

TABLE 1-1				
MASTER LIST OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS				
Project		Estimated		Source of
Date	Project Name	Cost		Funds
<b>Water System Projects</b>				
2007	Pilot Test Program	\$200,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2007	Water Rights	\$30,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2007	South Reservoir Generator Replacement	\$120,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2007	Design Effort for Water Main Extension to Casino	\$150,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2007	Shallow Well Exploration	\$40,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2007	Water Rate Study	\$80,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2008	Water Treatment Plant 2 Modifications	\$2,000,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2008	Additional 3 Shallow Wells and Transmission Lines	\$300,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2008	Design Effort for New Shallow Aquifer Treatment Plant	\$900,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2008	Construction of New Water Main to Casino	\$750,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2008	Distribution System Improvement Phase 1-A	\$510,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2009	Construction of New Water Treatment Plant	\$4,500,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2009	Distribution System Improvement Phase 1-B	\$510,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2010	Distribution System Improvement Phase 1-C	\$510,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2010	Upgrade to Auto Read Meter System Phase 1	\$425,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2010	Chlorine System Improvements at all locations	\$300,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2011	Water System Plan Upgrade	\$250,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2011	Upgrade to Auto Read Meter System Phase 2	\$425,000		W.F.S,PWTF
2011	Distribution System Improvement Phase 2	\$200,000		W.F.S,PWTF
	<b>Total Water System Projects</b>	<b>\$12,200,000</b>		
<b>Sewer System Projects</b>				
2007	Sewer Rate study	\$80,400		SEW
2007	Comp Plan and Capacity Upgrade	\$160,000		SEW
2008	Design Effort for Wastewater Plant Improvements	\$1,200,000		SEW,PWTF,F,S
2008	Illahee and Oyeht Sewer Extension	\$2,500,000		LID,F,S
2009	Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Phase 1	\$2,500,000		SEW,F,S
2010	Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Phase 2	\$3,500,000		SEW,F,S
2011	Design Effort for Moving Sewer Line Out of Oyeht Creek	\$350,000		F,S,M
	<b>Total Sewer System Projects</b>	<b>\$10,290,400</b>		
<b>Stormwater System Projects</b>				
2007	Ditch and Pipe Replacement	\$250,000		STORM
2008	Ditch and Pipe Replacement	\$250,000		STORM
2009	Ditch and Pipe Replacement	\$275,000		STORM
2010	Ditch and Pipe Replacement	\$300,000		STORM
2011	Ditch and Pipe Replacement	\$350,000		STORM
	<b>Total Stormwater System Projects</b>	<b>\$650,000</b>		
<b>Transportation Projects</b>				
2007	Sreet Rehab	\$12,000,000		LID,S,TIB
2008	Sreet Rehab	\$10,000,000		LID,S,TIB
2008	Pt Brown/Chance Roundabout	\$800,000		F,S,TIB
2008	Pt. Brown Sidewalk	\$200,000		TIB,M
2009	Tonquin Ave Bridge Repair	\$1,800,000		F,S,TIB
2009	Street Rehab	\$10,000,000		LID,S,TIB
2009	Downtown Revitalization	\$8,200,000		F,S,TIB
2009	Downtown Sidewalk	\$1,205,000		S,TIB,M
2009	Bike/Ped Paths	\$1,153,000		S,TIB,M
2009	Boat Ramps	\$200,000		F,S,M
2010	Ocean Shores Boulevard Recon.	\$14,500,000		F,S,TIB
	<b>Total Transportation Projects</b>	<b>\$15,853,000</b>		
<b>Building Projects</b>				
2008	City Hall	\$690,000		P,GO,REET
2008	Municipal Court/Council Chambers	\$250,000		P,GO,REET
2008	Permit Center	\$1,800,000		P,GO,REET
2007	Main Fire Station	\$5,400,000		P,GO,REET
2008	Library Expansion	\$850,000		D,P,REET
2009	South End Fire Station Addition	\$60,000		P,GO,REET
	<b>Total Building Projects</b>	<b>\$9,050,000</b>		
<b>Golf Course Projects</b>				
2008	Move Golf Holes	\$1,000,000		P
	<b>Total Golf Course Projects</b>	<b>\$1,000,000</b>		
	<b>Total All Projects</b>	<b>\$49,043,400</b>		
<b>Funding Source Legend:</b>				
C	Grays Harbor County	PFD	Public Facilities Distirct	
CC	Community Development Block Grant	PWTF	Public Works Trust Fund	
CDB	Community Development Block Grant	RB	Revenue Bond	
D	Donations	REET	Real Estate Excise Tax Revenue	
F	Federal Grant	S	State Grant	
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	SEW	Sewer Fund	
GF	City General Fund	ST	City Street Fund	
GO	General Obligation Bonds	STOR	Storm Drain Fund	
GOLF	Golf Course Fund	TIB	Transportation Improvement Board	
H	Hotel Motel Taxes	U	Unknown	
LID	Local Improvement District	W	Water Fund	
M	Match	WSDQ	Washington Department of Transportation	
P	Sale of City Property			

