

**PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES  
IMPACT FEE RATE STUDY**

FOR

**Thurston County, Washington**

Prepared By

Henderson,  
Young &  
Company

March 12, 2012

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. CAPACITY COSTS .....	7
3. FUNDING OTHER THAN IMPACT FEES.....	8
4. APPORTIONMENT OF POPULATION (2012–2017).....	10
5. APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDING OTHER THAN IMPACT FEES .....	11
6. GROWTH’S SHARE OF PROJECT COSTS (2012-2017).....	11
7. GROWTH’S COST PER CAPITA (2012-2017) .....	11
8. IMPACT FEE RATES .....	12
APPENDIX: LEVEL OF SERVICE .....	13

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This study of impact fees for parks and recreational facilities for Thurston County presents the methodology, summarizes the data, and explains the calculation of the fees. The methodology is designed to comply with the requirements of Washington law. This introduction describes the basis for parks and recreational impact fees, including:

- Definition and Rationale of Impact Fees
- Statutory Basis For Impact Fees
- Responsibility for Public Facilities
- Need for Additional Parks and Recreational Facilities
- Determining the Benefit of Parks and Recreational Facilities to Development
- Methodology and Relationship to Capital Facilities Plan
- Data Sources and Calculation

## Definition and Rationale of Impact Fees

Impact fees are charges paid by new development to reimburse local governments for the capital cost of public facilities that are needed to serve new development and the people who occupy the new development. New development is synonymous with “growth.”

Local governments charge impact fees on either of two bases. First, as a matter of policy and legislative discretion, they may want new development to pay the full cost of its share of new public facilities because that portion of the facilities would not be needed except to serve the new development. In this case, the new development is required to pay for virtually all the cost of its share of new public facilities<sup>1</sup>.

On the other hand, local governments may use other sources of revenue to pay for the new public facilities that are required to serve new development. If, however, such revenues are not sufficient to cover the entire costs of new facilities necessitated by new development, the new development may be required to pay an impact fee in an amount equal to the difference between the total cost and the other sources of revenue.

There are many kinds of "public facilities" that are needed by new development, including parks and recreational facilities, fire protection facilities, schools, roads, water and sewer plants, libraries, and other government facilities. This study covers parks and recreational facilities for Thurston County, Washington. Impact fees for parks and recreational facilities will be charged to all residential development within unincorporated Thurston County.

---

<sup>1</sup> RCW 82.02.050 (2) prohibits impact fees that charge 100% of the cost, but does not specify how much less than 100%, leaving that determination to local governments.

## **Statutory Basis For Impact Fees**

RCW 82.02.050 - 82.02.090 authorizes local governments in Washington to charge impact fees. The impact fees that are described in this study are not mitigation payments authorized by the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). There are several important differences between impact fees and SEPA mitigations including: 1) the ability to charge for the cost of public facilities that are "system improvements" (i.e., that provide service to the community at large) as opposed to "project improvements" (which are "on-site" and provide service for a particular development), and 2) the ability to charge small-scale development their proportionate share, whereas SEPA may exempt small developments.

The following synopsis of the most significant requirements of the law includes citations to the Revised Code of Washington as an aid to readers who wish to review the exact language of the statutes.

### **Types of Public Facilities**

Four types of public facilities can be the subject of impact fees: 1) public streets and roads; 2) publicly owned parks, open space and recreational facilities; 3) school facilities; and 4) fire protection facilities. *RCW 82.02.050(2) and (4), and RCW 82.02.090(7)*

### **Types of Improvements**

Impact fees can be spent on "system improvements" (which are typically located outside the development), as opposed to "project improvements" (which are typically provided by the developer on-site within the development). *RCW 82.02.050(3)(a) and RCW 82.02.090(6) and (9)*

### **Benefit to Development**

Impact fees must be limited to system improvements that are reasonably related to, and which will benefit new development. *RCW 82.02.050(3)(a) and (c)*. Local governments must establish reasonable service areas (one area, or more than one, as determined to be reasonable by the local government), and local governments must develop impact fee rate categories for various land uses. *RCW 82.02.060(6)*

### **Proportionate Share**

Impact fees cannot exceed the development's proportionate share of system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development. The impact fee amount shall be based on a formula (or other method of calculating the fee) that determines the proportionate share. *RCW 82.02.050(3)(b) and RCW 82.02.060(1)*

