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Forward

The purpose of this update to the Spokane County Capital Facilities plan is to recognize a Settlement Agreement entered into by the Spokane County Board of County Commissioners in Resolution (#2016-0464) to resolve Growth Management Hearings Board Case Nos. 05-1-007, 08-1-002, 13-1-006c, and 14-1-0002.

The terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement specify addition/removal of various properties into the Urban Growth Area Boundary per Exhibit “B” adoption of a 2017-2037 population forecast based on the Office of Financial Management (OFM) 2012 forecast of 583,409 countywide and 474,746 for the Urban Growth Area Boundary. The parties to the Settlement Agreement acknowledge that adoption of the 2017-2037 population forecast while lower than the population forecast adopted in 2013 does not require a reduction to the size of the Urban Growth Area Boundary.

Also included in the terms of the Settlement Agreement are adoption of an updated transportation element of the Capital Facilities Plan, analysis of transportation impacts to Highways of Statewide Significance (HSS), and analysis of the twenty-two (22) site specific amendments to the Urban Growth Area Boundary that are identified in Exhibits “B” and “C” and list the respective revisions to the Comprehensive Plan and zoning designations. More specifically, Section 3.4 of the Settlement Agreement specifies that Spokane County adopt amendments to its capital facilities plan that identify existing and forecast future needs for new and expanded capital facilities for the expanded urban growth area and the existing urban growth area to maintain adopted levels of service.

Existing and future needs for new and expanded capital facilities for the existing urban growth area were addressed in the environmental analysis and capital facilities plan prepared for adoption of the Spokane County Comprehensive Plan, Urban Growth Area Boundary, and Capital Facilities Plan cited in Board of County Commissioners Resolutions #2001-1050 and 1060. Subsequent revisions to the urban growth area since its initial adoption in 2001 were addressed in the Capital Facilities Plan adopted in 2007 by the Board of County Commissioners (January 2007) for the base year 2006 and the six-year forecast (2007-2012). The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that is incorporated into the 2007 CFP identified specific capital project expenditures and identified revenue sources that will pay for the projects.

The analysis required in Section 3.4 of the Settlement Agreement for the expanded urban growth area adopted in 2013 is included in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for Urban Growth Area Update (October 21, 2012) and the DSEIS for Alternative 5 (October 2012). The respective environmental documents provided a detailed analysis of various growth scenarios/alternatives to amend the urban growth area and site-specific review and analysis of 22 study areas that are referenced in Exhibits “B” and “C” of the Settlement Agreement.

Impacts of the site-specific amendments to the urban growth area listed in Exhibit “B” that are not subject to vested land use actions were analyzed in the above-referenced environmental documents (Chapter 4, Comparative Impact Analysis) that include Level of Service (LOS) assumptions, comparisons of service/facility impact by alternative, a summary of service/facility impact for all study areas, and fiscal
and capital cost comparisons (see Tables 4.1.1 – 4.1.8) based on levels of service for law enforcement, libraries, parks, schools, transportation, wastewater, and water consumption.

Impacts of the site-specific amendments to the urban growth area that are listed in Exhibit “C” that are removals from the urban growth area or are subject to vested land use actions are addressed in the previously-referenced supplemental environmental impact analyses and as follows.

Maps #2 (Figure CF-1), 11 (Figure CF-2), and 15 (Figure CF-3) of Exhibit “C” are removals of three properties from the Urban Growth Area and do not require analysis under the updated Capital Facilities Plan as their removal does not result in any impacts to adopted levels of service or demands on existing capital facilities. Map #5 illustrates a significant reduction of the urban growth area boundary, and the corresponding reductions in level of service were analyzed in Section 4.2.13 of the DSEIS dated October 2011. Map #5 (Figure CF-4) of Exhibit “C” was subject to a vested building permit application that was subject to project level review of impacts, is not served by a public sewer system, is subject to extension of a public water system at the proponent’s expense, and there has been no demonstration that the project will impact any adopted levels of service thus requiring no analysis for capital facilities. In addition, the vested building permit application for the property identified in Map #5 has lapsed, in null and void, and development of the subject property will be subject to concurrency review at the time of application when the map amendment if finalized pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

Map #6 (Figure CF-5) of Exhibit “C” is subject to approved preliminary plats (PE-1409-81 and PE-1108-77) that were approved prior to Spokane County planning under the Growth Management Act, were subject to review and approval per the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), RCW 58.17, are served by a public water and sewer system that have demonstrated capacity to serve the remaining undeveloped lots with no impacts to adopted levels of service, all costs associated with provision of infrastructure to the site are conditioned to be borne by the project proponent, and no further analysis is needed in the updated Capital Facilities Plan as the impact of including the subject property in the urban growth area boundary is found on page 4.2.6 of the SDEIS dated October 2011.

Map #9 (Figure CF-6) of Exhibit “C” is subject to an approved preliminary plat (PE-2034-14) that has been subject to project level review for concurrency of public services per Spokane County Code consistent with adopted levels of service, were subject to review and approval per the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), RCW 58.17, all costs associated with infrastructure improvements are conditioned to be borne by the project proponent, and no further analysis is needed in the updated Capital Facilities Plan as the impacts to the much larger study area are found on page 4.2.9 of the October 2011 DSEIS and the significantly smaller study area impacts are found on page 4.2.2 of the DSEIS dated October 2012.

Map #12 (Figure CF-7) of Exhibit “C” is subject to two approved preliminary plats (PS-2036-13 and PS-2037-13) that have been subject to project level for concurrency of public services per Spokane County Code consistent with adopted levels of service, were subject to review and approval per the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), RCW 58.17, all costs associated with infrastructure improvements are conditioned to be borne by the project proponent, and no further analysis is needed in the updated Capital Facilities Plan. In addition, the subject preliminary plats are provided public water and sewer service by the City of Spokane and any analysis of these facilities is subject to the City of Spokane Capital Facilities Plan (see page 4.2.11 of the DSEIS dated October 2011). Map #16 (Figure CF-8) of Exhibit “C” is
subject to an approved preliminary plat (PW-2034-13) that has been subject to project level review for concurrency of public services per Spokane County Code consistent with adopted levels of service, was subject to review and approval per the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), RCW 58.17, all costs associated with infrastructure improvements are conditioned to be borne by the project proponent, and no further analysis is needed in the updated Capital Facilities Plan. In addition, the subject preliminary plat is provided public water and sewer service by the City of Spokane and any analysis of these facilities is subject to the City of Spokane Capital Facilities Plan. Impacts and level of service analysis for this study area are found on page 4.2.16 of the DSEIS dated October 2012 and include a larger study area than that adopted and referenced in Exhibit “C”.

Map #17 (Figure CF-9) of Exhibit “C” is subject to a completed Essential Public Facility Siting process consistent with the Spokane County Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code and analysis of extension of these services by the City of Spokane was included in the Essential Public Facility analyses. Inclusion of the subject property into the Urban Growth Area Boundary is contingent upon approval of public funding for a new detention facility and when this occurs the Capital Facilities Plan will be updated accordingly along with any transportation impacts to Highways of Statewide Significance. Map #19 (Figure CF-10) of Exhibit “C” was initiated by the City of Medical Lake to modify the Urban Growth Area Boundary adjacent to the City and does not result in any Capital Facilities needs as the modification does not increase the areas within the Urban Growth Area Boundary or change the existing rural land use designation within the Urban Growth Area Boundary assigned to the City. Map #20 (Figure CF-11) of Exhibit “C” is subject to an approved preliminary plat (PW-1959-05) that has been subject to project level for concurrency of public services per Spokane County Code consistent with adopted levels of service, was subject to review and approval per the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), RCW 58.17, all costs associated with infrastructure improvements are conditioned to be borne by the project proponent, and no further analysis is needed in the updated Capital Facilities Plan as the level of service impacts are found on page 4.2.18 of the DSEIS dated October 2011. In addition, the subject preliminary plat is provided public water and sewer service by the City of Spokane and any analysis of these services is subject to the City of Spokane Capital Facilities Plan.
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The Geiger Spur is removed from consideration for inclusion in the UGA and will retain the Rural Traditional designation that was in place prior to the 2013 UGA Update.
Introduction

What are Capital Facilities?
Capital facilities are the public infrastructure needed to support new growth, such as: roads, bridges, sewer, water and storm water facilities, public buildings, and parks and recreation facilities. They typically have a long, useful lifespan and require a significant expenditure to construct.

What is a Capital Facilities Plan?
A Capital Facilities Plan is a six to twenty-year plan of capital projects, their cost estimates, and proposed methods of financing. The Capital Facilities Plan is a component of and an implementation tool for the Comprehensive Plan.

Why do a Capital Facilities Plan?
1) It’s Required by Law
Capital Facilities Plans are required for jurisdictions planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) (RCW 36.70A.070). Spokane County is planning under this provision. Spokane County Code 13.650.102 requires that the Capital Facilities Plan be updated consistent with schedule per GMA.

2) It’s Good Management
Capital facilities plans can help a jurisdiction use its limited funding wisely and most efficiently to maximize its project funding opportunities. By planning ahead to determine what the needs are, jurisdictions can better prioritize spending, coordinate activities on related projects, and meet the needs of the citizenry. A well written and up to date capital facilities plan increases a jurisdiction’s ability to acquire competitive loans and grants for project funding.

3) It’s an Investment in the Future
Well planned and functional public infrastructure is a critical component of an area’s capacity for long-term economic competitiveness. Businesses rely upon public infrastructure to operate and transport their goods and services. Well maintained and thoughtfully planned public infrastructure helps a community look good and function efficiently making it a desirable place to live and work.

What Does a Capital Facilities Plan Consist of?
- An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities
• A forecast of the future need for those facilities based upon adopted population projections
• The proposed locations and capacities of planned capital facilities
• At least a six-year plan that identifies proposed projects and how they will be funded
• A requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent

**Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan**

The Capital Facilities Plan is an important component of the County’s Comprehensive Plan. It is an implementation tool for the Land Use section which guides where and how the community will grow. It helps ensure that adequate public infrastructure and services are in place to meet the needs of mature and redeveloping areas while accommodating the demands of new development. The capacity of public facilities and services noted in the Capital Facilities Plan affect the size and configuration of the County’s Urban Growth Area. Chapter 7 of the Comprehensive Plan details the County’s adopted policies and goals for capital facilities and the importance of planning for future infrastructure needs.

**Concurrency Requirements**

One of the goals of the GMA is to have capital facilities in place or in conjunction with development. This concept is known as concurrency. In Spokane County, concurrency requires: (1) facilities serving the development must be in place at the time of development (or for some types of facilities, that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six-years); and (2) such facilities have sufficient capacity to serve development without decreasing levels of service below minimum standards adopted in the CFP.

The GMA only requires concurrency for transportation (RCW 36.70A.070 (6(b)), but Spokane County has adopted direct and indirect concurrency standards per Spokane County Code (SCC), Chapter 13.650.102(b)(c).

For new development within Spokane County, transportation, public water and public sewer are considered direct concurrency services and these facilities must be in place or a financial guarantee be demonstrated prior to construction ensuring that sufficient capacity is available for each proposed development.