# **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**2007 – 2011**

June 25, 2007

City of Ocean Shores  
800 Anchor Ave. NW  
Ocean Shores, WA 98569



## CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is prepared to prioritize projects and predict fiscal trends based on revenues and expenditures of the City. This enables the City to maintain and improve public facilities and infrastructure to meet established standards. A master list of capital improvement projects is presented in Table 1-1.

To ensure that the resources are available to provide the needed facilities, the plan should be reviewed on an annual basis by the City. If the City is faced with funding shortfalls various strategies to meet funding needs may be used. These include, but are not limited to, prioritizing projects focusing on concurrency, increasing revenues through use of bonds or user fees, decreasing facility costs by changing the project scope or adopted levels of service. In addition, the year in which a project is carried out, or the exact amounts of expenditures by year for individual facilities may vary from that stated in the capital improvement plan due to:

- Unanticipated revenues that become available to the City with conditions about when they may be used; or
- New developments that occur in an earlier or later year than had been anticipated.

Specific debt financing proposals may vary due to changes in interest rates, other terms of financing, or other conditions which make the proposals in the plan not advantageous financially.

### 1.2 GOALS AND POLICIES

The goals and policies of the CIP are intended to provide guidance for decision-making processes subject to this Plan.

**Goal CIP-1: Public involvement should be solicited and encouraged in public facilities planning.**

**Goal CIP-2: When designing and locating public facilities, public entities and utility providers should provide mitigation to prevent adverse impacts on the environment and other public facilities.**

Policy CIP-2.1            Impacts on water resources, drainage systems, natural habitat, geologically hazardous areas, other sensitive areas, and transportation systems should be considered and adverse impacts avoided or mitigated.

**Goal CIP-3: The costs of proposed City owned capital facilities should be within the City's funding capacity, and be equitably distributed between facility users and the City in general.**

Policy CIP-3.1 The CIP should integrate all of the City's capital project resources (grants, bonds, general City funds, donations, real estate excise tax, fees and rates for public utility services, and any other available funding).

Policy CIP-3.2 The additional operation and maintenance costs associated with the acquisition or development of new capital facilities should be assessed. If accommodating these costs places an unacceptable burden on the operating budget capital plans may need to be adjusted.

Policy CIP-3.3 Agreements should be developed between the City and County for financing of capital facilities in the extended service areas to the City before annexations occur.

Policy CIP-3.4 Public utility services should be provided at the lowest possible cost, taking into account both construction and operation/maintenance costs.

Policy CIP-3.5 New public utility services should provide adequate growth capacity avoid expensive retrofits of expansions.

Policy CIP-3.6 If the City is faced with capital facility funding shortfalls, any combination of the following strategies should be used to balance revenues and public facility needs:

- Increase revenues through use of bonds, new or increased user fees or rates, new or increased taxes/service charges, regional cost sharing, or impact fees.
- Decrease level of service standards.
- Reprioritize projects.
- Decrease the cost of the facility by changing project scope, or finding less expensive alternatives.
- Decrease the demand for the public service or facility. This could involve institutional measures to slow or direct population growth or development.

- Revise the Comprehensive Plan’s land use and rural areas element to change types or intensities of land use as needed to match the amount of capital facilities that can be provided.

**Goal CIP-4: Public facilities and services should be provided commensurate with planned development intensities without unduly impacting current service levels.**

Policy CIP-4.1 Land use decisions as identified in the comprehensive plans of the City should be the determinants of development intensity rather than public utility decisions and public utility planning.

Policy CIP-4.2 Where land use plans and zoning regulations conflict with long-range plans for public utilities, the plan and zoning designations should be reviewed.

