

12.0 IMPLEMENTATION COSTS

The improved management approaches presented in Alternatives II and III of the basin plan, in conjunction with the nonstructural surface water management program, provide the local jurisdictions with the ability to correct existing and prevent future flooding problems and protect the creek system from additional degradation. These alternatives represent a marked improvement in the way the local jurisdictions manage surface water concerns.

Because Alternatives II and III offer a proactive approach to problem solving, the public costs associated with the implementation of these alternatives are higher than the current funding levels. Many of these costs are associated with capital or constructed improvements aimed at correcting historical problems. Given the decreasing availability of undeveloped land in the basins, the costs of capital improvement solutions can be expected to increase dramatically in future years. Therefore, capital solutions to the problems of the basin are most cost-effectively addressed by acting expediently. Other costs of the plan offer a multifaceted approach to problem prevention and, when feasible, emphasize less costly noncapital improvement techniques.

Components of the noncapital improvement aspects of the plan include effective operations and maintenance, improved enforcement and complaint response, creek monitoring, and public involvement and education. The need for these activities is not limited to the Indian/Moxlie Creek basin, nor could the activities be cost-effectively implemented for only this basin. These activities necessitate specialized staff responsible for the implementation of a program or policy throughout the region or jurisdiction. The Indian/Moxlie Creek basin plan as well as the Woodland/Woodard and Percival Creek plans include a consistent nonstructural management program described in Chapter 11 that is suggested for adoption throughout the north Thurston County area.

Because Alternatives II and III encompass basin-specific as well as the nonstructural management program, the funding needs for both aspects of the basin plan are presented in the cost analysis. The Percival Creek and Woodard/Woodland Creeks plans contain identical recommendations and associated costs for the management program.

12.1 Existing Basin Revenues

The combined stormwater utility rate revenues for the two jurisdictions within the basin total approximately \$430,000/year. These revenues were calculated by determining the number of single-family residences, and the quantity of impervious surfaces associated with nonresidential utility accounts and public streets. Nonresidential accounts provide

approximately \$245,000 of these funds. The distribution of the revenue for the jurisdictions of Olympia and Thurston County is approximately 97 percent and 3 percent, respectively.

General facilities charges (GFCs) provide stormwater funding in addition to the utility rates. GFCs are a one-time fee charged at the time of development that help sponsor continued improvements to the public stormwater infrastructure. In 1991, Olympia collected approximately \$20,000 in GFCs from new developments in the basins. Thurston County does not impose GFCs.

Utility revenues provide for the existing level of management within the basin and contribute to the local jurisdictions' stormwater programs of policy development, regulatory oversight, enforcement, operations and maintenance, public involvement and education, and capital improvements. Several capital improvement projects are currently underway in the basin.

Additional funding from several planning and public education grants is currently providing appreciable program budget supplements.

12.2 Rate of Growth in Basin Revenues

Future development in the basins can be expected to focus on residential development in the northern portion of the Indian Creek basin and conversions of residential to commercial/professional land use in the downtown areas. From a revenue standpoint, this potential level of development is minimal and, at best, may serve to negate long-term public revenue limitations due to inflation.

12.3 Implementation Costs for Alternative II and III

The implementation costs associated with Alternatives II and III have been delineated based on whether the cost is basin-specific or regional in nature. Additional cost delineations segregate existing and future problems. The costs applicable to each of the two jurisdictions are also presented.

12.3.1 Basin-Specific Costs

Based on the recommendations presented in Chapter 9, the one-time public capital costs of Alternative II exceed the current level of basin-generated funding by \$2,421,000. The

capital costs would be targeted for the construction of stormwater management facilities and habitat and water quality improvements. These capital costs are associated with the correction of historical deficiencies.

The public capital costs for Alternative III are \$4,625,000 higher than for Alternative II. Annual costs would not increase appreciably. Tables A-13 and A-14 in Appendix 2 summarizes these costs and presents potential funding sources.

12.3.2 Nonstructural Management Program Costs

The nonstructural management program (Chapter 11) needed for the implementation of Alternatives II and III includes increased regulatory oversight, additional operations and maintenance services, improved enforcement, and enhanced public involvement and education. The annual cost of the program to the entire jurisdictions of Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater, and Thurston County is approximately \$1,300,000. A one-time cost of \$696,000 would be necessary. A delineation of the costs of the regional proposals and jurisdictional needs is presented in Table 5 of Chapter 11.

12.4 Cost Share Approaches

Regardless of the funding mechanisms implemented by the local jurisdictions, costs for capital and noncapital activities would have to be allocated between the jurisdictions. Three approaches to capital improvement project and noncapital program cost sharing are available. These are discussed below:

12.4.1 Cost Share Option A

Under cost share option A, necessary funding for the correction of existing and potential future problems would be tied to the current level of development within each jurisdiction that contributes to the problem. The area contributing to a specific problem would be defined topographically.

The calculation of a jurisdiction's financial contribution for any one project would be based on effective impervious surfaces within the contributing drainage area. These surfaces are those impervious areas that generate runoff which leaves developed sites and reaches a downstream stormwater conveyance system. Conversely, many impervious surfaces generate runoff that is promptly infiltrated by adjacent permeable soils. For example, an office building and a single-family residence may contain the same quantity

of impervious surfaces, but due to the presence of a yard capable of infiltrating roof runoff the residential site would have less effective impervious surfaces than the office building. The calculation of effective impervious surfaces within each jurisdiction for existing and build-out conditions has been completed (EPA SWMM, 1991). Approximate cost shares for each basin-specific project based on Option A are presented in Table 6.

