

Clark County

Capital Facilities Financial Plan (2007-2012)

Supporting document to the
20-year Comprehensive
Management Plan

Revised
May 2007



proud past, promising future

CLARK COUNTY
WASHINGTON



**CAPITAL FACILITIES FINANCIAL PLAN
2007-2012**

CLARK COUNTY

20-YEAR GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

ADOPTED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

May 2007

Capital Facilities Financial Plan 2007-2012

The Capital Facilities Financial Plan presents a plan for financing capital facilities identified in the Clark County 20-Year Growth Management Comprehensive Plan. This document is part of the supporting documentation to the Plan that was adopted by the Clark County Board of Commissioners on December 20, 1994 and which is reflected in Ordinance 1994-12-47. This document has been updated as part of the revised Comprehensive Plan that was adopted by the Clark County Board of Commissioners under ordinance 2007. The other supporting documentation associated with the Plan includes (1) the capital facilities plans for the school districts, Clark County Parks and Transportation; and (2) a summary of the vacant lands analysis for each of the urban growth areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	5
Purpose and Scope.....	6
Expenditures & Earmarked Resources.....	6
A. Transportation.....	7
B. Parks and Open Space.....	8
C. Stormwater Drainage and Water Quality.....	10
D. Wastewater Treatment.....	11
E. County Buildings and Other Facilities.....	12
F. Summary.....	14
General Purpose Resources.....	15
A. Real Estate Excise Tax (REET).....	15
B. Fund Balance.....	16
C. Summary.....	16
Policy Implications.....	17
A. Implementation Action Needed.....	17
B. Long Term Financial Impact.....	17
C. Budget Process Implications.....	17
D. Impact on Households.....	18

TABLES

Table 1	Capital Facilities Financial Executive Summary.....	5
Table 2	Transportation Improvement Program 2007-2012 Summary.....	7
Table 3	Comprehensive Parks, Recreation & Open Space Plan.....	9
Table 4	Salmon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase 4 Expansion Summary.....	11
Table 5	County Buildings & Other Facilities.....	13
Table 6	Summary of Expenditures & Earmarked Funding.....	14
Table 7	Real Estate Excise Tax.....	15
Table 8	Fund Balances.....	16
Table 9	Total Financial Plan Summary 2007-2012.....	16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Capital Facility Financial Plan (CFFP) presents a plan for financing capital facilities identified in Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, as required by Washington State's Growth Management Act (GMA). It covers the following types of capital facilities: transportation; parks and open space; stormwater drainage and water quality; wastewater treatment; and county buildings and other facilities. The plan covers the 6-year period from 2007-2012.

The plan provides for:

- Expenditures totaling \$600.6 million over the 6-year period.
- Earmarked resources, such as grants, user fees, voter-approved bonds and legally dedicated revenues, to finance over 40% (or \$398.1 million) of the expenditure program.
- General purpose funding sources --To complete the financing of its overall capital facilities program, Clark County has the option to allocate additional funds from its general-purpose resources.
- New Development – Clark County is anticipating receiving \$202.4 million from new development sources.

The following table summarizes the expenditures and resources included in this plan:

Table 1 Capital Facilities Financial Executive Summary

	Expenditures	Earmarked Sources	New Development
Transportation	\$176,232,000	\$99,960,000	\$76,272,000
Parks & Open Space	160,909,000	116,805,893	44,103,107
Stormwater Drainage & Water Quality	19,500,000	4,400,000	15,100,000
Wastewater Treatment	77,000,000	10,000,000	67,000,000
County Building & Other Facilities	167,000,000	167,000,000	0
TOTAL	\$600,641,000	\$398,165,893	\$202,475,107

Like any long-term plan, the financing plan laid out in this document depends upon a number of forecasts and assumptions about future conditions. As time passes, it is expected that this plan will be modified and updated to reflect changing circumstances and financial realities. Year-by-year implementation of the plan will be carried out within the County's budgeting process and other appropriate processes.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Washington State's Growth Management Act (GMA) sets forth the requirements for local growth management plans in RCW 36.70A.070(3). One of the requirements is for a capital facilities plan, which must include at least a 6-year financial plan for funding future capital facilities within projected funding capacities, which identifies the sources of public funds. The capital facilities plan for Clark County encompasses chapters 5, 6, and 7 of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan (CGMP), along with relevant portions of other supporting documentation. This document is intended to identify funding sources for the principal capital facilities provided by Clark County itself. Financing for facilities provided by entities other than Clark County, such as the cities within the county, school districts and fire districts can be found in the CGMP.