### **Reductions of Impact Fee Amounts**

Impact fees rates must be adjusted to account for other revenues that the development pays (if such payments are earmarked for or proratable to particular system improvements). *RCW 82.02.050(1)(c) and (2) and RCW 82.02.060(1)(b)* Impact fees may be credited for the value of

dedicated land, improvements or construction provided by the developer (if such facilities are in the adopted CFP and are required as a condition of development approval). *RCW 82.02.060(3)*

## **Exemptions from Impact Fees**

Local governments have the discretion to provide exemptions from impact fees for low-income housing and other "broad public purpose" development, but all such exemptions must be paid from public funds (other than impact fee accounts). *RCW 82.02.060(2)*

## **Developer Options**

Developers who are liable for impact fees can submit data and or/analysis to demonstrate that the impacts of the proposed development are less than the impacts calculated in this rate study. *RCW 82.02.060(5)*. Developers can pay impact fees under protest and appeal impact fee calculations. *RCW 82.02.060(4) and RCW 82.02.070(4) and (5)*. The developer can obtain a refund of the impact fees if the local government fails to expend the impact fee payments within 10 years, or terminates the impact fee requirement, or the developer does not proceed with the development (and creates no impacts). *RCW 82.02.080*

## **Capital Facilities Plans**

Impact fees must be expended on public facilities in a capital facilities plan (CFP) element (or used to reimburse the government for the unused capacity of existing facilities). The CFP must conform to the Growth Management Act of 1990, as amended, and must identify existing deficiencies in facility capacity for current development, capacity of existing facilities available for new development, and additional facility capacity needed for new development. *RCW 82.02.050(4), RCW 82.02.060(7), and RCW 82.02.070(2)*

## **New versus Existing Facilities**

Impact fees can be charged for new public facilities (*RCW 82.02.060(1)(a)*) and for the unused capacity of existing public facilities (*RCW 82.02.060(7)*), subject to the proportionate share limitation described above.

## **Accounting Requirements**

The local government must separate the impact fees from other monies, expend the money on related CFP projects within 10 years, and prepare annual reports of collections and expenditures. *RCW 82.02.070(1)-(3)*

## **ISSUES RELATING TO IMPACT FEES**

Prior to calculating impact fee rates, several issues must be addressed in order to determine the need for, and validity of such fees: responsibility for public facilities, the need for additional park and recreational facilities, the need for revenue for additional parks and recreational facilities, and the benefit of new parks and recreational facilities to new development.

## **Responsibility for Public Facilities**

In general, local governments that are authorized to charge impact fees are responsible for the specific public facilities for which they may charge such fees. Thurston County is legally and financially responsible for the parks and recreational facilities it owns and operates within its jurisdiction. In no case may a local government charge impact fees for private facilities, but it may charge impact fees for some public facilities that it does not administer if such facilities are “owned or operated by government entities” (*RCW 82.82.090(7)*).

## **Need for Additional Park and Recreational Facilities**

The need for additional parks and recreational facilities is determined by using standards for levels of service for park and recreational facilities to calculate the quantity of facilities that are required. The required quantity is then compared to the existing inventory to determine the need for additional land and facilities. The analysis of needed parks and recreational facilities must comply with the statutory requirements for identifying existing deficiency, reserve capacity and new capacity requirements for facilities.

For the purpose of quantifying the need for parks and recreational facilities, this study uses the County’s value of the existing parks and recreational facilities per capita. As greater growth occurs, more value is required; therefore more parks and recreational facilities are needed to maintain standards. The analysis and text documenting the value of parks and recreational facilities per person is explained in Section 7 of this study and the Appendix.

## **Determining the Benefit to Development**

The law imposes three tests of the benefit provided to development by impact fees: 1) proportionate share, 2) reasonably related to need, and 3) reasonably related to expenditure (*RCW 80.20.050(3)*).

### **A. Proportionate Share**

First, the "proportionate share" requirement means that impact fees can be charged only for the portion of the cost of public facilities that is "reasonably related" to new development. In other words, impact fees cannot be charged to pay for the cost of reducing or eliminating deficiencies in existing facilities.

Second, there are several important implications of the proportionate share requirement that are not specifically addressed in the law, but which follow directly from the law:

- Costs of facilities that will be used by new development and existing users must be apportioned between the two groups in determining the amount of the fee. This can be accomplished in either of two ways: (1) by allocating the total cost between new and existing users, or (2) calculating the cost per unit (i.e., value per capita), and applying the cost only to new development when calculating impact fees.

- Impact fees that recover the costs of existing unused capacity can be based on the replacement cost of the facility in order to account for carrying costs of the government's actual or imputed interest expense.