Fire protection, police protection, parks and recreation, libraries, solid waste disposal, and schools shall be considered indirect concurrency services and the County will demonstrate adequacy of these facilities through the CFP. All indirect concurrency services will be evaluated for adequacy during the CFP update.

**Level of Service (LOS)**

These are benchmarks used to measure and evaluate changes in the quality and quantity of services provided. The County has formally adopted standards in its Countywide Planning Policies and Comprehensive Plan establishing minimum LOS for a number of public services and facilities. Typically, as population grows, public facilities need to be expanded to maintain the same LOS.
County Growth Projections

Spokane County’s 2017 population is estimated to be 499,348. The County has adopted a population projection to serve as a basis for planning purposes. This number is based upon the medium projection developed by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM). Using this projection, the County’s population in 2037 will be 583,409 which represents a 16.8% increase over that of 2017. These growth projections are the basis for future infrastructure projects and capital improvement planning.

Purpose of a Capital Facilities Plan

The overall purpose of the Capital Facilities Plan is to serve as a guide to decision making. It takes a comprehensive look at big ticket capital budget items and allows decision makers to see their relationship to the adopted LOS being provided. It offers a framework by which to make important choices regarding the priority of public projects. Policy decisions in the area of land use and law and justice have a relationship to the demand for services. New development will also place a demand on services. These services must be paid for and installed to meet adopted LOS standards and concurrency regulations. Without thoughtful planning, new demand may reduce the LOS to existing service users. This may create discontent and a legal obligation to meet the adopted standards, or to modify those standards to match current LOS.

Navigating the Capital Facilities Plan

The plan is divided into sections that cover specific types of public infrastructure. Each section provides a description of the service and its infrastructure and identifies which agency or jurisdiction is the purveyor. An inventory of existing assets is included and a description of any adopted improvement plans with both costs and funding sources identified. Each section also includes an analysis as to whether the service and infrastructure currently meet their adopted LOS and what might happen to the LOS over a 20-year planning horizon with the County’s adopted population projections. An Executive Summary is also provided for the reader’s convenience.
GMA Goals and Countywide Planning Policies

GMA Capital Facilities and Utilities Planning Goals (RCW 36.70A.020)

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) includes 14 goals that are intended to guide the content of comprehensive plans and development regulations. Following are the GMA goals that relate to capital facilities and utilities:

- Urban growth. “Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.”

- Economic development. “Encourage economic development throughout the state that is consistent with the adopted comprehensive plans, ... and encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the capacities of the state’s natural resources, public services, and public facilities.”

- Public facilities and services. “Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.”

GMA Requirements for Capital Facilities and Utilities Planning

Capital facilities and utilities are two of the required elements of a comprehensive plan under the GMA. They are both combined into one chapter in this comprehensive plan. Capital facilities elements must include at least the following:

- An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities.

- A forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities.

- The proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities.

- At least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes.

- A requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent.

The utilities element must describe the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines. Local criteria for siting utilities should address locations and densities of projected growth and land use, public service obligations, optimal siting for effective service, and design considerations. The Washington Administrative Code further outlines recommendations for meeting requirements relative to capital facilities and utilities.
Relationship to “Vested” Development in the 2017 Settlement Agreement

As described in the Forward to this plan, this Capital Facilities Plan establishes the framework to provide services to the County’s unincorporated UGA, including those portions added to the UGA under the terms of the 2017 Settlement Agreement. The Forward identifies environmental and capital facilities studies that focused on these expansion areas, demonstrating that the array of public services that the County and other providers are obligated to provide are either in place or planned to be in place by the time development occurs. These assertions were further borne out as part of the subdivision and land use actions that vested development rights on these sites, assuring that public services providers are committed to and capable of providing service delivery under conditions of development.

Checks and Balances

This capital facilities and utilities element should function as a check on the practicality of achieving other elements of the plan. For example, in order to prevent new development’s service demands from lowering the community’s existing level of service, concurrency requirements demand that adequate public facilities be available when the service demands of development occur. Taken in conjunction with the transportation and land use goals and policies, the following goals and policies related to capital facilities and utilities complete the framework for implementation of the GMA requirements for concurrency, consistency, and conformity.

Countywide Planning Policies

The Countywide Planning Policies (CWPPs) adopted by the Spokane Board of County Commissioners require the capital facilities and utilities chapter to address the siting of public capital facilities, joint city and county planning within urban growth areas, and the promotion of contiguous and orderly development and provision of urban services to such development.

For the entire text of the policy topics that relate to capital facilities and utilities, consult the Countywide Planning Policies for Spokane County, adopted December 22, 1994.
Vision, Values, Goals and Policy

While the comprehensive plan does not assert a vision, per se, a sense of a vision permeates every element in the plan. For instance, the chapters on urban and rural land uses include goals and policies that echo prominent community values, projecting them onto the county’s regional landscape. The implied vision is generally aspirational, interpreting the community’s hopes for its future onto a pattern of development and stewardship that will assure the community the future it wants.

In the scheme of capital facilities, several vision-related themes stand out:

- Essential services provided by capital facilities are crucial to the health, safety and welfare of community residents.
- The character and scale of development must be consistent and concurrent with public facilities needs and future community vision.
- The pace of growth and development should be consistent and concurrent with the vision set forth in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Services provision should be affordable, both for those customers paying for them through rates and taxes and for the providers, public and private, who must balance investment in facilities with the revenues available to support them.

Goals and policies provide specificity for planning and decision-making. Overall, they indicate desired directions, accomplishments, or aims in relation to the growth, development, and stewardship of the county. The policy discussion below provides background on the establishment of policy initiatives included in this CFP, adding context to the policy and aiding in its interpretation and implementation.

Policy Discussion:

Relationship to Land use

1.1 Discussion: Urban governmental services and public facilities for which level of service standards should be in place include fire, police, parks and recreation, libraries, public wastewater, public water, solid waste disposal and recycling, transportation, and schools (CWPP 3.1). The level of service shall be defined as the benchmarks which should be achieved and if not achieved the LOS should be revised or the land use component of the Comprehensive Plan should be revisited, or additional funding should be provided to meet minimum LOS.

1.2 Discussion: Consolidation of plans will allow for review to happen at the same time, allowing for priorities to be established more efficiently so they are reviewed on an established regular basis.

1.3 Discussion: GMA requires consistency and conformity between plans and budgets so that development does not occur before there are adequate services to support it. In this regard, the land use element, capital facilities plan elements and financing plan within capital facilities plan element should be coordinated and consistent.
A requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent.

1.4 Discussion: The CFP contains an inventory of existing and proposed capital facilities, establishes level of service (LOS) standards, identifies long-range facility service capacities and projected deficiencies, and outlines the actions necessary to meet such deficiencies. The program also provides the GMA-required six-year financing plan. This financing plan ensures that needed capital facilities will be financed and that the growth envisioned in the comprehensive plan can really happen. The available capacity of public facilities will affect the type, amount, and rate of growth. The CFP also contains twenty-year capital facility needs, projected improvements, and estimated expenditures required to adequately serve population and job growth while maintaining desired LOS standards.

1.5 Discussion: Public facilities are those public lands, improvements, and equipment necessary to provide public services and allow for the delivery of services. They include, but are not limited to, streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, solid waste disposal and recycling, fire and police facilities, parks and recreational facilities, schools and libraries.

Adequate facilities and services must be available to serve new development. While occupancy and use imply an immediate need for water, wastewater, and solid waste services, other public services may make more sense to provide as the demand arises. For example, a certain threshold of critical mass is often needed before construction of a new fire station, school, library, or park is justified. If these facilities and services do not currently exist, commitments for services may be made either from the public or the private sector. Public commitments are documented through the Capital Facilities Program and the relevant Six-Year Capital Improvement Plans.

If there is no public commitment to provide needed resources, the development could still proceed if the developer assumes responsibility for provision of all needed facilities and services, either through actual provision of the facility or service, or appropriate financial assurances that facilities and services will be provided in a timely manner.

1.6 Discussion: Growth planning must ensure that needed public facilities and services are adequate to serve new development without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.
GMA requires that adequate urban government services and public facilities be available at the time growth occurs.

1.7 Discussion: A concurrency management system is defined as an adopted procedure or method designed to ensure that adequate public facilities and services needed to support development, and protect the environment are available when the service demands of development occur.

The procedure for evaluating direct concurrency impacts (transportation, water, sewer) occur at the time of development. Indirect concurrency (fire, police, parks, libraries, solid waste and schools) are evaluated concurrent with update to the CFP.

Fiscal Sustainability

2.1 Discussion: Interlocal/joint agreements between jurisdictions and special purpose districts relating to the provision of urban governmental services and public facilities shall address fiscal impacts, revenue sharing, use of existing facilities, and level of service standards.

2.2 Discussion: Ensure fiscal feasibility and commitment prior to annexation to ensure equity across jurisdictions and ability to continue to meet locally established minimum standards.

Resource Conservation

3.1 Discussion: At a minimum, level of service for water systems should be consistent with adopted plans and projected future growth.

3.2 Discussion: Commercial and residential subdivisions and developments, residential planned unit developments, and manufactured home parks shall include the provision for road access adequate for residents, fire department, or district, ingress/egress and water supply for fire protection. Development in forested areas must provide defensible space between structure and adjacent fuels and require that fire-rated roofing materials be used (CWPP 3.7).

3.3 Discussion: Water conservation is an important way to protect the environment, reduce the demands placed on the sewer system, and retain sufficient water availability to support future growth and development. Conservation can be accomplished through a variety of approaches that include: conservation-oriented rate structures, plumbing codes that require low-water-use fixtures, systemic improvements that result in the reduction of unaccounted for or unmetered water losses, a community-wide conservation education program, or promotion of low-water-use landscaping and low-water-use irrigation systems for home and garden.

3.4 Discussion: By creating collaboration between and with purveyor’s facilities can be shared to provide better service at a decreased cost to the community.

Wastewater Service and orderly development

4.1 Discussion: Concurrency requires that facilities have sufficient capacity to serve development without decreasing levels of service below minimum standards adopted in the CFP. Concurrency
management procedures are in place to ensure that sufficient public facility capacity is available for each proposed development.

4.2 Discussion: Development should be approved based on consistency to the comprehensive plan.

4.3 Discussion: New development shall not be approved within the UGA boundary unless the proposal can demonstrate the availability of public water and sewer services consistent with adopted Levels of Service and consistent with the definition for concurrency in the Comprehensive Plan. New development must be connected to a live public sewer at the time of occupancy or be located within the Spokane County 6-year Sewer Capital Improvement Program, as adopted. Any development occurring in advance of sewer availability will need to hook up to the sewer at its expense when it becomes available. This is consistent with the UGA Update EIS.

**Stormwater**

5.1 Discussion: All new development projects shall have stormwater management systems, regardless of whether the project meets the regulatory threshold as spelled out in the Spokane Regional Stormwater Manual.

5.2 Discussion: Encouragement of development to treat stormwater runoff prior to injection decreases the costs of treatment of stormwater offsite. Projects proposing underground injection control (UIC) facilities must comply with UIC requirements, regardless of whether they trigger the regulatory threshold.