Since the CFFP is strictly financial in nature, it does not directly address capital facilities constructed by the private sector and subsequently donated to the county. Examples of such facilities include local streets constructed within subdivisions, local sewer hook-ups, and on-site stormwater detention/infiltration facilities serving new developments. Such facilities are indirectly addressed in that their existence mitigates the need for impact fees or System Development Charges (SDC) to construct them.

This document is also restricted to capital costs. It does not attempt to address issues relating to the need for the on-going maintenance and operation of capital facilities. These issues will be addressed in the Clark County's biennial annual budgeting process. Since this document focuses on the 6-year time frame required by the Growth Management Act, specifically the years from 2007-2012, long-range 20-year projections of expenditures and resources are available elsewhere for most types of facilities. The CFFP is chiefly intended to demonstrate the overall financial feasibility of the Clark County's 6-year capital facilities plan, so it does not contain detailed, project-level information.

This document is not intended to provide a year-by-year spending plan or cash flow analysis. Nor does it address the specific structure or timing of bond issues, where new debt is called for. These details should be developed during the county's annual budgeting process or through other appropriate processes. The information presented in this document is based on data provided by county staff in both oral and written form. Because this is a long-range planning document, rather than a budget, dollar amounts have been rounded to the nearest \$100,000. Finally, this document represents a long-range plan, and, thus, may be revised as appropriate to reflect changing financial conditions and the changing needs of the community.

EXPENDITURES AND EARMARKED RESOURCES

The following pages show the planned expenditure levels for each type of capital facility along with funding sources that are earmarked for each facility type. For example, the Transportation section shows planned expenditures for road construction, along with road-related grants and traffic impact fee revenues, which may be used to finance those expenditures. For some facility types, the earmarked resources are sufficient to finance the entire expenditure program. In other cases, general-purpose resources are needed to supplement the earmarked sources. (Sources of general purpose funding are discussed in the following section.)

Some of the earmarked revenue sources already exist. Examples include road fund property taxes, transportation and park impact fees, and the proceeds of the conservation futures bond

issue. Other sources, such as certain grants, have not yet been received, but are expected without the need for major action on the part of the Board of County Commissioners. Finally, certain earmarked sources described in this section will not materialize without specific action by the Board and are identified in the following pages.

Expenditures outlined in this section are divided into those related to “existing needs” and those resulting from “new development.” This categorization is approximate, and is based upon information included in the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. The basis for categorization is identified for each facility type. Revenue sources are similarly classified for each facility type.

A. Transportation

Transportation infrastructure needs and standards are outlined in Chapter 5 Transportation Element of the 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan 2004-2024. Clark County’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 2007-2012 serves as the capital facilities financial plan for roads. The TIP identifies individual projects, their expected costs, and anticipated funding sources and is summarized in Table 2 below:

Table 2 Transportation Improvement Program 2007-2012 Summary

Expenditures	Existing Needs	New Development	Total
Road Construction Projects	\$99,960,000	\$76,272,000	\$176,232,000
Total Expenditures	\$99,960,000	\$76,272,000	\$176,232,000
Resources			
Traffic Impact Fees ¹	\$4,392,000	\$5,438,000	\$9,830,000
Grants (Majority projected)	23,478,000	17,327,000	40,805,000
Road Fund Revenue for Capital	70,594,000	52,607,000	123,201,000
Other Revenue (Partnerships, Reimbursable)	1,496,000	900,000	2,396,000
Total Resources	\$99,960,000	\$76,272,000	\$176,232,000

Existing Needs and New Development:

Clark County has in place a system of transportation impact fees based on analysis of the road service levels and the impact of new development on the transportation network. On this basis, project costs totaling \$76.2 million are allocated to “New Development.” These costs are financed with a mix of traffic impact fees and road construction grants. The remainder of the construction program, totaling \$99.9 million, reflects existing transportation needs and the public share of impact fee-funded projects. The public share of impact fee-financed projects, reflecting the portion of those projects allocable to current demand, is included in the “Existing Needs” column of this table.