Policy CIP-4.3 Extension of services and construction of public capital facilities should be provided at levels consistent with development intensity identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

**Goal CIP-5 Public facilities and services should be provided at reasonable costs, consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan, capital budget, and six-year transportation program.**

Policy CIP-5.1 Ocean Shores’ biennial budget and six year transportation program required under RCW 35.77.010 should be consistent with intent and substance of this CIP and Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

**Goal CIP-6: Capital facilities should be designed to include mitigation to protect surface and ground water quality and habitat to prevent chronic flooding from stormwater, to maintain natural stream hydrology, and protect aquatic resources in areas experiencing flood control problems.**

Policy CIP-6.1 Within active flood control zone districts, comprehensive Storm Drainage Plans should be developed to identify and prioritize necessary stormwater services and capital facilities. As new Plans are adopted, the CIP should be reprioritized and updated as needed.

- Policy CIP-6.2 Within active flood control zone districts, the City should attempt to limit potential damage, dangers, or public costs associated with inappropriate land development by reasonable regulation of and application of uniform surface water and erosion control standards.
- Policy CIP-6.3 New development activities in sensitive areas should make provisions for surface water control.
- Policy CIP-6.4 Public improvements and private developments should not alter natural drainage systems without acceptable mitigating measures which limit the risk of flooding or negative impacts to water quality.
- Policy CIP-6.5 Natural surface water storage sites that help regulate streamflows and/or recharge groundwater should be preserved and their quality protected, as may be further defined in any adopted drainage ordinance.
- Policy CIP-6.6 Capital facilities development should not increase peak surface water runoff. In critical drainage, erosion, or flood hazard areas, development should not increase total runoff quantity.
- Policy CIP-6.7 Site designs and construction practices should limit on-site erosion and sedimentation during and after construction.
- Policy CIP-6.8 Natural stream channels should be preserved, protected, and enhanced for their hydraulic, ecological, and aesthetic functions.
- Policy CIP-6.9 The natural flood storage function of floodplains should be preserved where practicable.
- Policy CIP-6.10 One hundred-year floodplains should be protected by locating roads and structures above the one hundred year level, and requiring development to mitigate for existing flood storage capacity lost filling.
- Policy CIP-6.11 Development on slopes should be designed to prevent property damage and environmental degradation.

Policy CIP-6.12 In areas subject to erosion, native ground cover should be retained or replaced after construction, special construction practices should be used, and allowable site coverage may need to be reduced to prevent erosion and sedimentation. Limitations on the time when site work can be done may also be appropriate.

**Goal CIP-7: The City should coordinate planning of parks, trails, and preserves with other local governments so as to serve all residents.**

Policy CIP-7.1 The City should work with the County and other local governments to coordinate park needs throughout the City and to identify regional funding strategies.

Policy CIP-7.2 Future acquisition of parks, trails and preserves, if desired, should occur in a coordinated manner, within an overall plan that identifies priorities, funding sources, and a timetable for acquisition.

Policy CIP-7.3 The City should cooperate with other public agencies to share public facilities for park and year-round recreational use.

**Goal CIP-8: New City government buildings should be located to provide convenient access to residents. City government buildings should be designed for efficient and frugal use of public monies.**

Policy CIP-8.1 Standards for level of service must be realistic, attainable, and not excessive. Level of Service standards should be based on:

- Consideration of national, state and professional standards for the applicable space.
- Applicable federal and state laws.
- Cost effectiveness and consideration of the ability of the City to fund ongoing costs of operations and maintenance.

Policy CIP-8.2 Efficiency in design and use should be a goal for new facility development. Building design and

function should promote flexibility to accommodate a variety of uses and interior spatial changes.

Policy CIP-8.3 Charges for space in City buildings should recover full costs, including capital expenses, amortization, depreciation, and maintenance and operation cost.

**Goal CIP-9: The impact of new school facilities on roads and neighboring uses should be assessed before construction begins.**

Policy CIP-9.1 Where the size of a single proposed development warrants, the developer should identify at the first stage of project review proposed school sites which meet school district needs.

Policy CIP-9.2 Where practical, schools should be located along non-arterial roads, or should include frontage and off-site improvements needed to mitigate the impacts of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Availability of and water facilities and the presence of safety hazards should also be considered in siting schools.

**Goal CIP-10: The City should not provide landfill services.**

Policy CIP-10.1 The City should continue to facilitate the landfill and transfer station facility activities provided by private companies. To facilitate the coordination of these services, the City should discuss and exchange population forecasts, development plans, and technical data with the providers identified in this plan.

**Goal CIP-11: A recycling program should continue with the goal of reducing or recycling the City's waste stream.**