5.3 Discussion: Preserving natural location of drainage systems will help ensure that stormwater runoff can be conveyed and disposed of at its natural location. Preservation also increases the opportunity to use the predominant systems as regional stormwater facilities.

5.4 Discussion: Stormwater runoff from a developed site shall leave the site in the manner and location as it did in the pre-developed condition.

5.5 Discussion: Considering multi-use of stormwater facilities increases community benefit of such facilities while achieving requirements for stormwater infiltration on-site. Location and design of community facilities should be encouraging maximum flexibility, utility, and multiple uses as a cost-effective alternative to single-use sites.

5.6 Discussion: Regional facilities may reduce a community’s long-term costs for stormwater management because they can free up buildable land for development and can be less expensive to build, operate, and maintain than multiple individual facilities.
**5.7 Discussion:** Rewards and credits can be used to reduce expensive stormwater treatment off-site by encouraging onsite treatment.

**5.9 Discussion:** If infiltration is proposed, negative impacts on down-gradient properties are of concerned, or seasonal high groundwater is suspected, then a geotechnical site characterization shall be submitted as part design deviation.

**Public Schools**

**6.1 Discussion:** Rural Activity Centers are identified in the Comprehensive Plan as rural residential centers supported with limited commercial and community services.

**6.2 Discussion:** The County desires to coordinate its land use and transportation plans with those of school districts, and district advance planning can help. Identifying and acquiring potential school sites will inform future UGA and land designation decisions and contribute to transportation planning at a regional level.

**6.4 Discussion:** Location and design of community facilities should encourage maximum facility, utility and multiple uses as a cost-effective alternative to a single-use buildings and sites.

**6.5 Discussion:** Ensure that private residential development and demographic trends are consistent with school facility capacity and development is concurrent with school facility expansion.

**Library**

**7.1 Discussion:** Location and design of community facilities should encourage maximum facility, utility and multiple uses as a cost-effective alternative to a single-use buildings and sites.

**7.2 Discussion:** Ensure the growth of private residential development and demographic trends don’t exceed the lowest level of service for facility. The Library District adopts and maintains a capital facilities plan that can contribute to this activity.

**7.3 Discussion:** Libraries should be developed in locations where they are accessible by residential populations.

**7.4 Discussion:** Libraries evolve, and many have made partial transition to providing resources in digital format. This can reduce the space required to store material, and it can promote remote access to library volumes. Both may impact the ways in which libraries allocate facility space and program the services they offer.

**Solid Waste and Utilities**

**9.1 Discussion:** Both public and private utility providers should coordinate with land use planning so that future development does not obstruct utility corridors as described in the CWPP’s under Regional Utility Corridor Planning. Land use plans should also take into consideration any possible environmental or health issues associated with regional utility corridors.

**9.3 Discussion:** Infill and dense development should be encouraged where excess capacity is available since compact systems are generally less expensive to build and maintain. However, it
may also be necessary to periodically include upgrades in the Six-Year Capital Improvement Plans if sufficient capacity is not currently available to support intensification of development in target areas.

9.4 Discussion: Since urban land is at a premium, it should be consumed as efficiently and effectively as possible. For this reason, it is the policy of Spokane County to minimize the number of wireless communication support towers and to encourage the co-location of antenna arrays of more than one wireless communication service provider on a single support tower. In addition, existing structures such as buildings or water towers should be fully utilized as support sites for telecommunication facilities before new towers are built. To assist in the implementation of this policy, the county will pursue all reasonable strategies to promote co-location agreements between multiple wireless communication service providers.

9.7 Discussion: Long-term planning for telecommunications systems will enable for future need to be established and to plan structures according to long term growth and need.

9.8 Discussion: Need and impact of increased transportation facilities may be minimized by the encouragement of telecommunication facilities.

9.9 Discussion: In order to facilitate timely repair and reduce the duration of power outages, it is important that access to electrical, cable, and telephone transmission facilities be available and unobstructed at all times. Satisfactory access can be provided either by placing pedestals along the street in the case of underground utilities or running lines along dedicated alleys. Utility easements in new developments should not be permitted along back lot lines without alley access.

9.10 Discussion: Local criteria for siting utilities should address locations and densities of projected growth and land use, public service obligations, optimal siting for effective service, and design considerations (WAC 365-195-320.2, f). Both public and private utility providers should coordinate with land use planning so that future development does not obstruct utility corridors as described in the CWPP’s under Regional Utility Corridor Planning. Land use plans should also take into consideration any possibly environmental or health issues associated with regional utility corridors.

9.11 Discussion: Each jurisdiction in its comprehensive plan should provide policies that support the compatible incorporation of utilities, greenbelts and open space within common corridors.

9.12 Discussion: To further this effort, Spokane County should encourage joint use of transportation rights-of-way and utility corridors where possible. In addition, utility service providers should receive copies of all six-year street programs on an annual basis.
9.13 Discussion: The goal of such coordination should be to reduce the disruption of public streets and the negative economic and visual impacts incurred when developing utilities.

9.14 Discussion: Each jurisdiction should encourage cooperation with both utilities and users for purpose of including compatible passive recreational and open space uses with existing utilities or when siting new utilities.

9.15 Discussion: In addition to using recycled products itself, Spokane County should encourage residents and businesses to reduce waste and recycle through differential rates, educational and promotional programs, and other initiatives. Recycling should be recognized for its potential to provide employment opportunities and contribute to affordable housing through resource-efficient construction materials and the reuse of demolition debris. The county shall coordinate its efforts with regional planning for solid waste reduction and disposal.

Growth & Cost

10.1 Discussion: Approval of the GMA included new statutes (RCW 82.02.050-.090) authorizing impact fees in counties or cities planning under the GMA. These sections authorized local jurisdictions to impose impact fees on development activity as part of the financing for public facility system improvements in order to ensure that adequate facilities are available to serve new growth and development. The purpose is also to ensure fair share: those who benefit should pay, and those who pay should benefit. In particular, residents who live where services are adequate should not have to bear the costs of new growth at the outside edges of the city where adequate services are not yet available.

10.3 Discussion: Development activities with broad public purposes may include low-income housing, special needs housing, transit, and childcare facilities. Exemptions are contingent on the impact fees for such development activity being paid from public funds other than impact fee accounts. (RCW 82.02.060, 2).
Goals & Policies

Goal CF 1 – Relationship to land use

Provide adequate public facilities services to support rural or urban levels of development, as appropriate, integrating capital facilities planning and the siting of essential public facilities with land use policy.

CF-1 Policies

1.1 Establish and maintain levels of service as follows for urban areas of Spokane County. Capital Improvement Program, Sewer Construction Capital Improvement Programs, Parks Improvement Plan and, Transportation Improvement Program to implement Capital Facilities Plan priorities. Plans shall be updated yearly for consideration in the annual budgeting process.

Table CF-1: Capital Facility Level of Service Standards – Long Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Water</td>
<td>800 gallons per residential equivalent per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Emergency Medical</td>
<td>Urban areas served by Fire District with at least a Class 6 Insurance Rating. Fire flow and hydrant placement per International Fire Code. Urban areas must be within 5 road miles of station with “Class A” pumper. Urban areas shall be served by a basic life support (BLS) agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>The County must provide 1.01 law enforcement officers (LEO) per 1,000 residents within the unincorporated Urban Growth Area (UGA) not otherwise served by a law enforcement agency or by contract services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>.41 square feet per capita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>The County must provide 1.4 acres of Community Parkland per 1,000 residents within the unincorporated Urban Growth Area (UGA) where a concentration of 7,000 or more residents are not located within three miles (using existing road/street system) of an existing improved or unimproved County, municipal or other public park that provides or is planned to provide amenities similar to a Community Park (e.g. irrigated turf, play fields, etc.). For purposes of this Level of Service standard only, the calculation of residential population concentrations shall be determined by multiplying the existing and permitted dwellings within the designated area by the Washington State Office of Financial Management’s persons per household estimate for single family residential and multi-family residential within unincorporated Spokane County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>To be determined by individual school district CFP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>As adopted by Spokane Transit Authority Board of Directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>Public sewer required where densities exceed 2 equivalent residential units per acre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Ensure that the estimated cost of all capital improvements does not exceed the estimate of available revenues.

1.3 Finance capital improvements and manage debt consistent with the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

1.4 Provide public facilities and services or accept their provision by other entities only if Spokane County or the other entity is able to pay for subsequent operation and maintenance costs.

1.5 Approve urban comprehensive plan land use and UGA amendments only after it is determined that public facilities and services will have the capacity to serve it without decreasing levels of service below adopted standards.

1.6 Ensure fire protection, law enforcement, parks and recreation, libraries, public sewer, public water, solid waste disposal and recycling, transportation, and schools meet adopted level of service standards and be consistent with the Concurrency Management System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>Solid Waste processing will meet Federal and State regulations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Stormwater | New development shall not increase runoff volume off-site.  
Prevent flooding of property during a 25-year storm.  
Prevent damage to buildings from a 100-year storm.  
Stormwater discharge to any surface or ground waters will be allowed unless the discharge will degrade water quality below standards. |
| Transportation | LOS for operational analysis shall be as contained in the Spokane County Standards for Road and Sewer Construction.  
Maintain travel corridor time as established by Spokane Regional Transportation Council. |
| Water | Minimum water pressure of 45 pounds per square inch |
Goal CF 2 – Fiscal sustainability

Create a fiscally sustainable capital facilities environment, ensuring adequate public services and facilities are provided.

*CF 2 Policies*

2.1 Establish interlocal/joint planning agreements with municipalities and other providers of public facilities to coordinate planning for, and development of, Urban Growth Areas.

2.2 Use annexation agreements to ensure fiscal balance and equity as portions of the UGA annex into incorporated jurisdictions.

Goal CF 3 – Resource conservation

Promote efficient domestic water service and protect the natural resource

*CF 3 Policies*

3.1 Ensure water system plans are consistent with anticipated population growth, the Comprehensive Plan, and Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP).

3.2 Ensure water systems for urban and rural developments include adequate water rights, supply, and distribution systems for domestic use and fire protection per local, state and federal plans, policies and regulations.

3.3 Encourage public and private water purveyors to implement measurable water conservation practices.

3.4 Encourage the continued cooperation, coordination, and consolidation of water purveyors to achieve greater efficiency in the delivery of water services.

Goal CF 4 – Wastewater service and orderly development

Promote efficient sanitary sewer service, protect natural resources, and ensure orderly physical development

*CF 4 Policies*

4.1 Prohibit the extension of any sewer system that will degrade the existing system below the adopted level of service.

4.2 Consider anticipated population growth in sewer planning, ensuring it is consistent with, and developed in coordination with comprehensive plan land use policies.

4.3 Consider the location and capacity of existing and planned sewer facilities when determining the intensity and/or density of land use designations.

4.4 Determine whether changes to comprehensive plan designation or urban growth areas can be accommodated within the planned capacity of the sewer conveyance and treatment system before approval, in accordance with the Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan.
4.5 Encourage a coordinated, regional wastewater service organization to provide sewer services to all urban areas of the County inside the Urban Growth Area.

