



AIRWAY HEIGHTS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

1.0 Introduction

The City of Airway Heights is expected to grow from 4,840 to roughly 9,556 people by the year 2026. This means that an additional 1,987 households will generate a corresponding demand for expanded public facilities and services. This demand presents both major short and long term facility and financial implications for the City and its residents. While this growth will stimulate the local economy and maintain a diverse and vibrant community, it will also generate a corresponding demand for new public services and facilities, such as schools, parks and streets. These new facilities, and the financial implications they will have for Airway Heights and its residents are the subject of this capital improvement plan (CIP or Plan).

The state Growth Management Act (GMA) requires communities to plan for capital facilities to ensure there is an adequate level of facilities and services in place to support development at the time of occupancy or use. The overall goal is to ensure that new development does not exceed a jurisdiction's ability to pay for needed facilities or that new development does not decrease current service levels below locally established minimum standards. The capital improvement plan is a long range financial planning tool that allows the City to prioritize public projects and identify adequate funding sources. This serves as a guide to the City's financial commitment to providing those facilities desired by the community.

The CIP will be updated as part of the annual budget process, thereby ensuring most current growth and capital facilities information are used in accordance with levels of service and the City's concurrency plan. It is anticipated the City will fully implement this policy with the annual budget process. The CIP is directly tied to the Capital Facilities Plan which is housed in chapter 6 of the City comprehensive plan.

1.1 Purpose

The CIP is used to implement the comprehensive plan. It includes a list of public facility projects that are needed, when they may be funded and from what revenue sources these might be funded.

The process of developing a CIP includes identifying the capital facilities and other services needed to support the anticipated land use and development in the City. A vital part of the CIP is to determine whether sufficient revenues will be available to finance needed facilities and services. This involves balancing three different elements into a coordinated system of planning.

In the process, projects in the CIP are evaluated first on land use, then financial capability and last for services and facilities level of service (LOS). First, land use involves not only the consideration of how much development might occur, but also the timing and location of this development. This future commitment as established in a land use plan, determines the amount of public facilities that will be needed to provide any given level of service.

Second, these facilities must be financed. If there is not enough financing to meet these commitments, then a strategy is needed to achieve a balance. The City could reduce the future land use commitment by changing the amount of development planned or the timing of future development.

Third, once total needs to support the comprehensive plan are identified, it may become necessary to identify a more realistic list of potential needs. Often this may be achieved by reducing the levels of service. This may then be further refined to fit within available financing. Since this is a 20-year list of projects, it needs to be further narrowed to a list of projects that can be accomplished within six years. This six-year list of projects forms the basis for the annual budget.

The CIP will assist decision-makers in planning for the future of the community by prioritizing projects, allocating resources and identifying improvements to accommodate future residents, City improvements and land use decisions for the City.

1.2 GMA Requirements

The GMA requires that the City and the County include projects in the CIP only when there is a reasonable expectation that sufficient funding will be available. As required by the GMA, the CIP element includes:

- An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by the City, showing the locations and capacities of the facilities;
- A forecast of the future needs for the capital facilities;
- The proposed location and capacities of expanded or new facilities;
- A six-year plan to finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identified sources of public money for such purposes;
- Policies 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 element and financing plan within the capital facilities element are coordinated and consistent.

1.3 Capital Improvement Plan

This Plan is not a wish list, but a Plan to balance facility needs against comprehensive plan requirements, LOS standards and available funding resources. This means better coordination between land use planning and capital facilities planning, and between services demanded by the public and actual dollars available to provide them. Growing urbanization needs and demands compete for fewer funds and policy makers must balance conflicting policy priorities. Policy makers face two important questions:

- What can we really afford?
- What yields when two or more community policy priorities conflict with each other?

For the purposes of this CIP, the City addresses improvements of a relatively large scale, non-reoccurring high cost project and those that involve multi-year financing. Major capital facilities projects included in this Plan tend to cost more than \$25,000, have a life expectancy of more than 10 years and result in additions to multiple improvement expenditures addressed in the City's annual budget process.

1.4 LOS Standards

LOS standards are an indicator of the amount, extent or quality of public facilities or services that are provided to the community. They are a summary of existing or desired public service conditions. Typically, measures of LOS are expressed as ratios of capacity to demand.

Each facility's LOS is measured using a standard specific to that facility type. For example, police LOS standards rely on an annual average call for service standard to determine the community's current and future police needs.

The City uses this defined LOS standard to determine the community's future facility needs to plan for both the provision and funding of future capital facilities. The GMA requires the City to maintain a six-year plan of planned capital projects and projected funding capacities. To determine how the requirement will be met, two questions need to be answered:

- What is the quantity of public facilities that will be required by the end of the sixth year?

- Is it financially feasible to provide the quantity of facilities that are required by the end of the sixth year?

The answer to each question is derived by evaluating the LOS or capacity for each type of facility based on the adopted standard. The need in the sixth year is calculated and the end result is either a deficiency or a surplus of the measured capital facility.

Table 1 lists the types of facilities and services and the provider.

Table 1: Agency Providing Service

Type of Capital Facility	Lead Agency	Examples
Water	City of Airway Heights Public Works Department and the City of Spokane	Capacity adequate to handle the demand from each service connection
Sanitary Sewer	City of Airway Heights	Capacity adequate to handle the demand from each service connection
Fire	City of Airway Heights Fire Department	Response time within the City limits
Police	City of Airway Heights Police Department	Calls for service per officer
Parks	City of Airway Heights Public Works	Acreage per capita
Roads and Streets	City of Airway Heights Public Works Department	Traffic volume to planned capacity
Library	Spokane County Library District	Square footage per capita or user
Schools	Cheney School District	District standards for capital facilities
Solid Waste & Recycling	Waste Management	Company provides garbage and drop point recycling in the City

Table 2 shows example level of service (LOS) measurements for all sections detailed in further sections of the CIP.

Table 2: LOS Measurements

Type of Capital Facility	Lead Agency	LOS Standard
Water	City of Airway Heights	<u>Normal operating:</u> · 30-40 psi for residential/commercial/industrial. · Provision of 362 gallons per day ERU. <u>Fire/Emergency Demand:</u> Minimum fire flow for residential shall be 1,000 gpm. Minimum fire flow for commercial shall be 1,500 gpm.
Fire	City of Airway Heights	· Fire protection = Fire Insurance Rating of 4 or less. · EMT = 5 minute response time.
Police	City of Airway Heights	· Adopted LOS = 1 Officer / 1,000 calls for service.
Parks	City of Airway Heights	· 10 acres per 1,000 non-institutional populations
Transportation	City of Airway Heights	See Table 11.
Sewer	City of Airway Heights	245 gallons per day.
Library	Spokane County Library District	LOS established by Spokane County Library District.
Schools	Cheney School District	LOS established by Cheney School District.
Solid Waste and Recycling	Waste Management of Spokane	LOS established by Waste Management.

2.0 Capital Facilities Inventory

The GMA does not require the adoption of LOS standards for capital facilities, except for transportation; however, the City has opted to define desired LOS for the following facilities provided by the City in concurrence with other agencies in order to monitor the ability of capital facilities to meet public needs. A detailed Capital Facility Inventory is included in the Appendix.

2.1 Water

Water facilities, such as water mains and pump stations, provide for the safe and efficient delivery of water to the community. The City operates six municipal wells and one intertie.