The broad-based nature of the noncapital components of the basin plan do not lend themselves well to a funding approach based on a topographic delineation of the source problem as is common for capital improvements. Cost sharing of noncapital programs is better addressed by cost share options B and C.

**Table 6: Implications of Cost Share Options
Alternative II Capital Improvements
Indian/Moxlie Creek Basin**

Recommendation		Cost Share Option A		Cost Share Option B		Cost Share Option C			
		Olympia	Thurston County	Olympia	Thurston County	Olympia	Turnwater	Thurston County	Lacey
9.1.1	Correct Log Cabin/Cain Road	400,000	0	384,000	16,000	117,000	31,000	188,000	64,000
9.1.2	Replace and remove culverts and pipes west of Fredrick Street	305,000	10,000	303,000	12,000	92,000	25,000	148,000	50,000
9.1.3	Interstate 5 detention pond construction	200,000	0	192,000	8,000	58,000	16,000	94,000	32,000
9.1.6	Separate sanitary sewer and stormwater systems	unknown							
9.1.7	Upgrade downtown stormwater system	350,000	0	336,000	14,000	102,000	27,000	165,000	56,000
9.1.8	Retrofit private systems	35,000	0	34,000	1,000	10,000	3,000	16,000	6,000
9.2.1	Replace and remove culverts and pipes east of Fredrick Street	87,000	4,000	87,000	4,000	27,000	7,000	43,000	15,000
9.2.4	Remove Indian/Moxlie pipe near outfall to Budd Inlet	75,000	0	72,000	3,000	22,000	6,000	35,000	12,000
9.5.1	Correct bacteria contamination problem in downtown Olympia	15,000	0	14,000	1,000	4,000	1,000	7,000	2,000
9.5.2	Correct toxicant contamination problem in downtown Olympia	10,000	0	10,000	0	3,000	1,000	5,000	2,000
9.5.3	Conduct septic system investigations	18,000	12,000	29,000	1,000	9,000	2,000	14,000	5,000
9.5.4	Upgrade Olympia Maintenance Center system	150,000	0	144,000	6,000	44,000	12,000	71,000	24,000
Total Financial Responsibilities		2,395,000	26,000	2,325,000	96,000	706,000	189,000	1,134,000	387,000

12.4.2 Cost Share Option B

Cost share option B proposes that the distribution of a specific project or program cost would be based on a jurisdiction's total quantity of effective impervious surfaces within the entire basin. This approach would utilize funding from both Olympia and Thurston County regardless of a specific project's location within the basin.

The option provides a readily acceptable approach to the funding of noncapital improvement programs such as creek monitoring. For capital improvement projects, the option represents a departure from current cost share determinations. While not a regional approach to funding, the option takes the step of distributing the funding needs for projects among the jurisdictions sharing responsibility for the basin. By funding projects based on the total impervious surfaces within the basin, the option recognizes the interconnectedness of the basin's, and to a lesser extent the region's different land uses.

Unlike other urbanized basins in north Thurston County, the Indian/Moxlie Creek basin is almost entirely within one jurisdiction. Given this situation, Olympia carries the burden of financial responsibility for both cost share options A and B. The cost allocation difference between options A and B is minimal for the basin.

12.4.3 Cost Share Option C

Cost share option C is a regional approach to funding surface water management programs within the Urban Growth Management Area (UGMA). The 84-acre UGMA is the core of the region's urbanizing area as formally delineated by the four local jurisdictions. High-density development is encouraged within the area in order to prevent urban sprawl and cost-effectively provide municipal services.

The option expands the responsibility for funding basin management needs beyond the jurisdictions encompassing the basin. Historical problems within the urban core could be funded regionally, while rural problems could be addressed with the recognition that these areas may be more heavily urbanized in the future. The cost sharing option acknowledges that the successful management of surface water provides a critical element in the region's high quality of life, and is therefore a broad-based benefit and concern. Such management may also offer increased operational and managerial efficiencies.

Several levels of regionalization are available under this option. These levels could allow gradual and directed implementation of the option. Potential levels of regional consolidation are as follows:

- Public education and involvement activities could be funded at the regional level.
- Regulations addressing drainage requirements and critical areas could be consistent within the jurisdictions.
- Activities such as operations and maintenance and enforcement could utilize common staff and equipment.
- Utility rate surcharges for the funding of basin-specific projects could be imposed throughout the UGMA.
- Major capital improvement projects could be funded by a regional mechanism. Prioritization of projects could be established by a committee staffed by the local jurisdictions.
- The full scope of jurisdictional management responsibilities could be shifted to a single entity.

Depending upon the degree of consolidation, the implementation of cost share option C would represent a marked departure from existing jurisdictional policies. A cursory analysis of the financial implications of this option on basin-specific capital projects is presented in Table 6. Jurisdictional responsibilities under cost share option C have been estimated based on the respective current populations of the jurisdiction.

12.5 Proposed Cost Share Approach

The determination of an appropriate cost share option must consider equity, effectiveness, and feasibility. With these considerations in mind, different cost share approaches can be used for different types of projects and programs. Preferred approaches should accommodate implementation within a reasonable time frame.

Unlike the majority of the basins in the north Thurston region, Indian/Moxlie Creek basin is almost entirely within the boundaries of one jurisdiction, Olympia. This situation simplifies the analysis of cost sharing and implementation.