4.6 Public sewer service shall not be provided outside the Urban Growth Area boundary, except as follows:
   a. In response to an immediate threat to public health or safety;
   b. When necessary for the protection of aquifers designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.170;
   c. Consistent with state law.

Goal CF 5 - Stormwater

Provide stormwater facilities and related management programs to protect surface and groundwater quality and habitat, prevent chronic flooding from stormwater, maintain natural stream hydrology, and protect aquatic resources.

CF 5 Policies

5.1 New development within the UGA shall require stormwater management systems.

5.2 Best management practices should be utilized to treat stormwater runoff prior to injection of runoff into the ground.

5.3 New development shall be designed to protect natural drainage functions including flood plains, drainageways, sink areas, and other natural and existing drainage facilities.

5.4 New development shall be designed to prevent onsite and off-site damage from stormwater runoff that result from site development or from the new land use activity.

5.5 New development shall consider, where feasible, the multiple uses of facilities, such as the integration of stormwater facilities with recreation/open space areas.

5.6 Conduct stormwater management planning by drainage basin, treating basins as complete drainage systems, to assure that the most economical and beneficial stormwater controls are provided.

5.7 Encourage use of alternatives to impervious surfaces through rewards and credits.

5.9 Provide alternatives to on-site disposal of stormwater in areas of steep slopes, high groundwater, shallow soils, poorly draining soils and other physical conditions make on site stormwater disposal difficult.
Goal CF 6 – Public Schools

Ensure school sites and facilities meet the needs of Spokane County residents.

*CF 6 Policies*

6.1 Encourage school districts serving predominantly rural area populations to locate schools within designated Rural Activity Centers or Limited Development Areas.

6.2 Encourage school districts to develop capital facilities plans that identify future school sites and include early acquisition of sites in their long-range strategy.

6.3 Develop land use designation and policies that protect and allow for the establishment of new schools in urban areas and designated Rural Activity Centers. The extension of public facilities and utilities to serve a school sited in a rural area that serves students from a rural area and an urban area may be allowed consistent with GMA Guidelines.

6.4 Encourage school districts to allow for shared access of facilities for recreational or other public purposes.

6.5 Encourage the expansion of school facility capacity to proceed at a comparable rate with that of private residential development and demographic trends.

6.6 Consider the adequacy of school facilities when considering UGA and Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

6.7 School districts should develop capital facility plans addressing population growth and future capital needs for schools.

6.8 Encourage School districts to develop capital improvement plans which identify future school site expansion.

Goal CF 7 - Libraries

Provide library services efficiently and cost effectively to Spokane County residents

*CF 7 Policies*

7.1 Encourage inter-jurisdictional cooperation, sharing of equipment and facilities.

7.2 Ensure that the expansion of library capacity proceeds at a comparable rate with that of private residential development and demographic trends.

7.3 Ensure that land use regulations allow siting of library facilities in locations convenient to residential areas.

7.4 Consider the opportunities and implications of libraries providing digital services when evaluating capital projects and levels of service.
Goal CF 8 – Public safety

Provide public safety services efficiently and cost effectively to Spokane County residents

*CF 8 Policies*

8.1 Encourage inter-jurisdictional cooperation among law enforcement and corrections agencies to further develop, where practical, shared service and facility use.

8.2 Encourage new development in areas served by a fire protection district or within the corporate limits of a city providing its own fire department.

8.3 Road access and water supply shall be adequate for fire safety and suppression in commercial and residential developments.

8.4 Encourage continued inter-jurisdictional cooperation among fire districts, including the sharing of equipment and facilities to reduce demand for new facilities and equipment.

Goal CF 9 – Solid waste and utilities

Provide utilities and solid waste collection services that are consistent and available to support land use policies.

*CF 9 Policies*

9.1 Coordinate with utility providers to ensure that sizing, locating and phasing of utility systems are consistent with the Comprehensive Plans and meets anticipated population needs in a timely manner.

9.2 New construction associated with development shall comply with utility specifications and standards.

9.3 Promote conservation measures to reduce the need for additional utility distribution facilities/services in the future.

9.4 Ensure that utility and telecommunications facilities are designed to minimize adverse aesthetic and land use impacts on surrounding uses, with telecommunications facilities using existing structures where feasible.

9.5 Encourage availability and efficient use of natural gas.

9.6 Encourage coordination with utility providers in the provision of natural gas, telecommunications services, and electrical services.

9.7 Promote long-term planning for telecommunications systems.

9.8 Encourage telecommunication services as a means to mitigate the transportation impact of development and growth.

9.9 Protect existing utility corridors to permit maintenance access and future expansion.
9.10 Provide for efficient, cost effective and reliable utility service by ensuring land is available for the location of utility lines, including their location within transportation corridors and by creating guidelines and permit processes that are conducive to utility operations.

9.11 Coordinate dimensional guidelines for regional corridors with effected utility providers and jurisdictions.

9.12 Promote the co-location of new utility transmission distribution and communication facilities when doing so is consistent with the utility industry practices, DOT requirements, and national electrical and other codes.

9.13 Provide timely notice to affected private utilities of all major utility projects, including the maintenance and repair of existing roads, in order to promote the joint planning and coordination of public and private utility activities.

9.14 Where consistent with multiple uses, promote joint use of utility corridors with recreational and green space applications.

9.15 Encourage recycling to conserve resources and energy.

Goal CF 10 – Growth and costs

Ensure growth and development to pay a proportionate share of the cost of planned facilities needed so serve it.

CF 10 Policies

10.1 Distribute and assess proportionate costs to new growth and development.

10.2 Consider instituting impact fees, but only for those services and facilities as permitted by GMA and

a. Only for system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development;

b. Not to exceed a proportionate share of the costs of system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development; and,

c. Only for system improvements that will reasonably benefit the new development

10.3 Exempt new housing units meeting the standard federal and state definition of “low-income housing” from development impact fees or proportionate cost payments.

10.4 Discount or waive development impact fees or proportionate cost payments for new housing units serving populations with special needs, such as persons with severe disabilities.
Levels of Service

Introduction

The Capital Facilities Goals and Policies and this Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) complement the balance of the comprehensive plan to ensure that foreseen development can be served at acceptable levels of service.

This CFP specifically identifies public facilities that will be needed in the future. Table CF-2 lists the County’s Capital Facility Plans and Capital Improvement Programs (CIP) for the services that maintain detailed plans. When a service does not maintain a separate capital facility plan or capital improvement program the plan and program is maintained within a chapter of this document.

Each CFP contains an inventory of existing and proposed capital facilities, evaluates level of service (LOS) standards, identifies long-range facility service capacities and projected deficiencies, and outlines the actions necessary to meet such deficiencies. The program also provides the GMA-required future financing plan. The six-year financing plan portion of the CFP is a summary of the county service providers’ six-year capital improvement programs (CIPs). The program is, therefore, a mechanism to coordinate the capital improvement needs of the county departments. CIPs will be updated annually. The updates will be completed prior to adoption of the County budget to incorporate into the budget the capital improvements from the updated CFP. The six-year capital improvement (CIP) programs for those departments managed by Spokane County are hereby adopted by reference as a part of the Comprehensive Plan. Printed copies are available, and the programs may be viewed on line.

The Capital Facilities Program (CFP) addresses all areas within unincorporated Spokane County, with special attention to those services within the urban growth area. The scope of Spokane County’s Capital Facilities Program is, in alphabetical order:

- Domestic Water
- Fire and Emergency Medical Services
- Law Enforcement and Justice
- Libraries
- Parks, Recreation, Golf and Open Space Facilities
- Public Schools
- Sanitary Sewer
- Solid Waste
- Transportation

The Capital Facilities Program for Transportation is detailed in the Transportation element and summarized later in this plan and in Appendix B.
Table CF 2 lists service types, service providers and the associated capital facility related plans and programs.

### Table CF-2: Types and Providers of Capital Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Service Provider</th>
<th>Source for capital facility inventory, planning, and programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic Water</strong></td>
<td>City of Spokane, Consolidated Support Services, Spokane County Water District 3, Whitworth Water District are Domestic Water providers, see Water section for full list of systems</td>
<td>Spokane County Capital Facilities Plan Chapter 5.13 and UGA Update EIS for water capacity and legal availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Maps CFU-1, CFU-2, CFU-3, CFU-4, CFU-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire and Emergency Services</strong></td>
<td>City of Spokane Fire Dept., Medical Lake Fire Dept. Fire Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13</td>
<td>Spokane County Capital Facilities Plan, Chapter 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Maps CFU-6, CFU-7, CFU-8, CFU-9, CFU-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law Enforcement &amp; Justice</strong></td>
<td>Spokane County Sheriff Office Spokane Municipal Courts, District Courts, Superior Courts, Juvenile Courts County Jail, Geiger Corrections Facility, Juvenile Detention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Map CFU-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries</strong></td>
<td>Spokane County Library District, 11 libraries See Map CFU-12</td>
<td>Library District maintains its own capital facilities plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks, Recreation and Open Space</strong></td>
<td>Spokane County Department of Parks, Recreation and Golf See Maps CFU-13, CFU-14, CFU-15, CFU-16, CFU-17, CFU-18, CFU-19, CFU-20, CFU-21, CFU-22, CFU-23, CFU-24, CFU-25, CFU-26, CFU-27, CFU-28, CFU-29, CFU-30, CFU-31, CFU-32, CFU-33</td>
<td>County parks department maintains its own facilities plan and program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanitary Sewer/ Stormwater</strong></td>
<td>City of Spokane Sewer Maintenance (up to 10 million gallons per day) Spokane County Public Works and Utilities Stormwater handled on a project-by-project basis See Maps CFU-34, CFU-35, CFU-36, CFU-37, CFU-38, CFU-39</td>
<td>City of Spokane Sewer Maintenance Spokane County Public Works and Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Schools | Central Valley, Cheney, East Valley, Mead, Medical Lake, Spokane Schools, and West Valley School Districts serving UGA  
Other rural school districts  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane Solid Waste Management</td>
<td>Spokane County Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan of 1998 (currently being updated) and the Solid Waste Management Department’s 10-year plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transportation | Spokane County  
WA State Department of Transportation  
See Map CFU-52, CFU-53, CFU-54, CFU-55 |  |
Levels of Service (LOS) Standards

Levels of service measure the amount of public facilities and services that are provided to the community, factors that significantly contribute to the community’s quality of life. Service providers establish levels of service to identify future capacities of capital facilities, projected deficiencies, and the necessary improvements to serve new growth while still maintaining service levels that will meet the desires of the community, state standards, and federal requirements.

Levels of service usually are quantifiable measures of the amount of public facilities and services that are provided to the community but also may measure the quality of a public facility. Typically, LOS is expressed as a ratio of facility or service capacity to unit(s) of demand. Examples of LOS measures include the number of police officers per 1,000 people, the number of park acres per 1,000 people, and the number of gallons of water used per day per customer.