¹ The traffic impact fees are based on the adopted 2007-2012 Clark County Transportation Improvement Program.

BOCC Action Needed:

No extraordinary action by the Board of County Commissioners is needed to implement the funding sources included in this portion of the plan.

Financial Impact Summary:

- General Purpose Resources Needed: none
- General Obligation Debt Needed: none
- Non-General Obligation Debt Needed: none

B. Parks and Open Space

One of the Growth Management Act's 13 primary goals is to "Encourage the retention of open space and development of recreational opportunities, to conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks."

Clark County's standards and needs for parks and open space are outlined in Chapter 7 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element of the 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, which also includes the capital facilities plan for parks¹. The capital facilities plan identifies individual acquisitions and development projects, as well as ongoing allocations for major capital repairs and improvements to existing parks. It also identifies anticipated funding sources for each project. The urban park component of the capital facilities plan is based on needs and adopted standards for residents of the Vancouver urban growth boundary as of November 2006. The parks and open space program is summarized in the table below:



¹ The capital facilities plan referenced here is part of the Draft 2006 Comprehensive Parks, Recreation & Open Space Plan, with expected adoption in May 2007

Table 3 Comprehensive Parks, Recreation & Open Space Plan

Expenditures	Existing Needs²	New Development	Total
Regional Facilities: Acquisition & Development			
Regional Parks ³	\$26,256,000	0	\$26,256,000
Trails	7,584,657	\$2,969,343	10,554,000
Conservation Areas	12,128,800	3,032,200	15,161,000
Special Facilities	7,200,000	1,800,000	9,000,000
Urban Parks Acquisition & Development ³	58,044,836	36,070,164	94,115,000
Park Improvements & Repair	4,666,000	0	4,666,000
Planning	925,600	231,400	1,157,000
Total Expenditures	\$116,805,893	\$44,103,107	\$160,909,000
Resources			
REET	\$25,745,600	\$6,436,400	\$32,182,000
Grant Revenues	11,072,000	2,768,000	13,840,000
Donations and Partnerships	368,000	92,000	460,000
Conservation Futures/Areas	10,032,440	2,508,110	12,540,550
Park Impact Fees (Acq. and Dev.) ⁴	8,905,057	27,888,367	36,793,424
County Local Share (Acq)	2,950,000	0	2,950,000
New Regional Park Funding (Acq. and Dev.) ⁵	26,256,000	0	26,256,000
New Regional Trail Funding (Acq. and Dev.) ⁶	10,554,000	2,620,450	13,174,450
Total Resources	\$95,883,097	\$42,313,327	\$138,196,424

Source: Draft 2006 Comprehensive Parks, Recreation & Open Space Plan 2006-2012

Existing Needs and New Development:

As with roads, the use of impact fees as a funding source has been taken as an estimate of the effect of new development, as distinct from existing park needs. The parks capital facilities plan is envisioned as a first stage of a twenty-year acquisition and development program intended to meet the park and open space needs of the community. Needs associated with new development during that twenty-year period will be met as they arise, using, in part, impact fees as a funding source.

BOCC Action Needed:

² Expenditures and Revenues for existing and new development are based on adopted standards, where applicable, or are weighted based on the relative contribution of existing and new residents to the 2012 expected population.

³ Estimated expenditures for urban parkland assume acquisition and development of sufficient parkland to meet current deficits and 2012 needs and revenues and expenditure values for the Greater Clark Parks District current as of December 2006.

⁴ The Park Impact Fee revenues shown here assume rate updates pursuant to Clark County Code CCC 12.65.098.