All three cost share options are currently being utilized on a limited basis by the four local jurisdictions. The following assignment of cost share responsibilities is proposed given already existing cost share mechanisms.

<u>Management Components</u>	<u>Cost Share Option</u>
Stormwater Facilities	A
Habitat Enhancement/Critical Areas Protection	A, B, or C
Regulations/Development Controls	B or C
Enforcement/Complaint Response	B
Pollution Source Control Programs	B or C
System Monitoring	B or C
Public Involvement and Education	B or C
Regional Program Management	C

The recommended cost share approach accepts the current governmental necessity of funding stormwater facilities based on the drainage area contribution of each jurisdiction (Table 6, cost share option A). Steps to increase the degree of regional management should be embodied in the preferred option for the remaining noncapital management components. In some cases, such as maintenance and enforcement, the existing system represents the appropriate degree of regionalization. Higher degrees of regionalization can be readily implemented for specific activities within, for instance, the public involvement and education program. The nonstructural management program (Chapter 11) presents the proposed degree of noncapital regionalization considered appropriate for the short term. The basin-specific recommendations (Alternatives II and III), as well as the nonstructural management program, support ongoing long-term efforts to increase the level of cooperation among the local jurisdictions.

13.0 FUNDING ALTERNATIVES

The implementation of either Alternative II or III necessitates increased revenues for basin-specific capital projects and noncapital programs as well as the nonstructural management program. Although the strengths and weaknesses of the jurisdictions' surface water management programs are different, all the jurisdictions are under funded compared to implementation funding needs.

Specific recommendations for enhanced funding mechanisms for the local jurisdictions are beyond the intent of the planning process. However, information generated during the planning process has provided numerous insights into the potential for different mechanisms to generate additional funding. This information has been evaluated and the feasibility of existing and potential funding mechanisms investigated.

Establishing an equitable funding approach for Alternative II and III is the primary concern of the funding analysis. Numerous funding options are conceptually possible. The mechanism of revenue generation could encompass administratively simple changes in the existing utility rate structure or the adoption of a fundamentally new approach. The different approaches to funding are associated with varying levels of implementation feasibility, certainty, and equity. Several of these options may be appropriate, or at least provide the basis for comparison and further evaluation. The funding approaches have been evaluated in varying degrees of detail.

13.1 Existing Funding Mechanisms

The local jurisdictions have several existing mechanisms for the funding of stormwater projects and programs. These include historical methods as well as the more recently established stormwater utilities.

13.1.1 Stormwater Utility Fees

The use of stormwater utilities and the associated collection of charges for management services has become an accepted method of revenue generation in the Puget Sound area. The local jurisdictions have unique charges for differing land use types as well as different methods for calculating charges. Charges are based on one of three basic approaches: flat fees, density of development, and amount of impervious surfaces. These calculations are based on the concept that charges be based on the level of contribution to the management problem. The utility charges help fund comprehensive stormwater management programs and to some extent capital improvement projects.

In the Olympia area, residences are charged a flat fee while nonresidential customers pay a rate based on the amount of impervious surface on their parcel. In addition to charges based on the volume of runoff generated by a development, the City of Olympia uses a charge on nonresidential accounts to address water quality concerns. Additionally, a system of credits and surcharges is incorporated into Olympia's utility. In Thurston County, stormwater utility charges are assessed to residents and businesses in the northern portion of the county. County rates are typically less than the cities' rates for similar land uses. The current utility rate structures of the local jurisdictions are as follows:

Table 7: Local Stormwater Utility Rates

Land Use Type	Olympia	Tumwater	Lacey	Thurston County
Single-Family Residential	\$4.50/month	\$4.50/month	\$3.90/month	\$20.00/year
Duplex	\$9.00/month	\$9.00/month	\$7.80/month	\$26.00/year
Multi-Family Residential	8.44 + 1.49 (Total Impervious Area) 2528 sf + 4.13 (Non-building Imp. Area) 2528 sf	0.75 + 3.75 (Total Impervious Area) 3250 sf	\$1.87 to \$44.02/gross acre	\$6.00/unit/year
Commercial, Industrial, and Schools	8.44 + 1.49 (Total Impervious Area) 2528 sf + 4.13 (Non-building Imp. Area) 2528 sf	0.75 + 3.75 (Total Impervious Area) 3250 sf	\$1.87 to \$44.02/gross acre	\$5.56/1,000 impervious sf/year
Streets, Roads, and State Government	30% of commercial charge	30% of commercial charge	30% of commercial charge	30% of commercial charge

Accurate information has been generated on the existing level of development for each jurisdiction in the basin. This information provides the basis for analyzing potential changes in utility rates. These changes are not presented as recommendations, but rather illustrate the structure and potential funding capabilities of the utilities. The results of the evaluation are presented in Table A-15 of Appendix 2. Highlights of the analysis for the Indian/Moxlie Creek basin are as follows:

- A utility rate increase of \$18/year/single-family residence in the portions of the basins in Olympia would generate \$55,000/year.