Existing LOS

Spokane County service providers have determined that, in most cases, the current levels of service are adequate. Therefore, the proposed LOS standards established for the comprehensive plan to determine future capital facility capacities, needs, deficiencies, and projected improvement costs are, with the exception of Fire and Emergency Services, based on current service levels. The Spokane County Countywide Planning Policies establish regional minimum levels of service under Policy Topic 3, Policy 1.

Future Demand

As the LOS is based, for the majority of services, on population it is necessary to understand just how much the population of the City and UGAs may grow over the years. Per RCW 43.62.035 the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) provides each county with a population projection range. The County chooses a population growth rate within this range and then allocates (or distributes) the population to the municipalities within its jurisdiction. The Board of Commissioners for Spokane County adopted a population forecast for planning purposes on August 3, 2017 (BCC Resolution 2016-0553). The forecast used the Office of Financial Management’s medium forecast for Spokane County.

Spokane County has adopted a twenty-year (to 2037) population growth of 84,061 new people to the County. It appears this allocation may change based on the ability of the various jurisdictions within the County ability to provide services.

Population forecasts for Spokane County’s Urban Growth Areas for the 2017 to 2037 planning period can be found in Table CF-3 and Table CF-4. The 2017 population estimate was determined by calculating a population for each area based on the 2015 American Community Survey and then determining the percentage of the total unincorporated UGA population for each UGA area. Those percentages were then
applied to the 2017 population estimate for the unincorporated UGA as adopted by the Board of County Commissioners with BCC Resolution 2016-0553.

Population growth for each area was estimated by considering the growth potential in each area using factors including availability of facilities and services, growth trends, population capacity and environmental constraints.

Spokane County is planning to be able to accommodate a population increase within its unincorporated jurisdiction, with the majority of that population increase occurring within the urban growth area. Throughout the Capital Facilities Element there will be references to “demand population” in either a six-year outlook or a twenty-year outlook, and some of those numbers may reference unincorporated or UGA population growth. Table CF-3 below is intended as a reference to those numbers:

Table CF-3: 2017 – 2037 Population Forecast and Allocation for Cities and Towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights</td>
<td>9,071</td>
<td>5,226</td>
<td>14,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>11,827</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>14,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>4,110</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>5,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake</td>
<td>9,780</td>
<td>6,129</td>
<td>15,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>5,072</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>6,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwood</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangle</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>215,839</td>
<td>20,859</td>
<td>236,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Valley</td>
<td>95,264</td>
<td>14,650</td>
<td>109,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverly</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>354,445</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,184</strong></td>
<td><strong>406,629</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table CF-4: Population Estimate for Unincorporated UGA by Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UGA Area</th>
<th>2017 Population Estimate</th>
<th>2017 to 2037 Population Increase Estimate</th>
<th>2037 Population Estimate Forecast by UGA area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five Mile</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillyard</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Metro UGA</td>
<td>26,146</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>29,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Metro UGA-JPA</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Mile</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upriver UGA-JPA</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley 1</td>
<td>5,252</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley 2</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley 3</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley 4</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>3,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley 5</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>3,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley 6</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcott UGA-JPA</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran/Glenrose UGA-JPA</td>
<td>8,080</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>9,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights UGA-JPA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Canyon</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar Rock</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Plains/Thorpe UGA-JPA</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>6,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,893</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,224</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,117</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table CF-5: Population Estimates All Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>499,348</td>
<td>583,409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Spokane County</td>
<td>144,903</td>
<td>176,780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Rural</td>
<td>91,010</td>
<td>108,663</td>
<td>17,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated UGA</td>
<td>53,893</td>
<td>68,117</td>
<td>14,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities and Towns</td>
<td>354,445</td>
<td>406,629</td>
<td>52,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UGA</td>
<td>408,338</td>
<td>474,746</td>
<td>66,408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table CF-6 identifies the levels of service that are applicable to that land within the urban growth area and, where appropriate, to the county’s jurisdiction as a whole. While concurrency requirements obligate the County to consider LOS standards when updating the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations within the unincorporated UGA, impacts to countywide LOS for various facilities and services will also be considered. Concurrency management at the development level is governed by Chapter 13.650 of SCC under Concurrency.

Table CF-6: Capital Facility Levels of Service within UGA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/Service</th>
<th>UGA LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>800 gallons per residential equivalent per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and EMS</td>
<td>Urban areas served by Fire District with at least a Class 6 Insurance Rating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire flow and hydrant placement per International Fire Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban areas must be within 5 road miles of station with “Class A” pumper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban areas shall be served by a basic life support (BLS) agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement/justice</td>
<td>The County must provide 1.01 law enforcement officers (LEO) per 1,000 residents within the unincorporated Urban Growth Area (UGA) not otherwise served by a law enforcement agency or by contract services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>.41 square feet per capita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>1.4 acres of Community Parkland per 1,000 residents within the unincorporated UGA where a concentration of 7,000 or more residents are not located within three miles of an existing improved or unimproved County, municipal or other public park that provides or is planned to provide amenities similar to a Community Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>To be determined by individual school district CFP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>As adopted by Spokane Transit Authority Board of Directors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sanitary Sewer
Public sewer required where densities exceed 2 equivalent residential units per acre.

## Solid waste
Solid Waste processing will meet Federal and State regulations.

## Stormwater
- New development shall not increase runoff volume off-site.
- Prevent flooding of property during a 25-year storm.
- Prevent damage to buildings from a 100-year storm.
- Stormwater discharge to any surface or ground waters will be allowed unless the discharge will degrade water quality below standards.

## Transportation
- LOS for operational analysis shall be as contained in the Spokane County Standards for Road and Sewer Construction.
- Maintain travel corridor time as established by Spokane Regional Transportation Council.

## Water
Minimum water pressure of 45 pounds per square inch

Though there is a set capital facility levels of service that are intended to be met, the county could plan to exceed these minimum levels of service if there is a desire by the community and budget to do so.
Implementation Strategy

While the comprehensive plan’s capital facility planning is necessarily long-range in nature, it relates directly to the County’s annual work programs and budgets. It informs decisions on priority and adds order to what gets done and when it happens. The County – and its public services partners – must allocate their capital investments and resources strategically, timing and leveraging decisions to greatest effect. The policies in this document provide guidance, both for the County and those agencies, districts and jurisdictions who partner with the County to ensure the county’s population is safe and healthy. The UGA Update EIS provides a detailed fiscal analysis of the proposed implementation strategy.

Based on capital facilities policy, forecast growth in the urban growth area, and adopted levels of service (both direct and indirect), certain actions must be taken to ensure that those residing or doing business in unincorporated areas are appropriately served. Table CF-7 identifies the specific anticipated needs for investment in services and facilities, establishing a general timescale for those investments and where the resources will come from. Table CF-8 identifies the various appropriate funding mechanisms. The County’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is a budgeting tool used to identify capital expenditures and revenue sources and ensure that anticipated expenditures are consistent with this CFP and the County’s priorities. It constitutes part of the County's budgeting process, to include adoption, transfers, revisions or supplemental appropriations, which have the effect of adjusting expenditures as conditions demand.

Table CF-7: Anticipated Facility/Service Investment Needs for County-Provided Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/Service</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Cost (in $1,000)</th>
<th>Fund Mechanisms</th>
<th>Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement/Justice</td>
<td>Refer to 6-year CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane County Sheriff, Board of County Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Refer to 6-year CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane County Parks, Recreation &amp; Golf Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>Education &amp; Outreach Program</td>
<td>2019 - 2035</td>
<td>$600/yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grants Tipping fees</td>
<td>Environmental Services Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source Reduction</td>
<td>2019 - 2035</td>
<td>$34/yr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grants Tipping fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>2019 - 2035</td>
<td>$15/yr.</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organics</td>
<td>2019 - 2035</td>
<td>$15/yr.</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>2019 - 2035</td>
<td>$9/yr.</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer System</td>
<td>2019 - 2035</td>
<td>$3,195/yr.</td>
<td>Tipping fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Recovery/Incineration</td>
<td>2019 - 2021</td>
<td>$11,000/yr.</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>Tipping fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Disposal Closure Maintenance</td>
<td>2019 - 2040</td>
<td>$800/yr.</td>
<td>County Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review post-closure plan &amp; obligation</td>
<td>2019 - 2035</td>
<td>$10/yr.</td>
<td>Landfill fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor developments in alternative processing tech and potential County application</td>
<td>2019 - 2035</td>
<td>$5/yr.</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess option for long-hauling of MSW out of County.</td>
<td>2019 - 2035</td>
<td>$25/yr.</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>Tipping fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Wastes</td>
<td>2019 - 2035</td>
<td>$520/yr.</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>Tipping fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative &amp; Enforcement</td>
<td>2019 - 2035</td>
<td>$25/yr.</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>Tipping fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to 6-year CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane County Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane County Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to 6-year CIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater (Sanitary Sewer)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Services Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donwood Sewer Project</td>
<td>New Service Area</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$1,080</td>
<td>Sewer Construction Fund (Fund 403)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Acres Sewer Project</td>
<td>New Service Area</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$2,020</td>
<td>Sewer Construction Fund (Fund 403)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havana Lyons Sewer Project</td>
<td>New Service Area</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$1,480</td>
<td>Sewer Construction Fund (Fund 403)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St. Sewer Project, Package 3 (Magnesium to Stoneman)</td>
<td>New Service Area</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$1,990</td>
<td>Sewer Construction Fund (Fund 403)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead Sewer Project</td>
<td>New Service Area</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$3,250</td>
<td>Sewer Construction Fund (Fund 403)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead-Mt. Spokane West Sewer Project</td>
<td>New Service Area</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$2,540</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund (Fund 438)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead-Mt. Spokane East Sewer Project</td>
<td>New Service Area</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$9,030</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund (Fund 438)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peone Pines Connections</td>
<td>Eliminate Ex. Drain Field</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$790</td>
<td>General Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Fund (Fund 438)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Road Pump Station &amp; Force Main</td>
<td>New Service Area</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$1,230 General Facilities Fund (Fund 438)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bluff Road Pump Station &amp; Force Main</td>
<td>New Service Area</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$1,230 General Facilities Fund (Fund 438)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer-term Expansion/Upgrades to SCRWRF</td>
<td>Upgrades</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$5,000 Sewer Operations Fund (Fund 401)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer-term Expansion/Upgrades to RPWRF</td>
<td>Upgrades</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$5,000 Sewer Operations Fund (Fund 401)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah Creek WWTP Stream Bank Stabilization</td>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$200 Sewer Operations Fund (Fund 401)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Line Restoration Program</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$11,000 Sewer Operations Fund (Fund 401)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station Upgrades (Electrical, HVAC, Etc.)</td>
<td>Upgrades</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$2,100 Sewer Operations Fund (Fund 401)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station Reliability Enhancements (VA Study Rec.)</td>
<td>Enhancement s</td>
<td>20-Year</td>
<td>$1,400 Sewer Operations Fund (Fund 401)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Current Fee/Tax Used for Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Water</td>
<td>Local funding: Ratepayers and special fees, as necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement &amp; Justice</td>
<td>General Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REET FUNDS: Real estate excise tax funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>REET FUNDS: Real estate excise tax funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFT: Conservation Futures Tax funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>TIPPING FEES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Stations: Minimum charge of $15 for first 300 pounds, or $104.50 per ton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-hauled Clean Green &amp; Yard Waste Debris minimum charge of $7 for 280 pounds, or $50 per ton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WTE: Minimum charge $16.59 or $108.41 per ton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-hauled Clean Green and Yard Waste Debris—minimum charge $5.45 or $51.21 per ton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>ANNUAL STORMWATER FEE: Flat fee per unit per year charted to single family homes, duplexes and triplexess. Other properties are charged based on the amount of hard surface on the property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>FEDERAL SOURCES: Authorized under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century, or MAP-21 and are administered by the Federal Highway Administration through the Washington State Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (SRTC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STBG: Surface Transportation Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Assistance: AAP, UAP, and SP are administered by the Transportation Improvement Board, RAP and CAPP are administered by the County Road Administration Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOCAL FUNDING: RID Bonds are sold to finance construction of local roads. Private funds are paid by private companies for various reasons, usually for commercial reasons. Spokane County collects funds primarily from the road tax and state gasoline tax.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developer Funded SEPA Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funds generated by Tax Increment Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funds from Public Development Authority within specified boundaries