The third aspect of the proportionate share requirement is its relationship to the requirement to provide adjustments and credits to impact fees, where appropriate. These requirements ensure that the amount of the impact fee does not exceed the proportionate share.

- The "adjustments" requirement reduces the impact fee to account for past and future payments of other revenues (if such payments are earmarked for, or proratable to, the system improvements needed to serve new growth).
- The "credit" requirement reduces impact fees by the value of dedicated land, improvements or construction provided by the developer (if such facilities are in the adopted CFP and are required as a condition of development approval). The law does not prohibit a local government from establishing reasonable constraints on determining credits. For example, the location of dedicated land and the quality and design of a donated public facility can be required to conform to local standards for such facilities.

Without such adjustments and credits, the fee-paying development might pay more than its proportionate share.

## **B. Reasonably Related to Need**

There are many ways to fulfill the requirement that impact fees be "reasonably related" to the development's need for public facilities, including personal use and use by others in the family and use by owners, employees and customers of business enterprises (direct benefit), and use by persons or organizations who provide goods or services to the fee-paying property (indirect benefit). These measures of relationship are implemented by the following techniques:

- Impact fees for parks and recreational facilities are charged to properties which need (i.e., benefit from) new parks and recreational facilities. Parks and recreational facilities are provided by Thurston County for public use to all kinds of property throughout the unincorporated areas of the County regardless of the type of use of the property. However, impact fees for park and recreational facilities are only charged to residential development in the County because the dominant stream of benefits redounds to the occupants and owners of dwelling units. As a matter of County policy, Thurston County elects not to charge parks and recreational impact fees to non-residential properties because there is not sufficient data to document the proportionate share of parks and/or use of parks that is reasonably needed by non-residential development.
- The relative needs of different types of growth are considered in establishing fee amounts (i.e., single-family dwelling units have different average number of persons per dwelling unit than multi-family dwelling units, etc.).

- Fee-payers can pay a smaller fee if they can demonstrate that their development will have less impact than is presumed in the calculation of the impact fee schedule for their property classification. Such reduced needs must be permanent and enforceable (i.e., through land use restrictions).
- Washington law requires one or more service areas as a way of connecting a unit of development and the benefits of public facilities paid for by impact fees. All impact fees paid by new development in the service area would be required to be spent on new park and recreational facilities in the same service area. Thurston County parks and recreational facilities are available to the entire County and everyone in the unincorporated County is supported by the same value per capita; therefore the impact fees are based on a single district.

### **C. Reasonably Related to Expenditures**

Two provisions of the law tend to reinforce the requirement that expenditures be "reasonably related" to the development that paid the impact fee. First, the requirement that fee revenue must be earmarked for specific uses related to public facilities ensures that expenditures are for identifiable projects, the benefit of which can be demonstrated. Second, impact fee revenue must be expended within 10 years, thus requiring a timeliness to the benefit to the fee-payer.

### **Methodology and Relationship to Capital Facilities Plan**

Impact fees for parks and recreational facilities in Thurston County are based on the value per capita of the County's existing capital improvements for parks and recreational facilities. New development will be provided its share of the value per capita, to be funded by a combination of general and capital improvement fund revenue and impact fees.

The amount of the impact fee is determined by charging each new development for the average number of persons per dwelling unit multiplied times the amount of the value per capita that is to be paid by growth.

The value per capita for future population is made through parks projects listed in the County's Capital Facilities Plan. The value per capita of the projects in the CFP is comparable to the value per capita for the current population, as shown in Appendix A, therefore (1) the standard is a reasonable and conservative basis for the impact fee, and (2) there is no existing deficiency that the County must eliminate.

### **A. Data Sources**

The data in this study of impact fees for parks and recreational facilities in Thurston County, Washington was provided by Thurston County (e.g., Comprehensive Plan 2011 Update, Parks Master Plan [2002]), etc.) unless a different source is specifically cited.



## B. Data Rounding

The data in this study was prepared using computer spreadsheet software. In some tables in this study, there will be very small variations from the results that would be obtained using a calculator to compute the same data. The reason for these insignificant differences is that the spreadsheet software was allowed to calculate results to more places after the decimal than is reported in the tables of these reports. The calculation to extra places after the decimal increases the accuracy of the end results, but causes occasional differences due to rounding of data that appears in this study.