- A utility rate increase from \$20/year to \$54/year for single-family residences in the portion of the basins in Thurston County would generate approximately \$10,000/year.
- Increasing the nonresidential charges in the portions of the basin in Olympia on a basis proportional to increases in the single-family residence increases would generate \$51,000/year. These revenues do not include public street and road charges.
- Increasing the utility rate for local streets and roads in the basin from 30 percent of the private nonresidential rate to 40 percent or 50 percent of the private nonresidential rate would increase revenues by \$21,000 or \$42,000/year, respectively. Since the rate charged for state roads can not be increased beyond the 30 percent level, those roads have not been included in the analysis.
- An enhanced system of surcharges for residential and nonresidential accounts without onsite stormwater storage facilities could generate between \$75,000 and \$225,000/year. The funds generated would be dependent upon the amount of the surcharge. A range of \$1.00 to \$3.00/month/single-family equivalent was used for the analysis. This analysis was limited to developments which provided no storage. Higher revenues would be generated if a specified level of facility performance was expected of existing facilities.

13.1.2 General Facilities Charge (GFCs)

General facilities charges are a one-time fee charged at the time of development to buy into the existing utility system. These charges acknowledge the past development of regional infrastructure and the need for continued construction activities. A fee of \$1,700/acre is charged to new development in the City of Olympia. The fee is aimed at providing regional stormwater management for the area. Thurston County does not impose these charges. Imposing GFCs basin-wide at the Olympia level would generate additional, but minimal, funds for Thurston County.

13.1.3 Street and Road Funds

Funding for drainage improvement and maintenance in Thurston County is largely the responsibility of the Street and Road Department. Improvements, such as culverts and ditches, are seen as necessary to accommodate transportation needs. Street and road

funds currently support only minor capital improvements. Thurston County's stormwater system is largely comprised of ditches and culverts. Minimal additional funds can be expected from this source.

13.1.4 General Funds

A jurisdiction's general funds can be used for a variety of projects and programs including stormwater management. Historically, these funds have provided capital funding for drainage improvements. With the imposition of stormwater utilities, the expected reliance on general funds for stormwater projects has been eliminated. Currently, general funds are not a readily available funding source.

13.1.5 Plan Review and Inspection Fees

The jurisdictional costs of plan review and construction inspection aimed at ensuring development compliance with codes, regulations, and policies is lessened by the imposition of one-time fees. All aspects of stormwater and environmental design are subject to review and inspection. These fees vary from fixed rates for small developments to variable rates for larger developments. The amount of money generated from permits does not typically cover the cost of program operation. Potential increase in the fee structure would generate minimal additional revenues.

13.1.6 State and Federal Grants

Although competition for grant funds is high, the adoption of a basin plan enhances a jurisdiction's ability to obtain funding. Historical problems causing property damage, presenting a public safety hazard, or impairing water quality are especially appropriate for grant funding. Public education and involvement programs are also eligible for grant funding. Utilizing these funds for historical problems would allow the expenditure of stormwater utility funds for the prevention of potential problems and the remediation of environmental damage.

Due to high competition for grants, the likelihood of receiving high levels of funding is minimal. While financially helpful, a reliance on grant funding generates management uncertainty. The local jurisdictions are currently utilizing grant funding for planning, construction, and PIE activities.

The major grant funding sources applicable to surface water management are as follows:

Centennial Clean Water Fund

The Centennial Clean Water Fund is administered through the Washington Department of Ecology. The fund was established in 1986 to provide a source of financial assistance for the funding of planning, design, acquisition, construction, and improvement of water pollution control facilities including nonpoint source projects. These projects are supported to meet state and federal pollution control requirements for the protection of the state's waters. Grant recipients are required to provide a portion of the project cost through a local match of 25 to 50 percent. The fund has \$45 million available per year through 1995.

Flood Control Assistance Account Program

The Floodplain Management Section of the Department of Ecology administers the Flood Control Assistance Account Program (FCAAP). FCAAP is a grant program that assists cities, counties and local districts with flood control emergency and non-emergency maintenance and capital improvement projects. The maximum funding possible per County per biennium is \$500,000 for non-emergency grants and \$150,000 for emergency grants. A local match of 50 and 20 percent is required for maintenance and emergency maintenance projects, respectively.

Puget Sound Water Quality Authority Public Involvement and Education Fund

Grants are available to local governments and other organizations to initiate and continue public involvement and education activities in the Puget Sound region. A wide variety of public education projects are potentially supportable by the grants. The funding for these grants originates from the Washington State Centennial Clean Water Fund. Approximately \$1 million per year is available.

Washington State Ecosystems Conservation Project

The Washington Department of Wildlife in cooperation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, has established two programs aimed at the protection of valuable upland, riparian, and wetland habitats within the state. Approximately \$300,000 annually has been allocated to support the programs.

One of these program, the Washington State Upland Wildlife Program addresses the loss of upland habitat and associated decreasing wildlife diversity. The current focus of the program is on the acquisition of upland habitat in eastern Washington. The second

program is the Washington Wetlands and Riparian Initiative. The goal of this program is to protect wetlands and riparian resources. Public ownership, incentives, easements, cooperative agreements, land trusts, and other innovative approaches are encouraged.

Olympia Environmentally Critical Areas Fund

Every year the City Council of Olympia allocates \$50,000 from the capital improvement projects budget for the acquisition of critical areas. These funds have been earmarked for the purchase of the Grass Lakes wetland area in Percival Creek Basin.

Table A-16 in Appendix 2 provides additional information on grant programs.

13.2 Potential Funding Mechanisms

Many different combinations of rate changes in the existing stormwater utility mechanisms are conceptually possible. The analysis has led to the evaluation of potential alternative sources of funding.

13.2.1 Development Impact Fees

Impact fees are paid by new development to fund infrastructure improvements occasioned by the development. These fees are charged to offset the public costs associated with growth. Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2929 (Growth Management Act) supports the use of impact fees for certain services in regions, such as the Olympia area, that are experiencing rapid growth rates.