⁵ An additional funding source for regional park acquisition and development is needed to meet current and future need, based on adopted standards. Regional park acquisition and development projects necessary to meet the needs of new development have not been included here due to the size of existing parkland deficits and the lack of a dedicated funding source.

⁶ An additional funding source for regional trail acquisition and development is needed to allow completion of projects outlined as part of the regional trail system envisioned in the Clark County Regional Trail & Bikeways System Plan.

To fully implement the plan outlined in Table 3, the Board of County Commissioners may establish a funding mechanism for the acquisition and development of regional parks and trails and update urban park impact fees.

Financial Impact Summary:

- General Purpose Resources Needed: none
- General Obligation Debt Needed: none
- Non-General Obligation Debt Needed: none

C. Stormwater Drainage and Water Quality

The following is a discussion of the funds available for stormwater improvements and potential future costs. Stormwater water quality improvements are funded through the Clark County Clean Water Program (CWP), which is funded through an annual fee charged to owners of property with impervious surfaces, in unincorporated areas of Clark County with an improvement value of \$10,000 dollars or greater. The fee is \$33.00/3,500 square feet of impervious area, which is the assumed impermeable surface area (roof, driveway, and deck/patio) for a single-family home or an Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU). Multi-family residential dwellings, such as trailer parks and apartments, pay a rate of \$33.00 per dwelling. Commercial and industrial sites, as well as county roads are billed by increments of 3,500 square feet of actual impervious areas. State highways are also billed by increments of 3,500 square feet of actual impervious area but at a rate of \$9.90 per ERU as established by state law.



This fee will raise approximately \$9.5 million every two years for overall clean water programs. Of this amount, approximately \$4.4 million is available for capital design, right-of-way, construction, and operation and maintenance. Currently, there is a reserve of approximately \$9.7 million, some of which may be available for capital projects and construction of future projects resulting from stormwater basin planning.

During 2006, the CWP developed a list of over \$19.5 million in stormwater capital improvements and received approval from the Board of Commissioners to implement. The 2007-2012 Public Works Transportation and Capital Improvement programs will construct these projects. In addition, there are funds spent on stormwater mitigation as part of new road construction. The 6-year capital facilities plan for stormwater and water quality has a greater potential for variation and adjustment over the 6-year period.

Existing Needs and New Development:

The above stormwater projects focused on the Whipple Creek Watershed. Over the next several years the need for stormwater improvements will include other watersheds, such as; Gee Creek, Curtin Creek, etc. and other retrofit activities and regional stormwater facilities where possible.

BOCC Action Needed:

The Clean Water Program will annually update the Board of County Commissioners on the status of the Stormwater Capital Improvements.

Financial Impact Summary:

- General Purpose Resources Needed: none
- General Obligation Debt Needed: none
- Non-General Obligation Debt Needed: none

D. Wastewater Treatment

The capital facilities plan for Clark County's Salmon Creek Wastewater Management System appears in the Wastewater Facilities Plan/General Sewer Plan for the Phase 4 Expansion Program (CH2M HILL, July 2004). This document described the improvements required for the Phase 4 Expansion taking the capacity of the Salmon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant from 10.3 million gallons per day (MGD) to 14.95 MGD. The Phase 3 Expansion was implemented previously over the period 1993-1999. The county has completed the planning, permitting, and design process for the Phase 4 Expansion. Construction will start in 2007 and be complete by 2009. The estimate of the Phase 4 Expansion program costs are defined in the table below based on current available information.

Table 4 Salmon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase 4 Expansion Summary

Expenditures	Existing Needs	New Development	Total
Interceptor	\$0	\$9,200,000	\$9,200,000
Pump Stations	3,100,000	17,700,000	20,800,000
Force Main Systems	0	26,000,000	26,000,000
Treatment Plant	6,900,000	14,100,000	21,000,000
Outfall	0	0	0
Total Expenditures	\$10,000,000	\$67,000,000	\$77,000,000
Resources			
Wholesale Customers – CRWWD	\$8,000,000	\$48,500,000	\$56,500,000
Wholesale Customers – Battle Ground	2,000,000	18,500,000	20,500,000
Total Resources	\$10,000,000	\$67,000,000	\$77,000,000

Source: Wastewater Facilities Plan/General Sewer Plan for the Phase 4 Expansion Program, CH2M HILL, July 2004.