2.1.1 Water LOS

The existing water supply LOS standard is to provide reliable water service for domestic use, fire flow protection and emergencies. The water capacity and forecast is shown in Table 3 on the following page, and shows the City has a need for increased water capacity. According to Table 2, the LOS for water is 30 - 40 psi for residential/commercial/industrial use and 362 gallons per day equivalent residential units.

Table 3: Water Capacity and Forecast

Year	Average Daily Demand (x1000 Gal)	Maximum Daily Demand (x1000 Gal)	Rec. Capacity (1.25 x Max Day) (x1000 Gal)	Existing Pump Capacity (x1000 Gal)	Deficit or Capacity
2006	1,011	2,651	3,314	4,123	809
2007	1,087	2,585	3,231	4,123	892
2008	1,158	2,752	3,441	4,123	682
2009	1,229	2,922	3,653	4,123	470
2012	1,431	3,403	4,254	4,123	-131

Source: Century West Water Report

2.1.2 Future Water Needs

The City relies on water from four wells plus an intertie. The pumping capacity is determined partly by groundwater rights. The City will need to ensure there is an adequate supply of water for current and anticipated demand, without adversely impacting water quality.

On the capacity side, the City is developing strategies to ensure there is adequate water storage capacity to serve anticipated levels of development. Currently, the City has adequate water storage and production, but additional storage and production capacity will be needed to meet future development demands.

2.1.3 Finance

Capital facilities costs for the Airway Heights water system are identified in Table 4. It is estimated that approximately \$19 million will be needed to address existing deficiencies and to account for anticipated growth and proper functioning of the existing mains.

Funding for municipal water systems, in addition to budgeted funding is primarily achieved through the assessment of monthly user fees and connection charges.

Revenue is collected and used for operation and maintenance, including minor capital improvements and for debt service for bond issues and for loans on major capital improvements. In general the following funding sources are available to the City as a water purveyor:

1. Monthly user charges and connection charges
2. Grants and loans – A number of possible sources are available for grants and loans for major capital improvements.
3. Owner extension – new development or redevelopment that needs water service and involves the extension of a line which is paid for by the developer. If the line will serve other properties in the future, the owner may request a latecomer reimbursement at the time of future development.
4. Bonds – the City may incur debt through the issuance of bonds to provide needed money for long term capital projects.

Table 4 below shows a six-year plan of water improvements by year.

Table 4: Water Capital Improvements

SOURCES OF FUNDS	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Public Works Trust Fund Loans					3,500,000		2,500,000
State Revolving Loan Fund	868,000						
Centennial Clean Water Fund			675,000	100,000	475,000		
Total Sources	868,000	0	675,000	100,000	475,000	0	0
USES OF FUNDS							
Rehabilitate Well 2	500,000						
Campbell Street SR2 to 21st Avenue	368,000						
21st Avenue waterline, new 12-inch waterline					525,000		
Construct new SR2 Crossing at Garfield Road					150,000		
Russell Street SR2 to McFarlane Road			425,000				
Intertie with Medical Lake and Four Lakes			250,000				
Aquifer Storage Reservoir Facility at ParkWest				100,000			
FAFB/City of Spokane Intertie					300,000		
Develop New Well					3,000,000		
Construct Reservoir							2,500,000
Total Expenditures	868,000	0	675,000	100,000	3,975,000	0	2,500,000

2.2 Sanitary Sewer

The sanitary sewer system handles the sewage collection needs for the entire City. There are several areas of the City not served by sewer, though the City's goal is to provide sewer service, where feasible, to all areas within its service area.

2.2.1 Sanitary Sewer LOS

The City's existing minimum LOS standard for providing sanitary sewer service is the provision of treatment for 245 gallons per day (gpd). The provision of 245 is achievable.

2.2.2 Sanitary Sewer Future Needs

The City's future goals for sewer service are as follows:

- Use 100 percent of the Department of Ecology criteria for sewer works design.
- Provide gravity system sanitary sewer service wherever economically feasible.
- Reduce the number of septic systems by transferring connections to sewer.

2.2.3 Finance

Several sewer projects have been identified to accommodate population growth. In 2005 the City purchased land to build a new wastewater treatment plant to accommodate current and future sewer needs. Design of the plant will be complete in 2007 and the plant will be constructed in two phases beginning in 2009 with completion in 2010. Sources of funds for sanitary sewer, in addition to budgeted funding items include Public Work Trust Fund loans, Community Development Block Grants and Centennial Clean Water Fund.

Capital expenditures for sewer projects over the next six years are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Sanitary Sewer Capital Improvements

SOURCES OF FUNDS	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Public Works Trust Fund Loans				10,000,000		
City Sewer CIP Reserves				350,000		
CDBG	87,500					
GO Bonds				2,000,000		
Rural Development						90,000
Revenue Bonds				3,506,000		
USDA Grant				6,351,200		
Capacity Resale				3,000,000		
PWB Loan				8,000,000		
SRF Loan				1,341,800		
Total	87,500			34,549,000		90,000
USES OF FUNDS						
Septic Tank Elimination (15 connections) *	37,500					
South Side Sewer (Frank Street)						90,000
Wastewater Treatment Plant (Site Construction)				\$32,000,000		
Lundstrom to Ziegler south of 13 th construction of sewer line for alley	50,000					
Total	87,500	0	0	32,000,000		90,000

*What it would cost the city to eliminate 15 septic connections

2.3 Fire

The Airway Heights Fire Department provides fire protection services to the City. The department provides a complete range of services including fire protection, EMS, fire code planning, engineering and enforcement to both businesses and residents. This requires the City to maintain appropriate resources to respond to a variety of fire fighting and medical aid needs. Capital facilities associated with fire protection include fire stations, apparatus and service/aid vehicles.

2.3.1 Fire LOS

The City currently meets both its fire facility and apparatus LOS standards throughout the City although response times vary depending on the location. As the City grows, it will evaluate the need for additional fire stations to provide adequate coverage. The fire department and EMS response time standard is 5 minutes 90 percent of the time, while the average EMS response time is 4 minutes. A response time of 3 minutes is a future goal of the department. EMS and the fire department meet state standards and the fire insurance rating is classified as a 4.

2.3.2 Fire Future Needs

Determination of the City's fire service needs over the next 23 years is based on the adopted LOS standards. The LOS standard is used to calculate both facility and equipment needs over the six-year time frame by comparing existing LOS to projected needs. Future estimates are calculated for both station and equipment needs for the next 23 years. The City has no fire apparatus deficiencies projected over the next six years.

2.3.3 Finance

Sources of funds for fire capital facilities improvements, in addition to budgeted funding items are from the general fund.

Over the next 20 years, the City plans approximately \$3.1 million in investments to continue to meet the adopted fire LOS standard. The department has a brush truck owned by the U.S. Forest

Service, which is not included in the table and is on permanent loan. The fire department fleet was new in 2001 and does not need replacement until 2017.

Table 6: Fire Capital Improvements

Sources/Uses SOURCES OF FUNDS	2017- 2023	2024-2030	TOTAL
Current Expense – Fire Reserve Fund	\$785,000	\$2.3 million	\$1.6 million
Total Sources			
USES OF FUNDS			
Replace Attack One (AHA1) - 2017	\$285,000		\$285,000
Replace Engine One - 2023	\$500,000		\$500,000
Replace Engine Two - 2025		\$700,000	\$700,000
Replace AHPL1		\$1.6 million	\$1.6 million
Surplus or Deficit	0	0	0

* The table shows when the funds will be expended.