Under the current legislative mandate, impact fees cannot be imposed to address stormwater management concerns. However, road improvements and open space preservation are eligible for the imposition of impact fees. Such fees could assist in the upgrading of culverts, constructing stormwater management facilities for roads, and preserving the streamside habitat.

13.2.2 Street Utility

Local jurisdictions have the authority to impose street utilities to pay for street and street related improvements. The utility can be assessed at \$2/month/single-family residence and charged to employers at \$2/month/employee. State offices are exempt from paying the utility on their employees. In the north Thurston County area the state employs

approximately 35 percent of the work force. With respect to water resources concerns, the utility revenues could be used only for stormwater projects associated with streets and culvert improvements. Numerous such projects exist within the basin and region.

Imposing the utility would generate approximately \$120,000/year in the Indian/Moxlie Creek basin.

13.2.3 Fee-in-Lieu of Construction

This approach encourages a developer to contribute financially to the development of regional stormwater management facilities rather than construct onsite facilities. In certain instances, a regional facility could be a cost-effective, environmentally beneficial alternative to onsite systems. Costs savings to both private and public entities could be appreciable for certain projects.

13.2.4 Local Improvement Districts (LIDs)

Local improvement districts (LIDs) are a common funding source for infrastructure installation or improvement when the beneficiaries of the project are readily identifiable. These districts are established by residents for the purpose of funding neighborhood improvements. Once the district is established and recognized by the local jurisdiction, the jurisdiction sells bonds to finance the project and supervises the completion of the project. The district residents are responsible for reimbursing the jurisdiction for project costs.

Due to the difficulties associated with identification of the specific group benefiting from stormwater projects, LIDs are an untried mechanism for funding stormwater projects. LIDs are also relatively costly to establish and administer.

13.2.5 Flood Control Zone Districts

Counties may establish areas for the purpose of managing stormwater projects benefiting the specific area or watershed. Funds to support the district can be obtained by tax levies, special assessments, and LIDs.

13.3 Debt Financing

Capital improvement projects can be undertaken expediently by incorporating long-term financing by loans and/or bonds into the funding approach. This approach necessitates the confirmation of the ability of the jurisdiction to service the debt.

13.3.1 Loans

Several low interest, long-term loans are available to municipalities. Additional information on loan programs is presented in Table A-16 of Appendix 2.

The State of Washington Public Works Trust Fund

The Public Works Trust Fund offers low interest loans for the repair, replacement, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or improvement of public works systems through the State Department of Community Development. Emergency loans are also available. Eligible projects include a wide range of drainage facilities. Projects to enhance or protect wetlands from stormwater impacts are also eligible. The program is not intended to finance growth-related projects. Approximately \$43 million per year is available.

Department of Ecology Centennial Clean Water Fund—Loans

The Centennial Program offers grants and loans to local governments and Indian tribes for activities and facilities that protect and enhance water quality. Loans are available for up to 100 percent of the total eligible project costs. Terms of loans are interest free for 0- to 5-year loans, 4 percent for 6- to 14-year loans, and 5 percent for 15- to 20-year loans. Funds are available for planning, design, construction, or implementation of water related projects.

Washington State Revolving Fund for Water Pollution Control

The State Revolving Fund (SRF) was established in 1988 to provide financial assistance in the form of low-interest loans to public bodies to deal with high priority water quality needs. These may include wastewater treatment facilities, nonpoint source water pollution projects, and conservation and management projects in estuaries. The fund is self-sustaining through capitalization by federal grants. Projects may be 100 percent

eligible and repayable over 20 years. In fiscal years 1990 and 1991 approximately \$20 million was made available to fund projects. Funding may increase to \$30 million in 1993.

Eighty percent of the SRF is directed towards the planning, design, and construction of water pollution control facilities. The remainder is targeted towards nonpoint source pollution projects and estuary conservation and management.

13.3.2 Municipal Bonding

Municipal bonds are an agreement to pay specified sums of money in the future. The sale of utility bonds can raise capital to fund the construction of needed projects, with the costs being repaid over time. Two basic types of bonds can be utilized: general obligation bonds and revenue bonds. The use of stormwater utility revenue for bond servicing would prompt the use of revenue bonds. State law does not limit the amount of revenue debt for local jurisdictions, but assurances that utility rates capable of servicing the debt are necessary.

Bonding has commonly been used by municipalities for the financing of major improvements. Due to the relatively small expenditures needed for past stormwater improvements, bonding has not played a role in financing local stormwater projects.

13.4 Potential Intrajurisdictional Funding Approaches

Several changes in the funding structure of municipalities potentially offer increased stormwater revenues or efficiencies.

13.4.1 Combined Funding and Prioritization of Stormwater, Sewer, Water, and Solid Waste Projects

Conceptually, capital improvement revenues from the stormwater, sewer, water, and solid waste utilities could be combined and potential projects prioritization and undertaken based on the combined funding level. This approach could potentially lead to a more effective use of funds by the utilities. It would represent a major change in the structure of the utilities.

13.4.2 Joint Public Works and Parks Project Proposals

Public works and parks departments within the local jurisdictions commonly coordinate the development of stormwater management facilities with the goal of creating multiple use amenities. These efforts could potentially be enhanced by additional coordination, planning, and funding of natural resource preservation projects and programs.