The "Wholesale Customers" line in Table 4 represents payments from Clark County's wholesale wastewater treatment customers; the Clark Regional Wastewater District (CRWWD) and the City of Battle Ground. The wholesale customers are financing their respective portion of the Phase 4 Expansion without relying on county issued debt. The wholesale customers will pass the cost on to their ratepayers by charging system development charges (SDCs) for new hookups and/or by adjusting monthly sewer rates.



Existing Needs and New Development:

Clark County's Salmon Creek Wastewater Management System is adequate to meet existing demands. Further sewage treatment plant expansions are planned chiefly to address the needs of new development. The Phase 4 Expansion of the plant outlined above will meet the forecast demand for the next ten years.

BOCC Actions Needed:

The program shown in Table 4 assumes that major sewer facility expansions will be financed from revenue received from the county's wholesale wastewater treatment customers. The wholesale customers bear the full cost and responsibility for the expansion costs.

Financial Impact Summary:

- General Purpose Resources Needed: none
- General Obligation Debt Needed: none
- Non-General Obligations Debt Needed: none

E. County Buildings & Other Facilities

Chapter 6 of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan outlines the county's plans for new, expanded, and renovated facilities. These include the expansion of the downtown campus specifically the Law and Justice Center; development of the 78th Street/WSU Extension Service property; expansion of the 149th Street – Brush Prairie site; and the enhancement of the Clark County Health Complex. The financial impacts of the projects falling within the 2007-2012 timeframe are summarized in Table 5 below:

Table 5: County Buildings & Other Facilities

Expenditures	Existing Needs	New Development	Total
Campus Expansion	\$0	\$150,000,000	\$150,000,000
149 th Street-Brush Prairie Building	0	10,000,000	10,000,000
78 th Street/WSU Extension Service property	0	5,000,000	5,000,000
VA/CCH Campus Enhancement	0	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total Expenditures	0	\$167,000,000	\$167,000,000
Resources			
Earmarked Sources	\$2,000,000	0	2,000,000
General Obligation Bonds	165,000,000	0	165,000,000
Total Resources	\$167,000,000	0	\$167,000,000

Note: General Purpose Funding Needed identified as current capital fund balances.

Existing Needs and New Development:

The Comprehensive Growth Management Plan does not identify the portions of the building and facility program that are attributable to existing needs and to new development. In this presentation, the full amount is shown simply as “existing needs.”

Existing needs include the carryover and completion of projects that began prior to 2007. New development includes:

1. expansion of the downtown campus: the expansion of the county’s Law and Justice Center, additional courtrooms, jail space, administrative space and parking;
2. development of the 78th Street/WSU Extension Service property;
3. the enhancement of the Clark County Heath Complex; and
4. the construction of a new building at the Public Works 149th Street complex which will, at a minimum, house offices from the county’s Sheriff, Community Development, and Weed Management Departments and the WSU Cooperative Extension Office.

BOCC Action Needed:

To execute this plan the Board of County Commissioners will need to implement the fund actions below:

Financial Impact Summary:

- General Purpose Revenue Needed: none
- General Obligation Debt Needed: \$167,000,000
- Non-General Obligation Debt Needed: none

F. Summary

The table below consolidates the information presented in Tables 2 through 5:

Table 6 Summary of Expenditures & Earmarked Funding

Expenditures	Expenditures	Earmarked Sources	New Development
Transportation	\$176,232,000	\$99,960,000	\$76,272,000
Parks and Open Space	160,909,000	116,805,893	44,103,107
Stormwater Drainage & Water Quality	19,500,000	4,400,000	15,100,000
Wastewater Treatment	77,000,000	10,000,000	67,000,000
County Building & Other Facilities	167,000,000	167,000,000	0
Total	\$600,641,000	\$398,165,893	\$202,475,107

The capital facilities program for all five facility types total \$600.6 million over the period from 2007 to 2012. Of this, \$398.1 million will be financed with the “earmarked” funding sources discussed above.