2.4 Police Service Facilities

Police protection services are provided by the City of Airway Heights Police Department.

2.4.1 Police LOS

Police LOS standards are determined based on annual calls for service. Calls for service are defined as any time a report is generated. The current LOS is to provide:

- One officer/staff to handle each 1,000 calls for service.

Since police officers are not “capital” this standard is extrapolated to calculate the number of patrol vehicles needed as shown in Table 7. Capital facilities associated with police services include police stations, training facilities and police equipment. Projected capital facility requirements are based on the number of officers needed to respond to the calls for service LOS standard. As the need for additional officers increases, so does the need for additional police equipment and facilities.

Table 7: Police LOS Standards, Capacity and Forecast

	# Calls for Service	# of Officers required at 1/1,000 CFS	# of Officers	Surplus or Deficiency	Patrol cars required at .5 cars/officer	Patrol cars Available	Patrol car Surplus or Deficiency
2004 <i>(Actual)</i>	7,719	7.719	10	2.281	5	5	0
2005 <i>(Actual)</i>	9,274	9.274	12	2.726	6	7	1
2006 <i>(Projected Total)</i>	10,000	10	12	2	6	7	1
2012 <i>(Projected Total)</i>	17,000	17	20	3	10	11	1

* The number of officers includes the chief and the sergeant

The number of officers employed by the City depends on the call volume. The officers handle calls from the Northern Quest Casino, U.S. Highway 2, Fairchild Air Force Base and the Airway Heights Department of Corrections Facility.

2.4.2 Future Needs

The City will require additional patrol vehicles to meet its police LOS standards; some vehicles are also scheduled to be replaced based on mileage and wear and tear.

2.4.3 Finance

Police capital expenditures funding will be for additional vehicles and equipment.

The sources of funds for police, in addition to budgeted funding items are the general fund, criminal justice fund, casino impact funds and grants. The capital improvements required for the police department are detailed in Table 8 below.

Table 8: Police Capital Improvements

SOURCES OF FUNDS	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
General Fund	0	40,000	7,500	0	40,000	22,500	100,000
Criminal Justice Fund	0	35,000	45,000	45,000	22,500	67,500	0
Casino Impact Funds			32,500	25,000	22,500	37,500	
Grants	0	0	10,000	0	0	12,500	0
Total Sources		75,000	95,000	70,000	85,000	140,000	100,000
USES OF FUNDS							
Dash cameras	0	40,000	0	0	0	0	0
Replace Cruisers w radio and MDC	0	35,000	35,000	70,000	0	105,000	0
Add Cruisers	0	0	45,000	0	45,000	0	0
New Records Management System	0	0	0	0	0	0	100,000
Office Equipment Upgrades	0	0	0	0	40,000	10,000	0
Update Officer Equipment	0	0	15,000	0	0	25,000	0
Total	0	75,000	95,000	70,000	85,000	140,000	100,000

2.5 Parks and Recreation

Park and recreation facilities and open spaces are essential to a community’s mental and physical well-being. Parks and open space help soften dense development, provide important ecological functions and provide recreation opportunities for residents and visitors. For more detailed information on parks and recreation, see the parks and recreation element of the comprehensive plan.

2.5.1 Parks LOS

Per the Airway Heights Comprehensive Plan, the City has chosen to plan for a LOS standard of 10 acres per 1,000 non-institutional residents. In the analysis of future demand, population numbers reflect only the residential population of Airway Heights and do not include the institutional population of the Washington State Department of Corrections facility in Airway Heights. However, it is important to note that visitors to the correctional facility do have an impact on the City’s park and recreation infrastructure.

The analysis shows the City is not currently meeting its LOS standard of 10 acres per 1,000 residents. In addition to the 27 acres needed presently, the City will seek an additional 38 acres in the next 20 years to meet the future demand at its adopted LOS standard.

Currently, the City has a total of 23.06 acres of developed park land as shown in Table 9. The table shows

Table 9: Parks LOS Standard, Capacity and Forecast

Year	Number of Park AC	Population	Park AC Needed @ 10 AC/1,000 Population	Surplus or Deficiency of Park Lands
2007	23.06	2,867	28.67	-5.61
2008	27.06	3,041	30.41	-3.35
2009	31.06	3,220	32.2	-1.14
2010	35.06	3,405	34.05	1.01
2011	39.06	3,597	35.97	3.09
2012	43.06	3,797	37.97	5.09

Note: Population forecast is based on a 3.46 percent growth rate and is less an estimated 2,140 prison population. In 2007 there was 23.06 acres of parkland, and it is estimated the city will purchase 4 acres of parkland per year.

2.5.2 Future needs

A parks and recreation impact fee will be collected from residential developments to provide for parks and facilities needed to support additional growth. The City expects to receive approximately one acre of parkland in 2007.

2.5.3 Finance

The park reserve fund, park impact fees, Spokane County Parks Department and IACC are the sources of funding for park related improvements.

Table 10: Parks and Recreation Capital Improvements Projects

SOURCES OF FUNDS	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Park Reserve Fund		\$173,866					
Park Impact Fees Collected/Year	\$107,000	\$107,000	\$107,000	\$107,000	\$107,000	\$107,000	\$107,000
Impact Fees Carryover		\$47,000					
Spokane County Parks Department			\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
IACC		\$172,134	\$383,000	\$333,000	\$333,000	\$448,000	\$503,000
TOTAL	\$107,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$450,000	\$450,000	\$565,000	\$620,000
USES OF FUNDS							
New Park Design	\$30,000						
Martella Field Reconstruction						\$65,000	
Tennis Court							\$70,000
Skate Park Half Pipe							\$50,000
Park Land Acquisition - 4 acres per year		\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000
Aspen Park Irrigation		\$100,000					
Sunset Park Irrigation			\$100,000				
Aspen Park Construction						\$100,000	
Sunset Park Construction							\$100,000
Aspen Park Bathrooms	\$30,000						
Sunset Park Play Equipment				\$50,000			
Aspen Park Play Equipment					\$50,000		
Total Uses	\$60,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$450,000	\$450,000	\$565,000	\$620,000

Note: The park reserve fund (includes impact fees) balance at the end of 2006 is \$173,866. Park impact fees are \$500 per dwelling unit, and an estimated 214 homes per year will be built and collected. An estimated four acres will be purchased per year, per Table 9 for a total of \$400,000 per year.

2.7 Schools

Proposed improvements and capital expenditures are determined by the Cheney School District which has prepared its own capital facilities plan. The only school in the Airway Heights City limits is Sunset Elementary. Like most school districts, Cheney relies heavily on the passage of bond levies to pay for capital improvements.

Due to the number of Airway Heights' students who attend school in the Cheney School District, and growth in the community, City growth has a large impact on the District's facility planning. The City is one of the District's largest growth areas – besides the Windsor area.

The District has plans to accommodate sudden population growth, as well as projections in a 20 year time frame. The District has projections for school capacity, building life, acreage needed and capital facility needs. Some of the District capital facility needs related to Airway Heights include:

- \$1.7 million in roof replacement throughout the district
- \$20,000 in ADA accessibility – automatic front doors throughout the district
- Portable classrooms

2.7.1 School LOS, Funding and Future Needs

The City neither sets nor controls the LOS standards and funding or projects future needs for area schools. The Cheney School District is charged with ensuring there is adequate facility space and equipment to accommodate existing and projected student populations. The City

coordinates land use planning with the School District to ensure there is adequate capacity in place or planned.