13.5 Regional Funding Approaches

13.5.1 Regional Management

While not a funding approach, regional management of water resources may present cost savings to the local jurisdictions. These potential savings could range from staffing needs to capital equipment. The basin plan has not quantified the potential savings, but recognizes the likelihood of increased efficiencies.

13.5.2 Sales Tax Levy

Local jurisdictions are allowed to utilize 0.5 percent of the 7.9 percent Washington state sales tax. An additional 0.5 percent of the tax is available if jurisdictions choose not to utilize a real estate excise tax. The local jurisdictions are currently collecting the optional sales tax instead of imposing the real estate tax. Thurston County and Olympia are collecting the maximum allowable amount. Sales tax revenues collected by the local jurisdictions are classified as general funds and can be utilized at the jurisdiction's discretion. The sales tax is distributed as follows: 6.5 percent to the State, 0.5 to 1.0 percent to the local jurisdictions, 0.1 percent to the state criminal system, and 0.3 percent to mass transit.

13.5.3 Real Estate Levy

Local jurisdictions can utilize two 0.25 percents in real estate excise taxes, and have an option to collect an extra 0.5 percent. Jurisdictions can choose to utilize the 0.5 percent real estate tax or the 0.5 percent sales tax.

The City of Olympia is collecting both of the 0.25 percent real estate taxes and the 0.5 percent retail sales tax. Thurston County collects only one of the 0.25 percent real estate taxes and the 0.5 cent sales tax.

13.5.4 Fuel Tax

Currently, only cities or towns within ten miles of an international border have the legal authority to impose a one cent-per-gallon fuel tax for street maintenance and improvement. In order for Thurston County to gain the authority to impose a fuel tax for watershed protection, a bill would have to be submitted for approval by the Washington State Legislature with subsequent ballot approval by Thurston County residents. Appreciable revenues could potentially be generated by such a tax.

Potential revenue sources are summarized in Table A-17 of Appendix 2.

13.6 Potential Funding Approach

Equity is the primary concern of establishing a feasible funding approach. With this in mind, an appropriate funding approach should focus on generating revenues from the contributors to the problems. In some cases a contributor to a problem can be identified (e.g., runoff generated by a impervious property). In other cases such as nonpoint water pollution, the problem stems from small contributions from the many residents of the region. A variety of revenue generating mechanisms are therefore suggested to equitably address the problems. Additionally, the utilization of state grant funds should be maximized whenever possible to fund capital projects.

Another equity issue is the need to promote consistent revenue generating mechanisms as well as development regulations among the local jurisdictions. If not guarded against, the funding and implementation of the plan could potentially promote financial inequities among the residents of the local jurisdictions.

The ongoing basin plans (Indian/Moxlie Creek, Percival Creek, Woodard/Woodland Creek, and Chambers Creek) consistently indicate that additional public funds will be necessary for effective surface water management throughout the north Thurston County region. A regional analysis of capital improvement costs is therefore necessary before an appropriate funding mechanism for a specific basin can be supported by staff and the public.

The draft Indian/Moxlie and Percival Creek basin plans are complete. The Woodard/Woodland Creek basin plan will be completed in the spring of 1993. Preliminary work on the Chambers Creek basin plan has begun. Additionally, a basin reconnaissance project conducted by the City of Olympia has provided an overview of problems in the other drainage basins of the urban area. The information available from

these various projects have been used to provide an overview of regional funding needs. Continuing discussions of funding alternatives for projects and programs in the Indian/Moxlie Creek basin will occur in the context of regional problems and needs.

14.0 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

14.1 Plan Development Process

In June 1990 the Stormwater Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), comprised of stormwater managers from the four local jurisdictions, adopted a set of goals and objectives to direct the development of all basin plans in the Thurston County area. These goals and objectives are presented in Chapter 2 of the plan and are used to evaluate management alternatives in Chapter 8.

Citizen Ad-Hoc Advisory Committees for the basin plans were established by the City of Olympia in April 1991. The five-member committees represent business, environmental, neighborhoods, and unaffiliated residents of the basin. The committees have met approximately eight times to discuss plan development and implementation. The Thurston County Storm and Surface Water Advisory Board (SSWAB) has also provided input and support to the plan.

In the later stages of plan development, the two ad-hoc committees and the basin planning subcommittee of SSWAB met an additional three times to discuss implementation and regional concerns.

A preliminary draft plan was issued in August 1991 and distributed to local and state staff and interested public. Based on resultant input, agreement on the scope and nature of the preferred management alternatives was established.

The draft plan was completed in March 1992. Approximately 150 copies of the plan have been distributed to local staff, neighborhood associations, business organizations, and the interested public. In general, comments regarding the recommendations have been supportive, and revisions minimal.

Three public workshops have been hosted over the two-year planning process by Olympia staff to solicit input to the planning process. The workshops were attended by generally supportive audiences.

14.2 Environmental Review

In April 1992, an environmental checklist was submitted to the City of Olympia Planning Department for the Indian/Moxlie Creek drainage basin plan. On June 12, 1992, a nonproject Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) was issued for the plan with no mitigating conditions (see Appendix 12).

14.3 Concurrence With the Plan

The process of concurrence formally establishes a jurisdiction's support of plan recommendations. If in concurrence with the basin plan, a jurisdiction indicates its commitment to pursue plan implementation. Letters of concurrence from the Washington Department of Transportation and Thurston County have been solicited and are included in Appendix 13 of the basin plan.