## 2. CAPACITY COSTS

“Capacity” capital facility projects directly contribute to Thurston County’s physical inventory of park and trails land and recreational facilities, and represent new and/or expanded facilities. “Non-capacity” projects include only the repair, renovation, replacement, remodel, etc. of existing parks and recreational capital facilities, and do not contribute additional new inventory to the County’s parks system.

Impact fees can only be used to help pay for the growth cost of “capacity” facilities projects. The cost of parkland (as well as trails) includes land, design, landscaping, site improvements, some recreational facilities (e.g., equipment or apparatus not separately listed in this study), and legal and administrative costs (which includes contingency).

The cost of recreational facilities includes design, site preparation, construction, and legal and administrative costs (which includes contingency). The cost of facilities does not include land if the facilities are customarily located at a park. If the facility is usually located at any site other than a park, the cost includes land. The cost of new parks, trails and recreational facilities in this rate study does not include any costs for interest or other financing. If borrowing is used to “front fund” the costs that will be paid by impact fees, the carrying costs for financing can be added to the costs, and the impact fee can be recalculated to include such costs.

Impact fees proposed in this rate study will help the County pay for the proportionate share of costs for facilities needed to support the County’s growth population for the next six years. As Table 1 shows, Columns 1-3 include the project name/description, type (acquisition vs. development), and year(s) of construction, respectively. Columns 4 and 5 identify the number of *park acres* to be acquired and/or developed, as well as the cost. Columns 6 and 7 identify the number of *trail miles* to be acquired and/or developed, and also the cost. Column 8 shows the total project cost for parks and/or trails, which is calculated by adding Column 5 plus Column 7.

**TABLE 1: CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN CAPACITY COSTS (2012-2017)  
THURSTON COUNTY**

(1) Project	(2) Acq/ Dev	(3) Year(s)	(4) Number of Park Acres	(5) Subtotal Park Acres Cost (\$)	(6) Number of Trail Miles	(7) Subtotal Trail Miles Cost (\$)	(8) Total Project Cost (\$)
<b>TRAILS</b>							
1. Chehalis Western Trail IV-VI: 6 miles Trail/ Trailhead @ Stedman/Deschutes River.	Dev	2013-17	5.0	\$ 1,559,000	6.0	\$ 116,000	\$1,675,000
2. Gate-Belmore Trail: 16 mi Trail Kenneydell to Glacial Heritage-Blk River-S County.	Dev	2013-17	0.0	0	16.0	4,600,000	4,600,000
3. Gate-Belmore Trail Acquisition: 4 Mi Trail Kenneydell to Glacial Heritage-Black River.	Acq	2013	0.0	0	4.0	500,000	500,000
4. Yelm-Tenino Trail: Yelm to Rainier Phase III Trailhead Facilities (2 Ac).	Dev	2014-17	2.0	1,200,000	0.0	0	1,200,000
<b>ACTIVE PARKS</b>							
5. Deschutes Falls Park: Utilities, Nature Trails (2), Restrooms, Caretaker Facilities.	Dev	2013	155.0	2,200,000		0	2,200,000
6. Cooper Point Park: Construct/Install P&R Facilities	Dev	2016	15.0	1,000,000	0.0	0	1,000,000
7. Kenneydell Park: Tumwater UGA Construct Parking, Picnic, Trails, Sports Facilities.	Dev	2013	17.9	300,000	0.0	0	300,000
8. Guerin Park: Phase I Construction Water Access, Trails, Restroom, Picnic Facilities.	Dev	2015-17	20.0	1,200,000	0.0	0	1,200,000
9. Monarch Park: Potential donation requiring frontage road improvements, gates, signs.	Dev	2012	0.0	25,000	0.0	0	25,000
<b>ATHLETIC FIELDS</b>							
10. Griffin Athletic Fields: County-Griffin SD Partnership Soccer, Softball/Baseball Fields.	Dev	2013-16	20.0	550,000	0.0	0	550,000
<b>PRESERVES</b>							
11. Gibson Reclamation: WSDOT donation requires road improvements, gates, signs.	Dev	2012	0.0	20,000	0.0	0	20,000
<b>OTHER</b>							
12. Park Master Plans for Kenneydell Park Phase III and Burfoot Beach Area.	MP	2012-14	0.0	50,000	0.0	0	50,000
<b>TOTAL</b>			234.9	8,104,000	26.0	5,216,000	13,320,000

### 3. FUNDING OTHER THAN IMPACT FEES

As noted in the introduction to this report, impact fees must be adjusted to account for other (non-impact fee) revenue that is paid by new development if that revenue is earmarked or proratable to the same system improvements that are the basis of the impact fees. This section summarizes the planned use of other revenues to fund future parks, trails, and recreational facilities. Thurston County has historically used local revenues, such as Conservation Futures, RCO grants, and Real Estate Excise Tax to pay for a portion of the cost of parks, trails, and recreational facility capital costs.