**Wastewater (Sanitary Sewer)**

- **SEWER CONSTRUCTION FUND**: Revenues from construction cost component of special connection charges and sewer trunk charges collected as well as interest on the Fund balance.
- **GENERAL FACILITIES FUND**: Revenues come from General Facilities Charges (GFCs) which are collected from new sewer connections, expansion, or increases in use and interest incurred on Fund balance.
- **SEWER OPERATIONS FUND**: Revenues come from monthly sewer service fees paid by utility customers. Annually a designated portion of the revenue from monthly sewer service fees is earmarked for the “Replacement Reserve Fund”.

In addition, there are several implementing programs the County must consider as it works to provide a sufficient spectrum of facilities and services within its jurisdiction. Many of them, listed below in Table CF-9, activate interjurisdictional cooperation and integrated budget planning, both necessary for efficient resource allocation and services provision.

**Table CF-9 Implementation Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Policy ref.</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Monitor the quantity of capital improvements that are needed to eliminate existing deficiencies and to maintain the Level of Service standards for public facilities and services provided by Spokane County. This will occur every seven years as part of the CFP update, annually as part of the budget and CIP update, and as needed as part of concurrency review for new development.</td>
<td>Set by department/purveyor</td>
<td>CBO¹, BOCC²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Monitor the implementation of Capital Improvement Programs and development to ensure that the Land Use, Transportation, and Capital Facilities Elements are coordinated and consistent, that established Level of Service standards for public facilities, and services are achieved.</td>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
<td>CBO¹, BOCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assess the Comprehensive Plan and, as appropriate, reduce Level of Service standards, increase funding for new or improved facilities or reassess the Land Use element if the adopted Level of Service standards are not achieved.</td>
<td>Semiannual update/UGA revisions</td>
<td>BOCC²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Designate phases for development within designated Urban Growth Areas as follows.</td>
<td>UGA Update</td>
<td>BOCC²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Implement a Concurrency Management System to ensure that adequate public facilities and services needed to support</td>
<td>Per development review</td>
<td>B+P⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development are available concurrent with the impacts of such development.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Assess existing interlocal agreements with municipalities and other providers of public facilities to coordinate planning for, and development of, Urban Growth Areas.</td>
<td>Per periodic update of CP’s/UGA’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Define and adopt watershed protection areas for watersheds where steep slopes, high groundwater, shallow soils, poorly draining soils and other special physical conditions make on-site disposal of stormwater difficult. In these watershed protection areas, special stormwater management studies and techniques may be required.</td>
<td>Per RCW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Assist school districts in developing Capital Facilities Plans that are consistent with the Growth Management Act and the County’s Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Develop workable evaluation processes and program performance measures to evaluate police and fire protection effectiveness. Such performance measures might include response time to calls, crime solution rates or other methods to determine actual effectiveness.</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Develop and adopt access and water supply provisions for fire protection in commercial and residential developments.</td>
<td>Per B+P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Identify and implement comprehensive emergency management plans consistent with the elements of the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Require development of comprehensive emergency management plans consistent with elements of Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Dem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1 CBO: Chief Budget Official
2 BOCC: Board of County Commissioners
3 B+P: Building and Planning Department
4 SCEO: Steering Committee of Elected Officials
5 CWSP: Coordinated Water System Plan
6 Department of Emergency Management
Appendix A: Goal and Policy Summary

This summary links the CFP’s goals, policies, and implementation programs, illustrating in one place how each relates to the other. Not every policy will have an implementation program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF-1</td>
<td>Provide adequate public facilities services to support rural or urban levels of development, as appropriate, integrating capital facilities planning and the siting of essential public facilities with land use policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Establish and maintain levels of service as follows for urban areas of Spokane County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Consolidate the Capital Improvement Program, Sewer Construction Capital Improvement Programs, Parks Improvement Plan and, Transportation Improvement Program to implement Capital Facilities Plan priorities. Plans shall be updated yearly for consideration in the annual budgeting process.</td>
<td>Chief Budget Official Budget/BOCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Ensure that the estimated cost of all capital improvements does not exceed the estimate of available revenues.</td>
<td>Chief Budget Officer Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Finance capital improvements and manage debt consistent with the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td>Chief Budget Officer Budget/Board of County Commissioners Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Provide public facilities and services or accept their provision by other entities only if Spokane County or the other entity is able to pay for subsequent operation and maintenance costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Approve urban comprehensive plan land use and UGA amendments only after it is determined that public facilities and services will have the capacity to serve it without decreasing levels of service below adopted standards.</td>
<td>Board of County Commissioners, Annual/Periodic amendments to the Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7 Ensure fire protection, law enforcement, parks and recreation, libraries, public sewer, public water, solid waste disposal and recycling, transportation, and schools meet adopted level of service standards and be consistent with the Concurrency Management System.

Spokane County Code.
Building and Planning Department
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF 2</td>
<td>Create a fiscally sustainable capital facilities environment, ensuring adequate public services and facilities are provided.</td>
<td>Establish interlocal/joint planning agreements with municipalities and other providers of public facilities to coordinate planning for, and development of, Urban Growth Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Use annexation agreements to ensure fiscal balance and equity as portions of the UGA annex into incorporated jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 3</td>
<td>Promote efficient domestic water service and protect the natural resource.</td>
<td>Ensure water system plans are consistent with anticipated population growth, the Comprehensive Plan, and Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Ensure water systems for urban and rural developments include adequate water rights, supply, and distribution systems for domestic use and fire protection per local, state and federal plans, policies and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Encourage public and private water purveyors to implement measurable water conservation practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Encourage the continued cooperation, coordination, and consolidation of water purveyors to achieve greater efficiency in the delivery of water services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 4</td>
<td>Promote efficient sanitary sewer service, protect natural resources, and ensure orderly physical development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Prohibit the extension of any sewer system that will degrade the existing system below the adopted level of service.</td>
<td>Spokane County Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Consider anticipated population growth in sewer planning, ensuring it is consistent with and developed in coordination with comprehensive plan land use policies.</td>
<td>Urban Growth Area/Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Consider the location and capacity of existing and planned sewer facilities when determining the intensity and/or density of land use designations.</td>
<td>Spokane County Code Concurrency, Board of County Commissioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Determine whether changes to comprehensive plan designation or urban growth areas can be accommodated within the planned capacity of the sewer conveyance and treatment system before approval, in accordance with the Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan.</td>
<td>Urban Growth Area/Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Encourage a coordinated, regional wastewater service organization to provide sewer services to all urban areas of the County inside the Urban Growth Area.</td>
<td>Coordinated Water System Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Public sewer service shall not be provided outside the Urban Growth Area boundary, except under certain specific circumstances.</td>
<td>Spokane County Code Concurrency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 5</td>
<td>5.1 New development within the UGA shall require stormwater management systems.</td>
<td>Spokane County Stormwater Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Best management practices should be utilized to treat stormwater runoff prior to injection of runoff into the ground.</td>
<td>Spokane County Stormwater Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 New development shall be designed to protect natural drainage functions including flood plains, drainageways, sink areas and other natural and existing drainage facilities.</td>
<td>Spokane County Stormwater Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 New development shall be designed to prevent onsite and off-site damage from stormwater runoff that result from site development or from the new land use activity.</td>
<td>Spokane County Stormwater Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5 New development shall consider, where feasible, the multiple uses of facilities, such as the integration of stormwater facilities with recreation/open space areas.</td>
<td>Spokane County Stormwater Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6 Conduct stormwater management planning by drainage basin, treating basins as complete drainage systems, to assure that the most economical and beneficial stormwater controls are provided.</td>
<td>Spokane County Stormwater Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7 Encourage use of alternatives to impervious surfaces through rewards and credits.</td>
<td>Spokane County Stormwater Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.8 Encourage the development of a coordinated, regional stormwater service organization to provide stormwater services to all urban areas of the County inside the Urban Growth Area boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Provide alternatives to on-site disposal of stormwater in areas of steep slopes, high groundwater, shallow soils, poorly draining soils and other physical conditions make on-site stormwater disposal difficult.</td>
<td>Spokane County Stormwater Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 6</td>
<td>Ensure school sites and facilities meet the needs of Spokane County residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Encourage school districts serving predominantly rural area populations to locate schools within designated Rural Activity Centers.</td>
<td>School District’s Capital Facilities Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Encourage school districts to develop capital facilities plans that identify future school sites and include early acquisition of sites in their long-range strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Develop land use designation and policies that protect and allow for the establishment of new schools in urban areas and designated Rural Activity Centers.</td>
<td>Spokane County Zoning Code, Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Encourage school districts to allow for shared access of facilities for recreational or other public purposes.</td>
<td>Spokane County Capital Facility, Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Encourage the expansion of school facility capacity to proceed at a comparable rate with that of private residential development and demographic trends.</td>
<td>Spokane County Zoning Code, Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Consider the adequacy of school facilities when considering UGA and Comprehensive Plan Amendments.</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan/Urban Growth Area Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>School districts should develop capital facility plans addressing population growth and future capital needs for schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Encourage School districts to develop capital improvement plans which identify future school site expansion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CF 7

**Goal**: Provide library services efficiently and cost effectively to Spokane County residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Encourage inter-jurisdictional cooperation, sharing of equipment and facilities.</td>
<td>Bond Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Ensure that the expansion of library capacity proceeds at a comparable rate with that of private residential development and demographic trends.</td>
<td>Spokane County Zoning Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Ensure that land use regulations allow siting of library facilities in locations convenient to residential areas.</td>
<td>Capital Facilities Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Consider the opportunities and implications of libraries providing digital services when evaluating capital projects and levels of service.</td>
<td>Urban Growth Area/ Comprehensive Plan Amendments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CF 8