14.4 Plan Adoption

Adoption of the basin plan requires the approval of a jurisdiction's elected officials. Following adoption, local staffs would develop implementation strategies for the plan recommendations. Implementation would require changes in several related plans and regulations including capital improvement programs, comprehensive land use plans, critical area ordinances, and the *Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual for the Thurston Region*. Revisions to building codes and land clearing ordinances could also result from further investigations recommended by the plans. Additionally, increases in local stormwater utilities could be sought with the support of local elected officials.

On August 4, 1992, the Olympia City Council acted to adopt the Indian/Moxlie Creek drainage basin plan. On September 23, 1992, the Thurston Board of County Commissioners passed a resolution adopting the plan.

14.5 Roles and Responsibilities

The basin plan will necessitate close coordination among the jurisdictions within the basin. As has been discussed, enhanced capital improvement as well as noncapital programs will require additional funding and staff. The lead agencies for basin-specific projects and programs included in Alternative II are discussed in the recommendations of Chapter 9. Nonstructural surface water management program recommendations are presented in Chapter 11. The proposed roles and responsibilities of Olympia and Thurston County in implementing the final plan will include the following:

- Encourage public support of the plan.
- Initiate and implement necessary funding strategies.
- Providing adequate staff to fulfill plan recommendations.
- Heighten multi-jurisdictional cooperation in basin management.
- Evaluate compliance with and success of the implementation strategy.
- Respond to potential difficulties with plan implementation.

14.6 Schedule for Implementing Recommendations

The majority of the recommendations provided in the plan rely upon the existing regulatory framework of the jurisdictions. Programs utilizing this framework could, with adequate funding, begin to be implemented in 1993. Capital improvement projects typically require considerable lead time. In all likelihood capital projects could not be implemented prior to 1994.

A possible implementation schedule for the various programs and projects is presented in Table 8. This schedule is highly dependent upon the type of cost share and funding mechanisms utilized to generate additional revenues. The implementation schedule is expected to be altered following review of regional cost and funding information.

14.7 Evaluation of Plan Effectiveness

A mechanism to evaluate the long-term success of plan implementation is incorporated into the recommendations of Alternative II and III. A brief review of basin conditions and implementation successes and problems would be provided to the public, staff, and elected officials on a yearly basis. Methods to evaluate the success of the plan include:

- Water quality, flow, habitat, and wetland monitoring results.
- Achievement of anticipated creek flood flow levels.
- Compliance with state and potential federal water quality regulations.
- Preservation and enhancement of fish populations.
- Number of established conservation easements.
- Adherence to the implementation schedule.
- Increased public participation, knowledge, and awareness.
- Reduction of citizen complaints.
- Number of remedial and emergency responses necessary.
- Ability to respond to unforeseen management problems.

Elected officials would be notified of any failure to meet the level of service associated with the implemented plan and the extent of the inadequacies.

**Table 8: Capital Improvement Costs and Scheduling
Indian/Moxlie Creek Basin**

Recommendation		Engrs Cost Est	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
9.1.1	Correct Log Cabin/Cain Road flooding problem	400,000		400,000							
9.1.2	Replace and remove culverts and pipes west of Fredrick Street	315,000			315,000						
9.1.3	Interstate 5 detention pond construction	200,000				200,000					
9.1.6	Separate sanitary sewer and stormwater systems	750,000		75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
9.1.7	Upgrade downtown stormwater system	350,000				35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
9.1.8	Retrofit private systems	35,000			15,000	20,000					
9.2.1	Replace and remove culverts and pipes east of Fredrick Street	91,000									
9.2.4	Remove Indian/Moxlie pipe near outfall to Budd Inlet	75,000					75,000				
9.5.1	Correct bacteria contamination problem in downtown Olympia	15,000	15,000								
9.5.2	Correct toxicant contamination problem in downtown Olympia	10,000		10,000							
9.5.3	Conduct septic system investigations	30,000		30,000							
9.5.4	Upgrade Olympia Maintenance Center system	150,000					150,000				
Total Expenditures		2,421,000	15,000	515,000	405,000	330,000	335,000	110,000	110,000	110,000	110,000

Selected References

Bissonnette, P., "Bellevue Experiences with Urban Runoff Quality Control Strategies," In: Perspectives on Nonpoint Source Pollution, Proceedings of a National Conference, Kansas City, MO, May 19-22, 1985, Environmental Protection Agency, pp. 279-280.

Brown and Caldwell, Inc., "Analysis of Stormwater and Monitoring Data for Time Trends and Land Use Differences for City of Seattle," May 1989.

Canada Department of Fisheries and Oceans, "Fish Habitat Enhancement: A Manual for Freshwater, Estuarine, and Marine Habitats," British Columbia, 1990.

Canning, D.J., "Urban Runoff Water Quality: Effects and Management Options," Shorelands Technical Advisory Paper No. 4, Shorelands and Coastal Zone Management Program, Washington State Department of Ecology, 1988.

City of Olympia Planning Department, "City of Olympia Comprehensive Plan," Olympia, Washington, 1987.

"Drainage Design and Erosion Control Manual for the Thurston Region," Thurston County, 1991.

Galvin, D. and Moore, R.K., "Toxicants in Urban Runoff -- Metro Toxicant Program Report #2," Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle, Seattle, WA, 1982.

Hammer, T.R. "Stream Channel Enlargement Due to Urbanization," Water Resources Research, 8(6), pp. 453-471, 1972.

Jones, J.R., and Smart, M.M., "Stream-Watershed Relations in the Missouri Ozark Plateau Province," Missouri Water Resources Research Center, University of Missouri, NTIS PB81-14935, 1980.