Revenues that are used for repair, maintenance or operating costs are not used to reduce impact fees because they are not used, earmarked or prorated for the system improvements that are the basis of the impact fees. Revenues from past taxes paid on vacant land prior to development are not included because new capital projects do not have prior costs, therefore prior taxes did not contribute to such projects. The other potential credit that reduces capacity costs (and subsequent impact fees) is donations of land or other assets by developers or builders. Those reductions depend upon specific arrangements between the developer and Thurston County.

Column 1 in Table 2 below shows the identical list of projects from Table 1. Columns 2-5 identify four potential sources of revenue: the Capital Reserve Balance, Conservation Futures, Recreation & Conservation Organization (RCO) State grants, and the Real Estate Excise Tax (REET). Column 6 calculates the total amount of non-impact fee revenues for each capital project during 2012-2017.

**TABLE 2: FUNDING OTHER THAN IMPACT FEES (2012-2017)  
THURSTON COUNTY**

(1)  Project	(2) Beginning Capital Reserve Balance	(3) Conservation Futures	(4) RCO Grants	(5) Real Estate Excise Tax	(6) Total Non-Impact Fee Funding (\$)
<b>TRAILS</b>					
1. Chehalis Western Trail IV-VI: 6 miles Trail/Trailhead @ Stedman/Deschutes River	\$ 90,000	\$ .	\$ .	\$310,000	\$ 400,000
2. Gate-Belmore Trail: 16 Miles Trail Kenneydell to Glacial Heritage-Blk River			3,250,000		3,250,000
3. Gate-Belmore Trail Acquisition: 4 Mi Trail Kenneydell-Glacial Heritage-Blk River		500,000			500,000
4. Yelm-Tenino Trail: Yelm-Rainier Phase III Trailhead (2 Ac)				200,000	200,000
5. Deschutes Falls Park: Utilities, Nature Trails (2 mi), Restrooms, Caretaker Facilities					0
6. Cooper Point Park: Construct/Install P&R Facilities					0
7. Kenneydell Park: Tumwater UGA Construct Parking, Picnic, Trail, Sports Facilities					0
8. Guerin Park: Ph I Construction Water Access, Trails, Restroom, Picnic Facilities					0
9. Monarch Park: Potential donation requiring frontage road improvements, gates, signs				25,000	25,000
<b>ATHLETIC FIELDS</b>					
10. Griffin Athletic Fields: County-Griffin/SD Partners Soccer, Softball/Baseball Fields					0
<b>PRESERVES</b>					
11. Gibson Reclamation: WSDOT donation requires road improvements, gates, signs				20,000	20,000
<b>OTHER</b>					
12. Park Master Plans for Kenneydell Park Phase III and Burfoot Beach Area				50,000	50,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>90,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>3,250,000</b>	<b>605,000</b>	<b>4,445,000</b>

\*Column (4): Grants include Washington State Recreation & Conservation Organization [RCO] (Formerly Inter-Agency Commission [IAC]).

## 4. APPORTIONMENT OF POPULATION (2012–2017)

The revenues described in the preceding section are paid by both current and future residents of unincorporated Thurston County; therefore, it is necessary to apportion the revenues between the two population groups. The apportionment of the revenues will be based on each population group’s proportion of the total. However, because growth occurs over time, and not all at once, the apportionment is based on the cumulative increase in population compared to the total cumulative population over the same time period. This analysis will be described below

Thurston County’s unincorporated population represent the persons primarily served by the County’s parks, trails and recreational facilities. As part of the County’s long-range planning process, including its Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the Growth management Act, the County prepares forecasts of future growth. The County’s population shown below consists of the current 2011 unincorporated population (143,415) and the forecasted 6-year (2012-2017) growth population (21,905) for a 2017 unincorporated population of 165,320 persons.

The current year and six growth years are listed in Column 1 of Table 3. Column 2 repeats the “base”, or current population for 2011. For each year beyond 2011, the base population will increase annually by 3,651 persons (21,905 growth population divided by 6 years), as shown in Column 3. Column 4 shows the cumulative growth increase from year-to-year. The total population as it increases each year is shown in Column 5.