2.8 Library

The amount of public library space a community needs is often based on the ratio of library space to population. Increased demand for library services can be addressed by constructing new facilities and adding creative outreach programs and satellite service points. Funding for new facilities requires bond approval by district residents. The LOS for libraries is ½ square foot per capita. This LOS is set by the Spokane County Library District.

The City currently contracts with the Spokane County Library District (SCLD) for library services. The contract fee is calculated on the same basis as the SCLD's maximum property tax levy of 50 cents per \$1,000 of assessed valuation. The City intends to be annexed into the SCLD tax area. If it were annexed to the SCLD, property taxes would be levied by the SCLD and the City would not pay the district for the service.

2.8.1 Library LOS, Funding and Future Needs

The City neither sets nor controls the LOS standards, funding or projects future needs for area libraries.

2.9 Transportation

Vehicular traffic within the City is generated primarily by several sources: Airway Heights Corrections Center, the residential, commercial and industrial areas within the City and commuter traffic on U.S. Highway 2 generated by FAFB and commuters traveling to and from Spokane. As would be expected, the principal arterial, U.S. Highway 2, carries the heaviest traffic with traffic volumes decreasing with each street classification below principal arterial. Table 14 shows the acceptable range of traffic volumes per street classification. It also highlights existing traffic counts on selected City streets. By illustrating traffic counts with street classifications, the relationship between the two is clearly demonstrated.

2.9.1 Transportation LOS

Arterial streets, principal, minor, and collector, are measured against established standards allowing the City to determine if a street or street segment is operating at an acceptable level based on community needs. When a street or street segment falls below an established LOS, it is an indication traffic volume is exceeding the street traffic carrying capacity or traffic controls, such as stop signs and turning or traveling lanes. The City of Airway Heights uses LOS standards ranging from A to F as its minimum criteria for quality of service provided at peak hours of traffic on its arterials handling significant levels of traffic. The data in Table 12 comes from the Airway Heights 6-year Transportation Plan.

Table 11: Transportation LOS Definitions

LOS Category	Average Control Delay Seconds/Vehicle	Description
A	0-10	Primarily free-flow traffic operations at an average travel speed; vehicles are completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream; stopped delays at intersections are minimal.
B	> 10-15	Reasonably unimpeded traffic flow operations at average travel speed; ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted and stopped delays are not bothersome; drivers are not generally subject to appreciable tensions.
C	> 15-25	Stable traffic flow operations; ability to maneuver and change lanes in mid-block locations may be more restricted than in LOS B with lower than average travel speed; drivers will experience appreciable tension while driving.
D	> 25-35	Small increases in traffic flow, from that of LOS C, may cause substantial increases in approach delays and decreases in average speed: typically caused by high traffic volumes.
E	>35-50	Significant delays in traffic flow operations and lower operating speed; typically caused by high traffic volume and improper traffic control devices.
F	> 50	Traffic flow operates at extremely slow speed; intersection congestion is a result of improper traffic control devices, delays at intersections and high traffic volumes.

Source: Average traffic delay comes from the federal Highway Capacity Manual 2000 from the Transportation Research Board in Washington DC

Level of service characterizes the operating conditions of the facility in terms of traffic performance measures related to speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions and comfort and convenience.

The City of Airway Heights adopts LOS D as the standard for its principal and minor arterials and collector streets, with LOS C for local access streets, except where such streets intersect a principal, minor or collector street, in which case the LOS may be D at the intersection. U.S. Highway 2 is exempt from GMA concurrency because it is a highway of statewide significance.

There is a strong correlation between land use and transportation. As growth in community population and employment opportunity increases, so does the amount of traffic generated. The City has traffic counts for the U.S. Highway 2 corridor, which are maintained by WSDOT. As the City develops the U.S. Highway 2 corridor plan, it should forecast traffic demand for City's streets.

2.9.2 Transportation Future Needs

High priority projects are those that provide significant community-wide benefit, and are usually focused on downtown or principal and minor arterials. These projects may be primarily safety oriented, although capacity improvement projects, especially those that also provide safety benefits or reduce maintenance needs are also appropriate. Lower priority projects are those that either provide significant improvements serving local neighborhoods or projects that are similar to the high priority projects, except of significantly less urgency or need.

2.9.3 Finance

Funding was projected from the following sources: 10 percent Public Works Trust Fund loans, 10 percent Community Economic Revitalization Board, an estimated 27.8 percent in Community Development Block Grants, 5 percent Transportation Equity Act, 20 percent Transportation Improvement Board, 10 percent WSDOT, 17.2 percent local match and project mitigation fees for an estimated 214 homes at \$800 a trip, per SEPA mitigation fees for U.S. Highway 2 and Craig Road improvements.

Table 12: Transportation Capital Improvements

SOURCES OF FUNDS	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Public Works Trust Fund	\$14,300	\$80,500	\$0	\$62,900	\$41,100	\$51,800	\$54,400
Comm. Econ. Revit. Board	\$14,300	\$80,500	\$0	\$62,900	\$41,100	\$51,800	\$54,400
CDBG	\$39,754	\$223,790	\$0	\$174,862	\$114,258	\$144,004	\$151,232
Transp. Equity Act	\$7,150	\$40,250	\$0	\$31,450	\$20,550	\$25,900	\$27,200
Transp. Imp. Board	\$28,600	\$161,000	\$0	\$125,800	\$82,200	\$103,600	\$108,800
WSDOT	\$14,300	\$80,500	\$0	\$62,900	\$41,100	\$51,800	\$54,400
Local Match	\$24,596	\$138,460	\$0	\$108,188	\$70,692	\$89,096	\$93,568
Project Mitigation Fees – Craig/U.S. Highway 2 - Developers	\$170,933	\$170,933	\$170,933	\$170,933	\$170,933	\$170,933	\$170,933
Project Mitigation Fees – Craig/U.S. Highway 2 - City/State/County Match	\$279,067	\$279,067	\$279,067	\$279,067	\$279,067	\$279,067	\$279,067
Mitigation Fees Total in 2013							\$2,700,000
Total Sources	\$143,000	\$805,000	\$0	\$629,000	\$411,000	\$518,000	\$544,000
USES OF FUNDS							
U.S. Highway 2 Traffic Improvements at U.S. Highway 2 and Craig (Roundabout)							\$2,700,000
U.S. Highway 2 Crosswalk Enhancements - Russell to Ziegler		\$220,000					
U.S. Highway 2 Corridor Lighting Project - Garfield to Craig					\$411,000		
U.S. Highway 2 Corridor Landscaping from Garfield to Craig Road				629000			
14th Street Reconstruction Phase 1 - King to Lundstrom Street	73000						
14th Street Reconstruction Phase 2 - Lawson to Campbell	70000						
Lawson Street Improvement Project Phase 1 - U.S. Highway 2 to 18th Street		\$585,000					
Lawson Street Improvement Project Phase 2 - 18th to 21st Street						518000	
Russell Street Reconstruction Project Phase 1 - U.S. Highway 2 to 21st Street							271000
Russell Street Reconstruction Project Phase 2 - 21st to McFarlane Road							273000
Total	\$143,000	\$805,000	\$0	\$629,000	\$411,000	\$518,000	\$544,000

Note: Items shaded in gray are mitigation fees that can only be used for the U.S. Highway 2 Traffic Improvements at U.S. Highway 2 and Craig, they are not counted in the yearly total and will be used in 2013. Source: Airway Heights 6-year Transportation Plan

2.10 Solid Waste and Recycling

The City currently contracts with Waste Management of Spokane for both solid waste pickup and recycling. The company provides a weekly garbage pickup and multi-use bin for recycling which is located across from the community center.