**Goal**: Provide public safety services efficiently and cost effectively to Spokane County residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Encourage inter-jurisdictional cooperation among law enforcement and corrections agencies to further develop, where practical, shared service and facility use.</td>
<td>Spokane County Code Concurrency, Bldg. Codes, Permit Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Encourage new development in areas served by a fire protection district or within the corporate limits of a city providing its own fire department.</td>
<td>Interlocal &amp; Mutual Aid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Road access and water supply shall be adequate for fire safety and suppression in commercial and residential developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Encourage continued inter-jurisdictional cooperation among fire districts, including the sharing of equipment and facilities to reduce demand for new facilities and equipment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 9</td>
<td>9.1 Coordinate with utility providers to ensure that sizing, locating and phasing of utility systems are consistent with the Comprehensive Plans and meets anticipated population needs in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2 New construction associated with development shall comply with utility specifications and standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3 Promote conservation measures to reduce the need for additional utility distribution facilities/services in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4 Ensure that utility and telecommunications facilities are designed to minimize adverse aesthetic and land use impacts on surrounding uses, with telecommunications facilities using existing structures where feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5 Encourage availability and efficient use of natural gas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.6 Encourage coordination with utility providers in the provision of natural gas, telecommunications services, and electrical services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.7 Promote long-term planning for telecommunications systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.8 Encourage telecommunication services as a means to mitigate the transportation impact of development and growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.9 Protect existing utility corridors to permit maintenance access and future expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.10 Provide for efficient, cost effective and reliable utility service by ensuring land is available for the location of utility lines, including their location within transportation corridors and by creating guidelines and permit processes that are conducive to utility operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>Coordinate dimensional guidelines for regional corridors with effected utility providers and jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>Promote the co-location of new utility transmission distribution and communication facilities when doing so is consistent with the utility industry practices, DOT requirements, and national electrical and other codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>Provide timely notice to affected private utilities of all major utility projects, including the maintenance and repair of existing roads, in order to promote the joint planning and coordination of public and private utility activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>Where consistent with multiple uses, promote joint use of utility corridors with recreational and green space applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>Encourage recycling to conserve resources and energy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 10</td>
<td>Ensure growth and development to pay a proportionate share of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cost of planned facilities needed so serve it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.1 Distribute and assess proportionate costs to new growth and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2 Consider instituting impact fees, but only for those services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and facilities as permitted by GMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3 Exempt new housing units meeting the standard federal and state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definition of “low-income housing” from development impact fees or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proportionate cost payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.4 Discount or waive development impact fees or proportionate cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>payments for new housing units serving populations with special needs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>such as persons with severe disabilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Services and Providers

The following pages present information on each of the County’s public services and the array of agencies, districts, and companies who provide those services. The information is based on a comprehensive set of interviews with representatives from the purveyors and thorough background research.

Domestic Water

Water is one of Spokane County’s most important resources. An adequate and consistent supply is needed for community development and necessary for public health and fire safety. In Spokane County, water provision falls into two categories. Urbanized areas, where the bulk of the population and development occurs, are typically served by water systems administered by water districts, or municipalities. Rural areas are predominantly served by individual wells or small group systems. The UGA Update EIS details water service areas, their responsibilities and how well equipped each water service purveyor is to address anticipated changes in demand over time.

Domestic water is a direct concurrency service. New development cannot occur within the Urban Growth Area (UGA) unless the proposal can demonstrate the availability of public water consistent with adopted levels of service standards and consistent with the definition of direct concurrency.

There are numerous water purveyors throughout the County. They fall into three categories; municipalities, special districts and associations. Associations typically serve residential developments outside of the UGA which were developed prior to water service being available from a municipality or water district. These systems are typically closed to expansion. Special districts, known as water districts, are the second most numerous purveyors of water and have characteristics of being expandable, having bonding and taxing authority and possess an elected board of directors. The cities of Spokane, Cheney, Airway Heights, Deer Park, Medical Lake, Millwood, Fairfield, Latah, Rockford, Spangle, and Waverly operate their own water systems and may provide water service outside their corporate boundaries.

Water purveyors that do not have adequate water rights to meet demand within their service area have three options: 1. Apply for and receive additional water rights, 2. Acquire existing water rights, or 3. Purchase water from a purveyor with excess water rights. While not officially closed, the Washington Department of Ecology has indicated that it is unlikely that additional water rights will be issued from the SVRP aquifer. Acquisition of water rights from another party or purchase of water from another purveyor is the likely options for purveyors that will not have adequate water rights to meet future demands.
### Table CF-10: Water Rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Purveyor</th>
<th>Amount of water right available in 2030 (gal./day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>59,876,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitworth Water District #2</td>
<td>9,323,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCWD#3 Sys 3B</td>
<td>381,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Spokane Irrigation District #8</td>
<td>2,295,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena Park Irrigation District</td>
<td>(49,100.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Water System</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Irrigation District</td>
<td>3,437,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCWD#3 Sys 2 South Spokane Valley</td>
<td>234,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Irrigation District</td>
<td>(1,026,654)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water planning is closely reviewed and regulated by the State of Washington, and every domestic water purveyor must prepare system plans that are consistent with the Department of Health’s Water System Design Manual. Each system is unique, with demand patterns that vary from one system to another, making it difficult to draw direct comparisons on adequacy of available water, service ability and system performance between individual districts. Assessments of system performance and evaluations of water adequacy require detailed and complex engineering study, making the application of “one-size fits all” standards and rules of thumb difficult.

### Inventory of Existing Facilities

**Service area summary**

Although the County does not own or operate a municipal water system, it has a responsibility to coordinate with water purveyors to ensure that their actions are consistent with the County’s adopted land use plans, service areas, and health regulations. The County works with water purveyors and the State Department of Health, Drinking Water Section to prepare a Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP). The CWSP identifies future service boundaries for purveyors and serves as a coordinating document for regional water service. It sets minimum standards for public water systems and is updated as needed at the direction of the Board of County Commissioners or the State Department of Health. When updates occur, the CWSP is reviewed for consistency with the County Comprehensive Plan and adopted as a part of the Comprehensive Plan by reference.

**Water Rights**

Water rights are the legal right to withdraw and use water. The state of Washington uses the prior appropriation doctrine as the foundation of its water code. Prior appropriations or Western Water Law follows the principle, “first in time, first in right” which means if you establish your water right prior to your neighbor, in times of scarcity, you would be entitled to your full right before your neighbor could use any of theirs. Water rights in Washington State are administered by the Department of Ecology (DOE).
The UGA Update EIS discusses water rights in Spokane County in some detail, particularly addressing how water rights relate to forecast new development in the UGA.

Many areas of the state are considered over appropriated, or more water rights have been issued than there is water available. Applications for new water rights, change in use or transfers of existing rights, are administered by the DOE. Applications are processed in the order they are received and currently there is a significant backlog. There is an alternate process for water right changes and transfers. A change or transfer application can be submitted to the County Water Conservancy Board who will make a decision that is reviewed by DOE. By law, DOE must act on the decision within sixty days. Utilizing a County Water Conservancy Board is often a more expedient process for a water right change or transfer application.

When a water purveyor has exceeded its water rights, it must either acquire more or purchase water from a purveyor who has excess rights, such as the City of Spokane. Two water districts who serve within the Urban Growth Area have indicated that projected growth within their service area will exceed their water rights. Both Vera Water District and Pasadena Park Irrigation District indicate, in their Comprehensive Water System Plans, that they are projected to exceed their allotted right prior to 2031.

**Watersheds**

A watershed is the area of land where all of the surface water drains to the same place. Spokane County has six identified watersheds. They are formally known as Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIA) and were created by the State Department of Ecology after the passage of the Water Resource Act of 1971. Under RCW 90.82, the Watershed Planning Act, watershed plans were developed for each of the WRIs.

Table CF-11 contrasts water rights with current use within Spokane County’s identified watersheds. Spokane County resides within the WRIs noted below. The WRIA area is larger than the County.
### Table CF-11: Domestic Water Use v. Water Rights within Designated Water Resource Inventory Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIA</th>
<th>Domestic Exempt Well Rights Estimate (acre-feet)</th>
<th>Annual Water Use Estimates (acre-feet)</th>
<th>Public Supply</th>
<th>Self-Supplied Residential</th>
<th>Self-Supplied Industrial</th>
<th>Agricultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Spokane (WRIA 55)</td>
<td>8,361</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,512</td>
<td>8,361</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Spokane (WRIA 57)</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td></td>
<td>784</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Spokane (WRIA 54)</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah Creek (WRIA 56)</td>
<td>5,962</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>5,962</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palouse (WRIA 34)</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td></td>
<td>628</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Crab Creek (WRIA 43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas served by Spokane Valley Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>132,411</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>26,946</td>
<td>32,111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table CF-12 Annual Water Rights Certificates & Permits and Annual Claim Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIA</th>
<th>Annual Water Rights Certificates &amp; Permits (acre-feet)</th>
<th>Annual Water Rights Claims Estimate (acre-feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Spokane (WRIA 55)</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Spokane (WRIA 57)</td>
<td>294,000</td>
<td>319,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Spokane (WRIA 54)</td>
<td>78,500</td>
<td>37,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah Creek (WRIA 56)</td>
<td>37,085</td>
<td>41,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water Supply**

The CFP’s focus is on ensuring that water is available to serve demand in the unincorporated portions of Spokane County’s UGA. Service within cities is generally provided by city systems or water districts to support land use patterns adopted by the incorporated jurisdictions. The Department of Ecology is
responsible for verifying that the individual plans for the water systems operate within the limits of their water rights.

The primary source of water within the County is groundwater from the Spokane Valley-Rathdrum Prairie (SVRP) Aquifer. The SVRP Aquifer originates in North Idaho, with much of its water coming from the Spokane River and lakes within North Idaho. The water flows underground through the Spokane Valley and splits northwest of downtown Spokane. At that point, a portion heads north, eventually meeting the Little Spokane River while the balance of the aquifer flows northwest along the path of the Spokane River.

The Spokane Valley-Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer is managed at federal, state, and local levels. The states of Washington and Idaho have primary responsibility for water allocation and water quality. However, local governments are increasingly being called upon to consider water supply and quality implications in land use planning.

In 2007, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) completed an aquifer study called the Ground-Water Flow Model for the Spokane Valley-Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer Scientific Investigations Report 2007 - 5044. The purpose of this project was to provide a scientific foundation for management of the aquifer. The study examines the relationship between water withdrawals and flows of the Spokane River. The potential influence of this aquifer on surface-water flows and water quality of the Spokane River will further complicate aquifer management in the future.

Some other aquifers in Spokane County are experiencing availability problems. The south and western portions of the County contain basalt aquifers that are recharged mainly by precipitation. The West Plains area is experiencing problems with adequate water supplies, as are property owners who use private wells in some areas of the Little Spokane Watershed.