The rows at the bottom of Table 3 show the totals of the columns and the percentages of the total represented by the base population (see column 2) and growth population (see column 4) during 2012-2017. The base population percentage (92.90%) and the growth population percentage (7.10%) will be used in Table 4 in the next section to apportion non-impact fee revenues that are received by Thurston County.

**TABLE 3: APPORTIONMENT OF POPULATION (2012-2017)  
THURSTON COUNTY**

(1) <u>Year</u>	(2) <u>Base Population</u>	(3) <u>Annual Growth</u>	(4) <u>Cumulative Growth</u>	(5) <u>Total Population</u>
2011	143,415			143,415
2012	143,415	3,651	3,651	147,066
2013	143,415	3,651	7,302	150,717
2014	143,415	3,651	10,953	154,368
2015	143,415	3,651	14,604	158,019
2016	143,415	3,651	18,255	161,670
2017	143,415	3,651	21,905	165,320
Cumulative Total	1,003,905	21,905	76,669	1,080,574
% of Cumulative Total	92.90%		7.10%	100.00%

## 5. APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDING OTHER THAN IMPACT FEES

Table 4 apportions the non-impact fee revenues shown in Column 2 (\$4,445,000) and multiplies that amount by the respective base population (92.90%) and growth population (7.10%). The results of this calculation identify the dollar amount of non-impact fee revenue that each population group contributes to pay for capital projects during 2012-2017, as shown in Columns 3 and 4.

**TABLE 4: APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDING OTHER THAN IMPACT FEES (2012-2017)  
THURSTON COUNTY**

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<u>Source</u>	Total Non-Impact <u>Fee Funding</u>	Portion Paid by Base Population <u>92.90%</u>	Portion Paid by Growth Population <u>7.10%</u>
Funding Other Than Impact Fees	\$ 4,445,000	\$ 4,129,618	\$ 315,382

## 6. GROWTH'S SHARE OF PROJECT COSTS (2012-2017)

The value of parks, trails and recreational facilities to serve growth (from Table 1) is shown in the first line in Table 5 below. Next, the base population's share of non-impact fee revenue from Table 4 is listed and subtracted from the total cost to determine growth population's share of capital project costs of \$9,190,382 during 2012-2017.

**TABLE 5: GROWTH'S SHARE OF PROJECT COSTS (2012-2017)  
THURSTON COUNTY**

(1)	(2)
<u>Item</u>	<u>Calculation</u>
Total Projects Cost	\$ 13,320,000
Cost Funded by Base Population	<u>4,129,618</u>
Cost to be Funded by Growth	9,190,382

## 7. GROWTH'S COST PER CAPITA (2012-2017)

The value of additional parks, trails and recreational facilities to be paid by growth (from Table 5) is used to calculate the park and recreational facilities growth cost per person, which is then used to calculate the impact fee per dwelling unit.

First, the total cost to be funded by growth is reduced by \$315,382, which is the non-impact fee revenue paid by growth (from Table 4); the balance of \$8,875,000 will be paid by impact fees<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> The \$315,382 paid by growth from non-impact fee revenue is 3.4% of the \$9,190,382 cost to be funded by growth. This complies with the requirement of RCW 82.02.050 (2) to "not rely solely on impact fees" to finance system improvements to serve new development.

The growth cost per capita shown in Table 6 below is calculated by dividing the \$8,875,000 by the population growth of 21,905 (from Table 3). The result is the amount per capita (\$405) that will be paid by growth through impact fees.

**TABLE 6: GROWTH'S COST PER CAPITA (2012-2017)  
THURSTON COUNTY**

(1) <u>Item</u>	(2) <u>Calculation</u>
Cost to be Funded by Growth	\$ 9,190,382
Growth's Portion of Non-Impact Fee Funding	315,382
Growth's Portion to be Paid by Impact Fees	8,875,000
Growth Population	21,905
Growth Cost per Capita for Impact Fees	405

## 8. IMPACT FEE RATES

Table 7 shows the calculation of the impact fee cost per dwelling unit of parks, trails and recreational facilities needed to be paid by growth. Table 7 begins with the cost per new person for parks, trails and recreational facilities that will be paid by growth from Table 6: \$405. The amount to be paid by each new dwelling unit depends on the number of persons per dwelling unit. The number of persons per dwelling unit is the factor used to convert the growth cost of parks and recreational facilities per person into impact fees per dwelling unit. The persons per dwelling unit data is based on the 2012-2017 estimated housing units and population by type of housing units for unincorporated Thurston County.