Kirkpatrick, DeeAnn, "Urban Stormwater and Streams: Impacts and Management Solutions," M.S. Thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, 1990.

Klein, R.D., "Urbanization and Stream Quality Impairment," Water Resources Bulletin, 1979.

Knack, Ruth Eckdish, "Selling Cluster," 1990.

Miller, Stan, "The Impact of Storm Water Runoff on Ground Water Quality and Potential Mitigation," presented at the Conference on Protection and Management of Aquifers with Emphasis on the Rathdrum-Spokane Aquifer, October 10, 1984.

Murray, J., "Nonpoint Pollution First Step in Control," presented at the Engineering Foundation Conference on Current Practice and Design Criteria for Urban Quality Control, July 10-15, 1988.

Omerick, J.M., "Nonpoint Source Stream Nutrient Level Relationships: A Nationwide Study," U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Ecological Research Series Rep. EPA-600/3-77-105, 1977.

Pederson, E.R., "The Use of Benthic Invertebrates Data for Evaluating Impacts of Urban Stormwater Runoff," Master's Thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 1981.

Pitt, R., and Bozeman, M., "Water Quality and Biological Effects of Urban Runoff on Coyote Creek," Phase V - Preliminary Survey, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Protection Technology Series Rep. EPA-600-2-80-104, 1980.

Plafkin, J.L., et al., "Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Streams and Rivers," Benthic Macroinvertebrates and Fish, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency--Office of Water, EPA/444/4-89-001, 1989.

Platts, W.S., et al., "Method for Evaluating Riparian Habitats with Applications to Management," Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-221, USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Ogden, UT, 1987.

PTI Environmental Services, "Budd Inlet Urban Bay Action Program--Draft Report," 1990.

Puget Sound Water Quality Authority, "Protecting Fish and Wildlife Habitat in Puget Sound," March 1990.

Ralph, Stephen C., "Timber/Fish/Wildlife Stream Ambient Monitoring Field Program Manual," University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, 1989.

Richey, J.S., Horner, R.R., and Mar, B.W., "The Delphi Technique in Environmental Monitoring Program Design," *Journal of Environmental Management* (21), 1985b, pp. 147-159.

Richey, J.S., Horner, R.R., and Mar, B.W., "The Delphi Technique in Environmental Assessment II: Consensus on Critical Issues in Environmental Monitoring Program Design," *Journal of Environmental Management* (21), 1985b, pp. 135-146.

Robison, A.M., "The Effects of Urbanization on Stream Channel Morphology," In: *Proceedings of International Symposium on Urban Hydrology, Hydraulics, and Sediment Control*, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, 1986, pp. 115-127.

Schueler, T.R., "Controlling Urban Runoff: A Practical Manual for Planning and Designing Urban BMP'," Department of Environmental Programs, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, 1987.

Scott, J.B., "The Potential and Realized Impacts of Urban Nonpoint Source Pollution Upon the Fish Populations of Kelsey Creek, Bellevue, Washington," Master's Thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 1982.

Soule, Oscar H. and Neitzel, James J., eds., "Indian Creek Report," The Evergreen State College, Olympia, WA, 1990, unpublished manuscript.

Steward, C.R., "Salmonid Populations in an Urban Environment: Kelsey Creek, Washington," Master's Thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 1983.

Tetra Tech Inc., "Elliot Bay Revised Action Program: Storm Drain Monitoring Approach," Prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Seattle, Washington, 1988.

Tetra Tech, Inc., "Puget Sound Protocols: Recommending Guidelines for Measuring Organic Compounds in Puget Sound Sediment and Tissue Samples," Prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Seattle, Washington, 1989.

Tetra Tech, Inc., "Puget Sound Protocols: Recommending Guidelines for Measuring Metals in Puget Sound Water, Sediment and Tissue Samples," Prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Seattle, Washington, 1989.

Thurston County Environmental Health Department, "Northern Thurston County Groundwater Management Plan Preliminary Draft," Olympia, Washington, 1991.

Thurston County Environmental Health Department, "Thurston County Stormwater Quality Report," Olympia, Washington, 1989.

Thurston County Planning Department, "Thurston County Comprehensive Plan," Thurston County, Washington, 1988.

URS Company, "Comprehensive Circulation and Water Quality Study at Budd Inlet," 1986.

U.S. Department of Agriculture--Soil Conservation Service, "Soil Survey, Thurston County, Washington," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1990.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency--Water Planning Division, "Results of the Nationwide Urban Runoff Program," Vol. 1 - Final Report, Washington, DC, 1983.

U.S. Geological Survey, "Geology and Groundwater Resources of Thurston County, Washington," Tacoma, Washington, 1961.

Washington Administrative Code Revised, "Water Quality Standards for Waters of the State of Washington," 1988.

Washington Department of Ecology, "Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin--Public Review Draft," Publication #90-73, June 1991.

Washington Department of Ecology, "Trophic Classification of Washington Lakes Using Reconnaissance Data," Water Supply Bulletin #57, U.S.D.I. Geologic Survey, 1985.

Washington Department of Ecology, "Commonly Required Environmental Permits for Washington State," September 1990.

Washington Department of Wildlife, "Management Recommendations for Priority Species," Washington, 1991.

Williams, R.W., Laramie, R.M., and Ames, J.J., "A Catalog of Washington Streams and Salmon Utilization, Volume 1, Puget Sound," Washington Department of Fisheries, Olympia, Washington, 1975.