3.0 Potential Annexation Areas

It is recognized that the City may annex portions of the Spokane County West Plains Urban Growth Area/Joint Planning Area (UGA/JPA). Additional development may motivate expansion of municipal boundaries. The Joint Planning Areas (JPAs), land within the Spokane County UGA but outside of existing City limits, are considered potential annexation areas.

There are three distinct potential annexation areas. One is located east of Hayford Road, extending approximately one mile east of the existing City limits along U.S. Highway 2 and is within the UGA/JPA. This potential annexation area contains approximately 634 acres.

Another potential annexation area is located west of Craig Road, extending west ½ miles from the existing City limits and includes over 145 acres owned by the Spokane Tribe. This area is known as the Spokane County Airway Heights UGA/JPA and contains approximately 359 acres. The third potential annexation area is located north of the City limits, east of Craig Road, and extends over and includes the Spokane County ORV Park. This area is also known as the Spokane County Airway Heights UGA/JPA and contains approximately 323 acres.

The Spokane County UGA anticipates increased urban development along U.S. Highway 2, linking the City of Spokane to the City of Airway Heights. In designating that land within the UGA, Spokane County confirmed that development there would require urban levels of service. The County's comprehensive plan includes the area east of Hayford Road in the West Plains Joint Planning Area, requiring joint planning between the various agencies that now or may in the future have jurisdictional control. Spokane County and the City of Spokane have expressed interest in serving some of these areas as they develop, but their proximity to Airway Heights makes them suitable for eventual annexation by the City.

At present it is known: (1) the City provides police, fire and emergency services to the JPA, (2) the urban development adjacent to the City's eastern corporate limit has caused an increase in vehicle trips to and through the City; and (3) the new residential population is part of the Airway Heights community.

By classifying these lands as part of the City's planning area, the City offers annexation as an option to these property owners. Airway Heights can provide the potential annexation areas with municipal services.

The Spokane County Boundary Review Board (BRB) reviews annexations proposed in the County. In considering its decisions, the BRB must reference its objectives and principles. Airway Heights is including these potential annexation areas in its comprehensive plan in a manner that is consistent with the BRB factors (36.93.170 RCW) and objectives (36.93.180 RCW).

3.1 Factors

3.1.1 Population and Territory

Airway Heights' population density and intensity of land use is relatively low given constraints imposed by FAFB. However, its household size is 2.55 (US Census 2000), placing its household size slightly larger than the County mean. The City has designated land uses and adopted zoning to continue compatibility with FAFB.

Spokane County has identified the area east of Hayford Road as part of the Spokane County UGA/JPA. By establishing the UGA/JPA, the County has established a need for inter-jurisdictional planning along the corridor. The City has approved an inter-jurisdictional agreement for planning in the JPA. The area includes approximately one square mile (634 acres), and lies immediately adjacent the City limits. It is now being developed and will become urbanized within two to five years, much more rapidly than any of the other land along U.S. Highway 2 between Airway Heights and the City of Spokane. Given its proximity to Airway Heights, the imminence of its development and the connection to the City's social service network, it is anticipated to become part of the City in the future.

3.1.2 Municipal services

Airway Heights has plans to annex land within the Spokane County UGA and plans to provide urban services as it develops. Airway Heights provides social and public safety services to the area, while the City of Spokane provides water and wastewater service. Fire Protection District 10 provides first response fire service. The Spokane County Sheriff's Department provides law enforcement services. However, due to the City's proximity to these areas, it often functions as first response, with support coming from Airway Heights Police, Fire and EMS. Airway Heights is prepared to continue offering these municipal services for this area.

By including this area in its comprehensive plan, Airway Heights is also prepared to continue planning for land use and development after annexation and to negotiate terms for continuing or assuming provision of services by other governmental agencies.

3.1.3 Economic and governmental effects

The City recognizes that annexing this area will increase its development potential and will help to ensure that retail uses serving the City residents will be within City limits.

The potential annexation would incorporate an area that is physically connected to the community, ensure that the area receives services and anchors the east end of the City with goods, services and an expanding population.

4.0 Policies to Address Funding Shortages

The GMA requires the City to have polices to reassess the CIP and comprehensive plan land use element if funding falls short to ensure the two are consistent.

If the City is faced with capital facility funding shortfalls, any combination of the following strategies may be used to balance revenues and needs for capital facilities required to serve existing and future development:

- a. Increase revenues through bonds, new or increased user fees or rates, new or increased taxes, regional cost sharing, developer voluntary funds for needed capital projects.
- b. Decrease LOS standards if consistent with the GMA goals.
- c. Reprioritizing projects to focus on those related to concurrency
- d. Decreasing the cost of the facility by changing the project scope or finding less expensive alternatives.
- e. Decreasing the demand for the public service or facility such as ride sharing plans to cut down on traffic demands on roadways or instituting measures to slow or direct population growth or development such as moratoriums on development, developing only in areas served by facilities with available capacity or changing project timing and phasing.
- f. Revising the comprehensive plans land use chapter to balance the amount of capital facilities that can be provided to support development.

5.0 Funding Sources

There are a variety of funding sources for the capital improvement projects in the City that balance revenues and expenditures. Additionally, the City looks at the current financial capacity and debt as well as bonding capacity for future projects.

5.1 Revenues

The City uses a number of funding mechanisms to pay for its capital facilities needs. Funding for capital projects will come from grants, bonds, property and sales taxes, impact fees and contributions. Some of these funds are earmarked for specific projects while other projects come from the general fund. General fund revenues are used not only for part of the capital facilities expenditures, but also for the operation and maintenance of the City. Additional non-City sources of funds could fund many projects. The non-City sources could include grants, financing with

bonds, impact fees, county, state or federal funds and the continued use of local improvement district (LID) and developer extension agreements.

5.2 Expenditures

The CIP covers only the cost of capital facilities. With the development of these facilities there will be other operating, maintenance and staff costs that will continue to accrue annually over the life of the facility.

5.3 Funding strategy for governmental functions

Revenue sources are categorized based on their ability to fund different types and priorities of capital facilities. The first category is established revenue sources. These are more or less predictable and require no additional approval, although some monitoring of trends is necessary to forecast actual receipts. These are particularly suited to finance basic needs that should be met to avoid significant problems. The second category consists of revenues that require voter approval, such as bonds. These revenues are especially appropriate to finance enhancement needs that could enjoy widespread popular support in the community. Traditionally, cities have relied particularly on these sources for parks, community centers, public safety buildings and transportation capacity enhancements. Voter approved sources can also be used for basic needs, although relying on this source can lead to difficulty in addressing these needs if voter approval is not obtained. The third category consists of more general and unpredictable sources of revenue consisting of a wide variety of mechanisms ranging from SEPA mitigation, impact fees, local improvement districts, voluntary agreements, special purpose grants, non-financial measures etc. While these are more difficult to anticipate and quantify, they can be very significant sources of revenue. These sources also tend to match lower priority capital needs, or those that are necessary only if additional growth occurs. Matching these needs with these resources will occur as site specific needs, opportunities or problems arise.