Table 7 ends by multiplying the growth cost per person by the number of persons per dwelling unit. The result is the impact fee per dwelling unit for parks, trails and recreational facilities in unincorporated Thurston County.

**TABLE 7: IMPACT FEE RATES  
THURSTON COUNTY**

(1) <u>Item</u>	(2) Single Family <u>Houses</u>	(3) Multi Family <u>Dwelling Units</u>	(4) Mobile Home <u>Units</u>	(5)
Growth Cost per Capita	\$ 405	\$ 405	\$ 405	
Persons per Dwelling Unit	2.49	2.11	2.27	
Impact Fee per Dwelling Unit	\$ 1,009	\$ 855	\$ 920	

## **APPENDIX: LEVEL OF SERVICE**

The Level of Service standard for parks, trails and recreational facilities impact fees in unincorporated Thurston County is based on the value per capita of parks and trails lands, and recreational facilities.

Appendix Table A shows the current level of service for the existing population. The name of existing parks and trails are listed in Column 2, the acres of parks in the current inventory are in Columns 3 and the miles of trails are in Column 7. The average cost per acre for land and development is shown for parks in Columns 4 and 5, and trails [per mile] in Columns 8 and 9.

The current value is based on 2011 average costs. The value of each park is shown in Column 6 and each trail in Column 10. The values are calculated by multiplying the inventory for each park or trail by the average cost per unit for that component. The combined value of current parks and trails are shown in Column 11,.

Average current costs are based on a variety of information. The parks and trails land valuations represent either the Thurston County Assessor's Office valuations, or the actual purchase price for recent land acquisitions. The recreational facilities development costs represent a combination of actual and planned costs, and the County's Public Works Department estimates of costs.

The cost of parks and trails land includes land, design, landscaping, site improvements, some recreational facilities (e.g., equipment or apparatus not separately listed in this study), and legal and administrative costs (which includes contingency). The cost of recreational facilities includes design, site preparation, construction, and legal and administrative costs (which includes contingency).

The cost of facilities does not include land if the facilities are customarily located at a park or trail. If the facility is usually located on any site other than a park, the cost includes land. The cost of new parks, trails and recreational facilities in this rate study does not include any costs for interest or other financing.

Column 11 in Appendix Table A shows that the capital value for all parkland and recreational facilities development in the unincorporated County's current (2011) inventory is \$74,328,714. In addition, Column 11 shows that the County's future plans include \$4,129,618 for park and trails improvements that will be funded by sources paid by the current population, thus increasing the value for the current population.

The combined total value of \$82,682,954 is divided by the County's unincorporated 2011 population of 143,415 at the bottom of Table A to determine the current capital value per person of \$547.

