1: Make safety and mobility the primary considerations in ranking transportation improvements.

Policy 6A-2: Use the transportation planning process to identify transportation system needs throughout the county in order to provide adequate transportation facilities and services to meet current and future travel needs; identify and protect specific transportation corridors and alignments where transportation facilities including auto, commercial, bicycle, transit and rail are needed.

Policy 6A-3: Establish level of service "C" with a volume-to-capacity ratio of .75 during p.m. peak hours for county arterials and collectors located outside of city urban growth areas.

Policy 6A-4: Establish a level of service for county arterials and collectors located within city urban growth areas as shown below:

- All city UGAs – A volume to capacity ratio of less than 0.9 during p.m. peak hours (equivalent to LOS D).

Policy 6A-4: Establish levels of service for roads located within city urban growth areas that offer a reasonable transition with those set by the city.

Policy 6A-5: The state has established an "index value" of 6 (equivalent to LOS C) for highways of state-wide significance in rural areas. Establish level of service "C" for other rural state routes in Whatcom County. The state has established an "index value" of 10 (equivalent to LOS D) for highways of state-wide significance in urban areas. Establish level of service "D" for other urban state routes in Whatcom County.

Policy 6A-6: Level of service for arterials and collectors adopted by the plan are adequate to accommodate efficient transit service.

Policy 6A-7: Consider including intersection function in level of service definitions.

Policy 6A-8: Establish or maintain LOS "D" with a volume-to-capacity ratio of .8 during p.m. peak hours for county arterials and collectors within county unincorporated urban growth areas.