BOCC Action Needed (Recap):

To implement the plan outlined in Table 6, the Board of County Commissioners will:

- Establish a funding mechanism for stormwater and water quality facilities, such as a county-wide utility
- Ensure that charges to the county's wholesale wastewater treatment customers are adequate to repay bonds issued to finance plant and system expansion.

Financial Impact Analysis (Totals):

- General Purpose Resources Needed: \$398.1 million
- General Obligation Debt Needed: \$0 none
- Non-General Obligation Debt Needed: \$67.0 million

GENERAL PURPOSE RESOURCES

To complete the financing of its overall capital facilities program, Clark County must allocate an additional \$398.1 million from its general-purpose resources. In prior capital facilities plans, available resources included the Real Estate Excise Tax to pay for capital improvements of County Buildings and Facilities (.25%) and for Park Development (.25%). In 2002, the Board of County Commissioners re-enacted the second REET splitting the percentage 50/50 for Park Development and Economic Development. Together, both of these resources are committed to existing capital needs over the period covered by this capital facilities plan. Future resources generated by the County Buildings and Facilities REET may be sufficient and available for buildings and facilities. REET is a tax on the sale of real property and can be volatile depending on economic and market conditions.

However, prior balances have been used to pay for prior capital needs. Available resources include the existing .25% Real Estate Excise Tax (REET); an additional 0.25% REET authorized by the Growth Management Act specifically to finance capital projects; and accumulated fund balance. Combined, these sources will provide adequate funding for the county capital facility needs.

Sufficient and available resources will not be sufficient to pay the long-term costs associated with Stormwater Drainage and Water Quality capital needs. The current fee of \$33.00/3,500 square feet of impervious area pays for the costs of improving water quality. An additional estimated \$9.5 million will be necessary to fund stormwater capital needs in the Salmon Creek/Lakeshore basins, flooding, water quality, and habitat improvements in the Lacamas basin, as well as the pockets throughout the remainder of the urban area. Establishing a funding mechanism will be necessary to address these needs. The mix of funding shown in this section depends upon forecasts of available revenues. It may therefore be necessary to modify the funding strategy in future years to accommodate unanticipated economic conditions.

A. Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)

The Growth Management Act, as amended by the legislature, identifies the local Real Estate Excise Tax as a capital funding option for local governments. It also gives localities the authority to levy a second .25% REET, in addition to the .25% authorized by prior legislation. The table below reflects estimated REET collections covered by this plan.

Table 7 Real Estate Excise Tax

	Total REET Revenue	Parks	Economic Development
Estimated REET Revenue – 2007	\$6,480,000	\$1,620,000	\$1,620,000
Estimated REET Revenue – 2008	6,480,000	1,620,000	1,620,000
Estimated REET Revenue – 2009	6,480,000	1,620,000	1,620,000
Estimated REET Revenue – 2010	6,480,000	1,620,000	1,620,000
Estimated REET Revenue – 2011	6,480,000	1,620,000	1,620,000
Estimated REET Revenue – 2012	6,480,000	1,620,000	1,620,000
Total Available REET	\$38,880,000	\$9,720,000	\$9,720,000
First .25% REET	\$19,440,000	\$0	\$0
Second .25% REET	19,440,000	9,720,000	9,720,000
Total Available REET	\$38,880,000	\$9,720,000	\$9,720,000

The estimate of \$38.8 million is available REET. However, considerable variance from the figures is possible. Careful monitoring of this revenue source will be needed throughout the six-year planning period, and changes in financing strategy may be called for in response to changing economic conditions.

B. Fund Balance

Fund balance represents surpluses that have been accumulated by the county in past years. Best viewed as “non-renewable resources,” fund balances are available to finance major one-time expenditures. Appropriate expenditures might include County buildings and facilities. Fund balance is probably less appropriate as a funding source for parks acquisition and development because the expenditures included in this 6-year plan are just a portion of the total 20-year parks program. An ongoing source of funds, such as the REET (see above) is needed to support the parks program. Available fund balances needed to complete the financing of the capital facilities plan are shown in Table 8, below:

Table 8 Fund Balances

Real Estate Excise Tax Fund Balance	\$34,780,000
Capital Fund Balance	2,500,000
Total Fund Balance	\$37,280,000

C. Summary

Table 9, below, summarizes the total financial plan supporting the capital facilities program for the 6-year from 2007 to 2012.