While most of these projects are needed to fully achieve the comprehensive plan, in most cases failure to achieve the project will not lower the overall quality of the community.

5.4 Established sources of revenue

The City's capital facilities are funded by a variety of resources including dedicated funding that must be used for capital purposes and unrestricted resources that can be allocated to fund capital projects. Funding comes from the City and other sources originating outside the City such as state and federal grants, and contributions from other agencies or organizations. Each of these sources is briefly described in the Appendix.

Table 13 shows an overview of the general city taxes or revenue sources including impact fees, criminal justice reserves, real estate excise taxes, utility sources and loans.

Table 13 – Annual Revenue Summary

General City Taxes/Sources	Dollar Estimate	Note
Criminal Justice Revenues	\$77,000	State shared revenues based on a per capita distribution.
<u>Real Estate Excise Tax</u>		
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET), 1st Quarter Percent	\$50,000	Sales of real estate measured by the full selling price of the property; .25% of selling price; to be used for capital purposes identified in a capital improvements plan. Accounted for in separate capital projects fund.
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET), 2nd Quarter Percent	\$50,000	Sales of real estate measured by the full selling price of the property; .25% of selling price; to be used for capital project; some differences of uses than the 1st quarter percent. Accounted for in separate capital projects fund.
<u>Utility Sources</u>		
Water Hook Up Fee	\$735,000	Based on meter size, \$2,975 for 5/8" x 3/4" meter, meter based on single family and for all other classes.
Sewer Hook Up Fee	\$628,000	Based on meter size, \$5,132 for 3/4" meter, \$1.26 million for a 1" meter; rate schedule ranges from 5/8" x 3/4" meter to 12" meter.
Water/Sewer Capital Development Fee	\$27,000	Fee charged for each 1,000 gallons of water consumed/used. To be used for long-term planning and development of the City's owned utilities.
Public Works Trust Fund	\$7,000,000	Construction and pre-construction loans for repair, replacement, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or improvement of eligible public work systems; loans up to \$7 million; interest rates ranging from .5% to 2% linked to local match.

5.5 Overall capital needs priorities

The overall funding strategy assists in applying various resources to different needs. The first level (as well as the smallest subset) are basic needs that must be met or significant hazards, inefficiencies, greater costs or problems will result.

These include removing traffic hazards, rehabilitating or restoring deteriorating streets or facilities, severe points of congestion, replacing inadequate facilities in parks and public buildings, and providing appropriate municipal office space. The second level of needs are those projects that enhance the general quality of life and improve the overall community. These projects may include street improvements to remove congestion, provide additional transportation options, enhance the appeal of downtown, provide new parks or add new features to existing parks. It could also include a new community center or City Hall. It includes projects that require considerable public support. The third type of need consists of less definite site specific or lower priority needs. There are several types of projects included in this category. Projects needed to directly support growth, therefore and projects that benefit identifiable areas.

Of particular importance in implementing the strategy distinguishing projects to be funded in the first level of need from established funding sources, and those in the second level of need funded by voter-approved bond issues.

5.6 Current Financial Capacity and Debt

Using the City of Airway Heights' 2007 taxable value established by the County Assessor of \$199,471,729 the City could incur up to \$2,042,908 (\$2,992,076) debt capacity less existing debt of \$939,034 of general obligation bond debt without voter approval for general purposes and an additional \$1,994,717 with voter approval for general purposes. In addition, the City could incur up to \$3,918,997 (\$4,986,793) debt capacity less existing debt of \$1,130,000 and plus cash of (\$62,204) with voter approval for utility purposes (as the service provider) and \$4,986,793 for open space, parks, and capital facilities purposes with voter approval. Thus, the maximum available remaining debt capacity for the City is \$12,943,415, or 86.50 percent of the City's total debt capacity. Under state limitations, Airway Heights has sufficient debt capacity for capital improvement projects. The City will continue to seek alternative funding sources to assure long term fiscal health.

5.7 Airway Heights Maximum Bonding Capacity

Under state statutes, general obligation indebtedness for general purposes is limited to 2.5 percent of actual value of taxable property located within the City. Indebtedness without a vote of the electorate is limited to 1.5 percent of actual value subject to the limitation that total general purpose indebtedness may not exceed 2.5 percent of total assessed value.

There is also a 2.5 percent limitation each for utility purpose for open space, parks and capital facility purposes. Thus, under state law, the maximum general obligation debt that a City may incur cannot exceed 7.5 percent of the taxable assessed property valuation.

City goals for providing capital facilities needs and improvements are detailed on the next two pages.

6.0 Capital Improvement Plan Goals

GOAL 1 – Develop a well-coordinated Capital Improvement Plan that will efficiently and equitably prioritize those projects and target expenditures most critical to the advancement of the City.

Ensure that capital investments are consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan.

GOAL 2 – Encourage visibility and educational opportunities for City schools.

Locations for schools should be identified and located for easy access. Maintain or enhance the level of school facilities.

GOAL 3 – Continue to provide a parks and recreation system to meet the diverse needs of the community. Maintain and enhance the existing park and recreation system.

GOAL 4 – Continue to provide police protection and public services to the community.

Maintain and enhance the existing level of police and public services. Continue to involve fire and emergency services in project review.

GOAL 5 – Continue to maintain, enhance and improve the City's transportation system.

Ensure that new development is adequately served by transportation facilities.

GOAL 6 – Establish and maintain level-of-service standards adequate to meet community demands without compromising new development. Develop a concurrency requirement for new development to demonstrate that public services will be provided.

GOAL 7 – Provide a process to adequately place essential public facilities without compromising the surrounding neighborhood's integrity and character, and without hindering the overall livelihood of the community. The City will utilize the siting of the essential public facilities process developed in coordination with Spokane County.

GOAL 8 – Encourage all essential public facilities to adequately buffer their facilities in a manner that is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood context. The City will identify appropriate buffering techniques and methods for EPF that are consistent with state law and local regulations.