**APPENDIX TABLE A: LEVEL OF SERVICE FOR CURRENT POPULATION  
UNINCORPORATED THURSTON COUNTY**

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
		Number of Park Acres	Land Value Per Acre	Development Value per Acre	Subtotal Park Acres Value	Number of Trail Miles	Land Value per Trail Mile	Development Value per Trail Mile	Subtotal Trail Miles Value	Total Value (\$)
<b>ACTIVE PARKS</b>										
2.	Burfoot Park (Developed)	1	51.48	30,694	22,607				0	2,743,935
3.	Frye Cove Park (Developed)	1	86.31	30,694	22,607				0	4,600,409
5.	Kenneydell Park Phase I (Dev)	1	16.93	30,694	22,607				0	902,386
6.	Kenneydell Park Phase II (Dev)	1	23.00	30,694	22,607				0	1,225,923
11.	Cooper Point Park (Undeveloped)		32.00	30,694	0				0	982,208
12.	Deschutes Falls Park (Dev)	1	154.85	30,694	22,607				0	8,253,660
13.	Guerin Park (Undeveloped)		53.42	30,694	0				0	1,639,673
14.	Indian Road Park (Undeveloped)		10.28	30,694	0				0	315,534
15.	Lake Lawrence Park (Undev)		17.90	30,694	0				0	549,423
16.	Lassen Trust Donation (Undev)		13.02	30,694	0				0	399,636
17.	Louise H. Meyers (Undeveloped)		39.01	30,694	0				0	1,197,373
<b>PRESERVES</b>										
18.	Black River Natural Area (Undev)		12.64	30,694	0				0	387,972
19.	Mima Glacial Heritage Pres (Undev)		1,042.56	30,694	230				0	32,240,337
20.	Johnson Point Wetlands (Undev)		27.10	30,694	0				0	831,807
21.	Woodland Creek Wetlands (Undev)		67.91	30,694	0				0	2,084,430
<b>HISTORIC SITES</b>										
7.	Mima Prairie Pioneer Cemetery		2.28	30,694	64,000				0	215,902
8.	Fort Eaton Historical Monument		1.00	30,694	64,000				0	94,694
9.	G.W. Bush Historic Site		0.18	30,694	138,889				0	30,525
<b>TRAILS*</b>										
22.	Chehalis Western Trail								0	0
	- Chambers Lk Trailhead (CW-Dev)	2	1.71	30,694	394,142	0.00		58,000	0	726,470
	- Deschutes River Pk (CW-Undev)		4.68	30,694	0	0.00		58,000	0	143,648
	- Smith Lake Property (Undev)		3.00	15,602	0	0.00		58,000	0	46,806
	- 41st Avenue Trailhead (Undev)		5.00	15,602	0	0.00		58,000	0	78,010
	C.W. Trail System Miles (Undev)	3	0.00	0	0	27.50	214,263	0	5,894,983	5,894,983
23.	Gate-Belmore Trail (Undev)		0.00	0	0	12.50	114,972	58,000	2,162,151	2,162,151
24.	Yelm-Tenino Trail								0	0
	- Tenino City Park (Y-T Trailhead)	2	3.43	30,694	394,142	0.00		58,000	0	1,457,187
	- Yelm City Hall (Y-T Trailhead)	2	0.20	30,694	394,142	0.00		58,000	0	84,967
	- YTT Trail System Miles (Undev)					14.50	178,952	0	2,594,805	2,594,805
<b>ATHLETIC FIELDS</b>										
4.	Griffin Athletic Field	4	40.00	30,694	27,500				0	2,327,760
<b>RECREATIONAL FACILITIES</b>										
1.	Boston Harbor Boat Ramp		0.29	310,345	90,000				0	116,100
<b>TOTAL VALUE</b>					63,676,776				10,651,938	74,328,714
Funding of New Capacity Paid By Current Population										4,129,618
Total Value of Current Population										84,682,954
2011 Current Unincorporated Population										143,415
Value per Capita for Current Population										547.07

1 Projects 5-8: \$4,700,000 ÷ 207.9 ac = \$22,607/acre

2 Projects 1+4: \$2,759,000 ÷ 7 ac = \$394,142/acre

3 Projects 1+2: \$4,716,000 ÷ 22 miles = \$214,363/mile

4 Project 12: \$550,000 ÷ 20 acres = \$27,500/acre

5 Land value/acre = average of all unincorporated land in Thurston County (from Assessor's files)

\* Current Level of Service (CLOS) for trails is based exclusively on land acquisition/development of trailhead acres and trail miles.



As noted in the introduction to this report, RCW 82.02.050(4) requires identification of: (1) any existing deficiencies in facility capacity for current development, (2) capacity of existing facilities available for new development, and (3) additional facility capacity needed for new development. The following information complies with these requirements:

(1) There is no existing deficiency for the current population because their level of service is based on the value of the current inventory.

Appendix Table B shows the capital value of \$9,190,382 for all new park/trail land and recreational facilities included in the County’s 2012-2017 CFP that will be funded by growth (from Table 6). This value will be paid by a combination of impact fees and additional non-impact fee revenue that will be paid by growth. The total value is divided by the County’s 2012-2017 growth population of 21,905 to determine the growth population’s capital value per person of \$420.

**APPENDIX TABLE B: LEVEL OF SERVICE FOR GROWTH POPULATION  
UNINCORPORATED THURSTON COUNTY**

---

(1) <u>Item</u>	(2) <u>Amount</u>
Cost to be Funded by Growth	\$ 9,190,382
Growth Population	21,905
Growth Cost per Capita	420

The level of service that will be paid by growth (\$420 per person) is lower than the current level of service for the existing population (\$547 per person). This demonstrates that growth is not paying for any existing deficiencies, nor is it raising the level of service for the current population.

(2) There is no capacity of existing facilities to serve new development because the entire value of the existing parks and trails systems is assigned to the current population. Furthermore, the portion of future parks and trails that will be paid by the current population (as calculated in Table 4) is also assigned to the current population (as calculated at the bottom of Appendix Table A).

(3) The 2012-2017 CFP includes additional facility capacity needed for new development, as shown in Tables 1 and 4 - 6 of this study.