Table 9 Total Financial Plan Summary 2007-2012

Total Expenditures	\$600,641,000
Earmarked Sources	-398,165,893
General Purpose Funding Needed	\$202,475,107
REET (existing)	19,440,000
REET (extended)	19,440,000
Fund Balance	5,900,000
Total General Purpose Funding Available	44,780,000

The “Extended” REET was enacted by the Board of County Commissioners in 2002.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This section recaps the Board actions necessary to implement this financial plan, outlines the overall, long-term financial impact of this plan on the county, and highlights the role of the budget process in implementing, monitoring, and modifying this plan.

A. Implementation Action Needed

As discussed above, a number of Board actions are needed to implement this financial plan. These include:

- Implementing a funding mechanism (such as a property tax or tipping fee) sufficient to generate enough funds for the Conservation Areas Acquisition Program.
- Establishing a funding mechanism (such as a county-wide utility) for the capital costs of water quality and drainage with a fee structure.
- Ensure that the rates charged by the county to its wholesale customers are adequate to repay bonds issued for expansions. Maintaining a sewer rate structure adequate to cover the costs of future expansion.

B. Long-Term Financial Impact

Implementation of this financial plan will have an impact on the county's financial condition extending well beyond the six-year time horizon of the plan itself. While it is difficult to foresee the implications of these effects, it is important to be aware of them. The following points should be kept in mind:

- Most or all of the revenue from the existing Conservation Futures property tax levy will be committed to servicing bonds issued in 2002 for the next twenty years. Thus, a significant source of funding for the parks program contained in this plan will not be available again until the year 2024.
- Revenues from the Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) are committed to servicing debt on the Jail Work Center, Juvenile Center, and Public Service Center. Revenues from the REET may be available to meet this need, depending upon economic and market conditions and other community needs.
- A portion of the Fund balance accumulated in recent years has been expended. This may limit the county's ability to meet unanticipated needs in future years.

C. Budget Process Implications

This document is a long-term plan. Responsibility for the year-to-year financial decisions needed to implement the plan will fall to the county's budget process. Key tasks the budget process will need to perform include the following:

- Monitoring economic conditions and revenue estimates and, when necessary, modifying the financial plan to address changing conditions.
- Monitoring project expenditures to ensure that they remain within planned levels and, when necessary, modifying the financial plan to address changing conditions.

- Deciding the timing of the expenditures and debt issuance within the six-year time frame of the financial plan.
- Managing operating expenditure levels to ensure adequate funding for the maintenance of capital facilities developed under this plan.
- Reviewing the needs and priorities of the community, and, when necessary, modifying the capital plan and its financial elements accordingly.

D. Impact on Households

In some areas, this financial plan calls for new fees or taxes. The following summarizes the estimated financial impact of the changes described on individual households. These are estimates only, and, in certain cases, the decisions needed to precisely quantify the impacts have not yet been made.

- ***Transportation:*** No new taxes or fees anticipated within the 6-year time frame as outlined in this document.
- ***Parks and Open Space:*** A funding strategy will be needed to enable the Conservation Areas Acquisition Program. Originally contemplated using the Conservation REET, funding options also includes a property tax and garbage tipping fees, among others.
- ***Stormwater Drainage and Water Quality:*** A funding strategy will be necessary to pay for the capital costs of stormwater and water quality
- ***Wastewater Treatment:*** The costs of expanding the wastewater treatment system will be charged back to individual ratepayers and new development by the county's wholesale customers. The exact costs to ratepayers will not be known until the Clark Regional Wastewater District and the City of Battle Ground develop these rates.
- ***County Buildings and Other Facilities:*** Future funding will likely come from voter approved bond.