APPENDIX

TYPES OF FUNDING AVAILABLE

- Impact fees – state law allows the City to collect fees from owners or developers as development occurs to fund park acquisition, park development and transportation capital projects. The fee amount is determined by estimating the appropriate private sector cost of the capital facilities that are required to meet expected demand and achieve the established level of service standard. The appropriate private sector cost is allocated to new development based in its estimated impact on demand. These impact fees must be expended on projects located in the area where they were collected within six years from the date they were collected and must be matched by the appropriate amount of public funding.
- Systems development charges (SDCs) – Like impact fees, SDCs are collected from owners and/or developers as development occurs to fund improvements to the water and sewer utilities. These funds may be expended on projects that expand utility system capacity and can either pay for debt service on bonds or for direct project expenditures.
- Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) – State statute authorizes the City to impose two taxes of .25 percent each on the sale of real estate within the City limits. The proceeds of the tax must be used for capital purposes as allowed by state law and as directed by the City Council.
- Federal and state grants – The City is very active in applying for grants from various federal and state agencies to fund capital facilities. These grants are typically available for a specific purpose. The City has had the most success in obtaining grants for transportation projects. Both state and federal grants typically require the commitment of local funding as a match to the grant. In addition to grants from state or federal agencies, the City may allocate a portion of its Community Development Block Grant funding to selected capital projects.
- Other agencies – The City actively seeks out partnerships with other federal, state and local agencies to help fund capital facilities.
- General obligation bonds – Funding for capital facilities projects may be provided by general obligation bonds issued for specific purposes. The maximum amount of non-voted debt the City can issue is limited by state law to 1.5 percent of the City's assessed value. This type of bond issues is usually reserved for municipal improvements that are of a general benefit to the public, such as arterial streets, bridges, lighting, municipal buildings and parks. The money to pay off these bond is is raised by an assessment levied on property including commercial property. There are two types of general obligation bonds – inside and excess levies. The City may issue an inside or councilmatic levy which can finance almost any type of project of general benefit to the City. State law allows cities and counties to incur debt up to a limit of 1.5% of their assessed value without a vote of the people. The debt is not paid off by additional taxes, but retired using existing taxes and other revenue. Consequently, the use of this type of debt does not add new revenue but instead reduces by reallocation the amount of capital resources available for current operations.
- Water and sewer utility revenue bonds – Revenue bonds issued by the City's water and sewer utilities have been used to fund specific capital projects for the utilities including expansion of sewage treatment capacity. The bonds are repaid from user fees charged to the water and sewer utilities customers and from SDCs. Utility revenue bonds are repaid exclusively from utility revenues.
- Voter approved bonds – Voters can approve a property tax levy to pay for bonds issued to fund capital projects. Any proposed voter approved bond levy requires 60 percent voter approval.
- Operating funds – The City may allocate operating or general funds for capital purposes. Operating funds can be used to pay for projects directly or to pay principal and interest on bonds issued to fund capital projects. Excess operating funds are also used to fund capital projects for the City's utilities.
- Grants – Historically, grants were an important source of revenue for capital facilities. However, the demise of many federal grant programs has resulted in a dramatic reduction in the availability of these grant funds for capital projects.

CAPITAL FACILITIES INVENTORIES

<i>Name of Facility</i>	<i>Type of Facility</i>	<i>Location of Facility</i>	<i>Date of Facility Acquisition/Construction</i>	<i>Estimated Present Value</i>	<i>Present Condition</i>	<i>Improvements Required</i>	<i>Year Needed</i>	<i>Estimated Cost</i>
Lawson St. (water)	Water	SR2 south - 21st	1980s	\$50,000	Fair	replacement	2007	\$250,000
Lawson St. (water) south	Water	21st Ave. - McFarlane	1990?	\$230,000	Good		2018	\$330,000
Sunset Park Water Tower	Water	Sunset Park	1972	\$200,000	Good	Cathode protection, cleaning	2008	\$75,000
King St. (water)	Water	North of SR2	2002/2003	\$210,000	New	none (for 20 years)		\$0
15th Avenue (water)	Water	Lawson - Campbell	1970s	\$20,000	Fair	Replace to larger diameter	2012	\$57,000
19th Ave. (water)	Water	Campbell - 500' east	1980	\$0	Poor	Replace & loop to Russell	2008	\$61,000
16th Avenue (water)	Water	Market - Mullen	1970s	\$0	Fair	Replace to larger size	2011	\$91,000
18th Avenue (water)	Water	Lundstrom - Russell	1980	\$0	Good	reconstruct larger for full length	2015	\$218,000
17th Avenue (water)	Water	Lundstrom - Lawson	1970s	\$0	Fair	reconstruct larger diameter to Lundstrom	2011	\$91,000
Lundstrom St. (water)	Water	SR2 - south 21st		\$0	Fair	Reconstruct larger diameter to 21st - 2500'	2013	\$235,000
8th Ave. (water)	Water	Beeman - Russell	1990s/2002	\$205,000	New	none (for 20 years)		\$0

Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Location of Facility	Date of Facility Acquisition/Construction	Estimated Present Value	Present Condition	Improvements Required	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Mintle Street (water)	Water	18th - 21st	1980	\$0	Fair	Replace with larger diameter	2013	\$110,000
Russell St. (water)	Water	SR2 - 21st	1997	\$145,000	Poor	water line replacement to 21st	2009	\$245,000
Campbell St. (water)	Water	SR2 - 21st	1970s	\$5,000	Poor	replacement to 21st, 12" PUC, 900 2700'	2008	\$245,000
Chandler Ave. (water)	Water	Lawson - Russell	1996/1997	\$120,000	Good	none (for 15 years)		\$0
9th Ave. (water)	Water	Lawson - Russell	1996/1997	\$120,000	Good	none (for 15 years)		\$0
10th Ave. (water)	Water	Lawson - Russell	1995/1996	\$120,000	Good	none (for 15 years)		\$0
11th Ave. (water)	Water	Lawson - Russell	1994/1995	\$120,000	Good	none (for 15 years)		\$0
Lawson St. (water)	Water	SR2 - 6th		\$230,400	Good	none (for 15 years)		\$0
Horton St. (water)	Water	6th - 8th	1992/1993	\$56,160	Good	none (for 15 years)		\$0
Russell St. (water)	Water	SR2 - 8th	1991/1995	\$56,672	Good	none (for 15 years)		\$0
12th Ave. (east) (water)	Water	Hayford - Craig	1991/1995	\$1,013,760	Good	none (for 15 years)		\$0
Lawson/Craig Alley (water)	Water	SR2 - 13th		\$364,800	Fair			\$0

Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Location of Facility	Date of Facility Acquisition/Construction	Estimated Present Value	Present Condition	Improvements Required	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Lawson/Russell Alley (water)	Water	SR2 - 13th		\$120,000	Good			\$0
12th/13th Alley (water)	Water	north of SR2		\$0		plan to abandon line and connect to 12th / 13th		\$100,000
Stand Pipe	Water	Sunset Park	1972	\$675,000	Good	cathode inspection, clean, inspection	2008	\$75,000
Hayford Road water line	Water	N SR2 - Sprague	2003	\$335,000	New	none (for 20 years)		\$0
Lundstrom St. (north)	Street	North of SR2	1962/1963	\$0	Fair	Reconstruction of 1/2 within 10 years	2010	\$100,000
Lundstrom St. (south)	Street	South of SR2	1995?	\$0	Poor	Reconstructed - ACP 2"	2012	\$210,000
21st Avenue	Street	Lundstrom-Garfield		\$0	Poor	ROW, Alignment	2015	\$503,250
Mullen St.	Street	14th Ave. - 16th Ave.	1970s	\$0	Fair	Reconstruction	2012	\$45,000
14th Avenue	Street	Lawson - Lundstrom		\$0	Poor	Reconstruction	2008	\$100,000
McFarlane Road	Street	Craig - Hayford	2001/2002	\$1,600,000	New	none		\$0
18th Avenue	Street	Lundstrom		\$0	Fair	construct full width curb / sidewalk drainage	2016	\$330,000
17th Avenue	Street	Lundstrom - Lawson		\$0	Good	overlay asphalt	2008	\$58,000

Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Location of Facility	Date of Facility Acquisition/Construction	Estimated Present Value	Present Condition	Improvements Required	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Lundstrom Street	Street	SR2 - south 21st		\$0	Fair	reconstruct full width, curb/drainage 2500'	2013	\$312,000
Mintle St.	Street	18th - 21st		\$0	Fair	construct full with 2" ACP curb/sidewalk, drainage	2012	\$138,000
6th Avenue (west)	Street	Ziegler - King	2002	\$105,000	New	none		\$0
6th Avenue (central)	Street	King-Lawson (future to Garfield)	1992	\$62,000	Good	slurry seal	2007	\$2,500
8th Ave.	Street	Ziegler - Russell	2002/2003	\$302,000	New	none (for 15 years)		\$0
8th Ave.	Street	King - Russell		\$136,610	Good	none		\$0
10th Ave.	Street	Ziegler - King	2001/2002	\$98,000	New	none		\$0
Russell St.	Street	SR2 - 21st		\$0	Poor	Reconstruct 40'2" ACP curb/sidewalk/drainage	2009	\$210,000
Campbell St.	Street	SR2 - 21st	1980?	\$50,000	Fair	Reconstruct with curb/sidewalk/drainage	2010	\$185,000
Lawson St.	Street	21st - McFarlane	1990?	\$195,000	Good	crack seal / slurry seal	2006	\$2,000
Lawson St.	Street	SR2 south - 21st		\$100,000	Poor		2007	\$405,000
Chandler Ave.	Street	Lawson - Russell	1996/1997	\$302,660	Good	crack seal	2005	\$2,500

Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Location of Facility	Date of Facility Acquisition/Construction	Estimated Present Value	Present Condition	Improvements Required	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
9th Ave.	Street	Lawson - Russell	1996/1997	\$299,715	Good	crack seal	2005	\$2,500
10th Ave.	Street	Lawson - Russell	1995/1996	\$253,180	Good	crack seal		\$0
11th Avenue	Street	Lawson - Russell	1994/1995	\$296,000	Good	crack seal	2006	\$2,500
Lawson Street (cent.)	Street	SR2 - 12th Avenue		\$152,100	Poor	overlay	2006	\$85,000
Lawson Street (north)	Street	12th - 8th	1992/1995	\$270,470	Good	slurry street seal	2006	\$3,000
Lawson St. (far north)	Street	8th - 6th	1991/1992	\$133,425	Good	slurry seal road	2006	\$2,000
Horton St.	Street	6th - 8th	1992/1993	\$97,680	Good	slurry seal	2008	\$1,500
Campbell St. (north)	Street	12th - 8th	1993/1999	\$292,320	Good	slurry seal, crack seal	2008	\$5,000
Campbell St. (cent.)	Street	SR2 - 12th	?	\$91,250	Poor	overlay	2007	\$55,000
Russell St. (cent.)	Street	SR2 - 12th	2003	\$84,000	New	none		\$0
Russell St. (north)	Street	12th - 8th	1993/2004	\$162,000	Fair	none - need 261' ROW acquisition		\$0
12th Avenue (west)	Street	Ziegler - 270' short of Craig Rd.	2002/2003	\$211,125	New	slurry/crack seal	2010	\$2,500

Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Location of Facility	Date of Facility Acquisition/Construction	Estimated Present Value	Present Condition	Improvements Required	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
12th Ave. (cent.)	Street	Russell - Ziegler	1992?	\$408,370	Good	slurry/crack seal	2006	\$4,000
13th Avenue	Street	Russell - Craig	2002	\$392,325	New	crack seal	2007	\$2,000
13th Avenue	Street	Russell - Craig	1990s	\$482,400	Good	none		\$0
Lawson St. (sewer)	Sewer	17th Ave. - 18th Ave.	1997	\$45,000	Good		2020	\$90,000
Market St. (sewer)	Sewer	14th - 17th	1992	\$63,000	Good	none		\$0
16th Avenue (sewer)	Sewer	Market - Lundstrom	1997	\$140,000	Good	none		\$0
6th Ave. (sewer)	Sewer	Ziegler - Russell	1997/1998	\$275,000	Good	none (for 15 years)		\$0
8th Ave. (sewer)	Sewer	Lawson - Russell	2002	\$96,750	New	none		\$0
Russell St. (sewer)	Sewer	SR2- 21st	1997	\$105,000	Good	none		\$0
Campbell St. (sewer)	Sewer	15th - 18th	1997	\$150,000	Good	none		\$0
Chandler Ave. (sewer)	Sewer	Lawson - Russell	1996/1997	\$210,000	Good			\$0
9th Ave. (sewer)	Sewer	Lawson - Russell	1996/1997	\$210,000	Good	none		\$0

Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Location of Facility	Date of Facility Acquisition/Construction	Estimated Present Value	Present Condition	Improvements Required	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
10th Ave. (sewer)	Sewer	Lawson - Russell	1995/1996	\$210,000	Good	none		\$0
11th Ave. (sewer)	Sewer	Lawson - Russell	1994/1995	\$187,000	Good	none		\$0
Lawson St. (sewer)	Sewer	SR2 - 6th	1991	\$81,900	Good	none		\$0
Horton St. (sewer)	Sewer	6th - 8th	1992/1993	\$85,800	Good	none		\$0
Russell St. (sewer)	Sewer	SR2 - 6th	1992/1995	\$380,640	Good	none		\$0
12th Avenue (sewer)	Sewer	Russell - Craig	1992/1994	\$904,800	Good	camera clean	2006	\$15,000
13th Avenue (sewer)	Sewer	Russell - Craig	1993/1994	\$780,000	Good	camera/clean	2008	\$10,000
SR2/13th Alley (sewer)	Sewer	Craig - Russell		\$491,400	Good	none		\$0
City Hall/Fire Station	Building	1208 S. Lundstrom St.	1964	\$1,176,241	Good	none		
Public Works Shop	Building	2028 S. Russell St.	1980	\$197,229	Good	none		
Community Center	Building	13120 W. 13th Ave.	1998	\$1,501,621	Good	none		

Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Location of Facility	Date of Facility Acquisition/Construction	Estimated Present Value	Present Condition	Improvements Required	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Park Maintenance Shed	Building	12500 18th Ave.	1997	\$15,427		None		
Park Maintenance Building	Building	924 S. Lawson St.	1994	\$151,988		none		
Police Station	Building	13414 W. Sunset Hwy.	1971	\$180,000	Good			
Public Works Vehicle Storage	Building	2028 S. Russell St.	1997	\$361,266				
Sunset Park Restroom	Building	Sunset Park	1969	\$99,950				
Water tank - 1 mil gallons	Water	12723 S. McFarlane Rd.	1998	\$614,062				
Water tank - 317k gallons	Water	924 S. Lundstrom St.	1972	\$155,347				
Well (Parkwest)	Water	Craig Road	2002	\$126,000				
Well House w/ 1 well	Water	S. Garfield Road	2000	\$24,507				
Well House w/ 2 wells	Water	S. Lawson St.	1998	\$128,661				
Well w/ Pump House	Water	East of Craig Road	2002	\$61,405				
Attack 1	Fire	1208 S. Lundstrom St.	2002	\$175,000	Excellent	Replacement	2017	\$285,000

Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Location of Facility	Date of Facility Acquisition/Construction	Estimated Present Value	Present Condition	Improvements Required	Year Needed	Estimated Cost
Pumper-Ladder 1	Fire	1208 S. Lundstrom St.	2006	\$400,000.00	New	Replacement	2030	\$1,600,000.00
Engine 2	Fire	1208 S. Lundstrom St.	2001	\$200,000.00	Excellent	Replacement	2025	\$700,000.00
Engine 1	Fire	1208 S. Lundstrom St.	2001	\$200,000.00	Excellent	Replacement	2023	\$500,000.00
Shorty Combs Park	Park	12528 W. Frank	1999	\$257,700.00	Fair	See park improvement plan		
Sunset Park	Park	924 S. Lawson St.	2001	\$360,000.00	Good	See park improvement plan		
Aspen Park Site	Park		in design					
Sunset Crossing Park	Park		in design					