The Washington Department of Ecology has documented groundwater levels in wells drilled into the basalt aquifers of the West Plains area. In all but one of the wells tracked by Ecology, groundwater levels declined between 1955 and 2005. The declines ranged from about 15 feet in a Medical Lake well between 2001 and 2003 to about 120 feet in a Four Lakes well between 1997 and 2005. The data suggest well interference among the Parkwest (Airway Heights), Four Lakes, and Medical Lake wells and two other wells. Several solutions have been proposed for dealing with the West Plains water issues. Pumping water into aquifers with capacity problems during high flow times of year for use during low flow times of the year is one option. Inter-ties between systems with availability problems and systems with excess water rights (City of Spokane) is another solution that is currently being implemented. In 2017, the City of Airway Heights domestic water supply was found to be impacted by chemicals known by the acronyms PFOS and PFOA, ingredients found in fire-extinguishing foam and other materials. The chemicals are believed to have seeped into ground water from a fire training site on the eastern edge of Fairchild Airforce base. An intertie into the City of Spokane water system has been providing an alternative source of clean water to Airway Heights and, until the source of the contamination is cleaned up, the City will continue to use water from the City of Spokane or other sources to ensure its citizens are provided with clean water.
Spokane is also in negotiations with the City of Medical Lake for a transfer agreement. The City of Spokane has constructed a 36-inch pipeline out to the intersection of Craig Road and Highway 902 which will be extended to Medical Lake when an agreement is reached.

**Fire Flows**

Firefighting requires water at high flow rates and sufficient pressures for the time period necessary to extinguish the fire. A water system is required to have a supply, storage, and distribution system grid of sufficient capacity to provide firefighting needs while maintaining maximum daily flows to residential and commercial customers. The UGA Update EIS addresses fire flow for the unincorporated UGA, identifying specific actions fire districts should consider as new development occurs.

Districts whose jurisdictions include urban land typically require designs for the water system to provide fire flows that exceed standards established by the Insurance Service Office (ISO), standards administered by the Washington Survey and Rating Bureau (WSRB), minimum fire flows required by state law as set forth in Washington Administrative Code 248-57, and/or fire flows required by the fire district that has jurisdiction.

**Capacity Summary**

Table CF-13 shows, for the purposes of this Capital Facilities Plan, the inventory information of those water purveyors whose systems are expandable, allowing them to establish new connections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ground Water</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pump Capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Valley-Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer</td>
<td>Estimated 624.6 MGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well Stations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Station Capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Stations-Total System Capacity</td>
<td>282 MGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Booster Stations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Station Capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Booster Station Capacity</td>
<td>212.85 MGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reservoirs and Storage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Storage Capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Storage Capacity</td>
<td>106.34 MGD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forecast of Future Needs

**Demand**

Overall, the demand for water in Spokane County has been increasing. The primary reason for this is population growth. In 2000 the Census estimated the County population at 417,939. Today the estimated population is 499,348. This represents an increase of approximately 19% in the last 17 years.

Through the use of its building permit data, the Department Building and Planning has been able to identify which water districts serving the County’s UGAs have grown the fastest between the year 2000 and 2011. Within the County’s jurisdiction, Whitworth added approximately 4,991 persons, the City of Spokane’s water service area added 3,657 and Vera Water District’s population increased by 2,044.

Based on the Department of Health’s Water System Design Manual, systems use water demand estimates to size pumping equipment, transmission lines, distribution mains, and water storage facilities properly. Designs need to include sizing criteria that account for water uses during the highest demand periods, sufficient to address peak hourly demand and maximum day demand over the year. Assessing peak hourly demand and maximum day demand depends on careful research of available water metering and use data, and the results vary from one water purveyor to the next. System design, improvement, expansion, and management must be based on reasonable and data-based criteria that account for variances between systems. While it may be tempting to apply general standards to assess demand, the value in doing so is limited.

**Level of Service (LOS) Standard**

The regional minimum LOS for domestic water is established within the County’s Comprehensive Plan and set at 800 gallons per residential connection, per day for each of the following needs. Development conditions in different areas of the County and specific needs of each development type will influence how these level of service standards will apply. For instance, in areas where elevation and storage are issues, fire flow may be the most challenging level of service standard to achieve. In flatter areas, flow rates and system network issues may present the greatest degree of challenge. Utility providers will need to manage the application of level of service standards in ways appropriate to the context within which development will occur. The 800 gallons per residential connection standard is intended only as an initial point of reference, with actual requirements for each water district based upon each purveyor’s system design and demand patterns.

- **Domestic Water Supply** — Minimum Level of Service for storage capacity and flow shall be consistent with the Washington State Department of Health requirements and the Spokane Coordinated Water System Plan requirements (where applicable).
- **System Design** — Minimum Levels of Service for pipe sizing, flow rate, and systematic grid development shall be consistent with the Washington State Department of Health requirements and the Coordinated Water System Plan requirements (where applicable).
- **Fire Flow** — Fire flow rate and duration requirements are specified by the local fire authority or the Public Water System Coordination Act, whichever is more stringent. Spokane County Code
identifies minimum fire flow for new or expanding water systems within the area of the Coordinated Water System Plan as being 1,000 gallons per minute.

**Future Demand and Analysis**

The Water Resources Section of Spokane County, Environmental Services has evaluated water demand within the Urban Growth Areas (Table CF-11). Through the use of their water demand forecast model, an estimate has been produced based upon adopted County growth numbers for each of the County’s metro UGA areas.

**Table CF-11: Water Demand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UGA Areas</th>
<th>Water Service Provider</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Average Galls Per Day</td>
<td>Million Galls Per Year</td>
<td>Annual Average Galls Per Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcott JPA</td>
<td>All other providers</td>
<td>95,866</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillyard UGA – JPA</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran/Glenrose UGA - JPA</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>3,210,607</td>
<td>1,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Metro UGA – JPA</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>218,397</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Metro UGA – JPA</td>
<td>Hutton Settlement</td>
<td>959,575</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Metro UGA</td>
<td>Hutton Settlement/Spokane County Water District #3</td>
<td>7,918,813</td>
<td>2,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Mile UGA – JPA</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>330,955</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee UGA – JPA</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>9,374</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upriver UGA – JPA</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>197,600</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley UGA</td>
<td>Pasadena Park Irrigation District</td>
<td>3,008,433</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15,950,243</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,822</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The model indicates that water demand within the existing UGA will increase approximately 56% in the next 30 years. Significant increases in water usage are forecast for the North Metro, Valley and Moran/Glenrose areas. This information will be useful for water districts serving these areas as they plan for future growth.

Two challenges face the region’s water purveyors. The first challenge is that the flat and easy to develop land does not always have a sufficient supply of water directly below ground to serve its development. Such is the case on the West Plains, which includes a significant amount of land in the UGA, designated for future development. The second challenge is that of water rights. Vera and Pasadena Park water districts, which serve Urban Growth Areas, may exhaust their existing water rights within the 20-year planning horizon.

Both districts are coordinating their system plans and service availability with the Department of Ecology and Department of Health, ensuring that they do not overcommit service beyond their means. Policies 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4 of this Capital Facilities Plan require the County to continue coordinating with the water districts to make sure land use reviews consider water district abilities to provide services, and the County’s concurrency ordinance requires the County approve land use actions only when the districts can demonstrate available water. The City of Spokane Valley’s requirements mirror those of the County, providing a consistent regulatory framework with respect to entitling and permitting development within these water districts.

In the case of Pasadena Park, the district will almost certainly need to acquire access to additional water to meet anticipated service delivery demands of its forecast population. The City of Spokane Valley and Spokane County, as part of their coordinating roles with water purveyors, are collaborating with the water district to find possible solutions that may include adjudication, formation of a water authority, conversion of irrigation rights, or other approaches.

In February 2015, the Dept. of Ecology (Ecology) adopted a water management rule for the Spokane River and the SVRP Aquifer (WAC 173-557). The rule affects all surface and groundwater uses started on or after Feb. 27, 2015. At the same time, the rule for Little Spokane watershed (WAC 173-555-010) was amended to clarify how new uses of water in the area covered by both rules would be managed.

The West Plains UGA is within the City of Spokane’s water service area. Through the use of pipes and pumps, the City has been able to serve the area as it develops by using water extracted from the Spokane Valley Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer. For this service, the City charges a premium over what customers within its municipal boundaries pay and requires the new customers to sign annexation agreements. Recent water quality concerns, however, have increased Airway Heights’ reliance on City of Spokane water. That reliance is likely to continue into the foreseeable future.

The water right issue can be overcome through the use of a system of interties that allow water to be wholesaled between water purveyors. As various water districts approach the maximum extent of their water rights and supply, the ability to wholesale water from purveyors with available water rights, such as the City of Spokane, will ensure an adequate water supply within the 20-year planning horizon for growth, domestic use, and fire flow within the UGA. All agreements are based on the capacity of the
City’s water system and the amount of water required by the purveyor. In the event water supplies are in jeopardy, water service to the City will take precedence over any and all intertie agreements.

**Proposed Facility Improvements**

Each water district or purveyor within the County manages its own capital projects. Purveyors typically depend on developers to install and pay for the new infrastructure needed to expand the water system and serve new construction. Water use fees are the primary funding source for system improvement and capacity expansion projects. Water districts also have taxing authority and the ability to execute Utility Local Improvement Districts and pursue bonding of capital projects. Other sources of funding are water service connection fees, property assessments, developer improvements, mitigation or impact fees and State and Federal grants and loans.

The improvements each district needs to make are contingent on the specific issues each faces as growth occurs. In some cases, districts will be expanding storage capacity or drilling new wells. In others, where supply is adequate, the focus will be on service line extensions, network connectivity and fire flow upgrades. It will continue to be important that the County coordinate closely with water districts as land within the UGA develops, ensuring that adequate water service exists to support it.
Map CFU – 3 West Plains Water Districts
Map CFU - 6 Spokane Valley Water Districts
Fire and Emergency Medical Services

All fire and emergency service providers within Spokane County supply basic emergency medical service (EMS), as well as fire suppression services. Most of them also provide some degree of fire investigation, inspections, and public education. Other services provided include emergency rescue and hazardous materials response and these may be provided by other jurisdictions according to inter-local service agreements. Within Spokane County, there are 77 active fire stations.

In Spokane County, fire and emergency services are provided by city fire departments and regional fire districts. The cities of Spokane, Cheney, Medical Lake and Airway Heights provide these services to their citizens with their own municipal emergency services departments. The cities of Spokane Valley, Liberty Lake, Deer Park, and Millwood rely upon regional fire districts for their services. Fairchild Air Force Base provides its own internal service and the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) provides fire protection for grasslands and timberlands in the areas of the County not covered by a fire district and for rural state and federal lands.

The County’s Urban Growth Areas are served by six fire districts, as shown on Map CFU - 6: Spokane County Fire Service Providers. Fire District No. 1 serves most of the Spokane Valley and Liberty Lake. District No. 8 serves a small portion of the South Valley UGA. Fire District’s No. 4 and No. 9 provide service to the North Metro UGA, while District’s No. 3 and No. 10 serve the West Plains. Maps CFU - 7 through Map CFU 10 illustrate the Fire Districts in the West Plans, North Spokane, Spokane Valley, South Spokane Fire Districts and the nearest stations.

The Communications Network

The backbone of emergency service provision in Spokane County is the communication network that links calls for help with the appropriate service provider. The network is composed of 911, Central Dispatch, and Emergency Management, co-located at 1620 N. Rebecca, in a building owned by the City of Spokane, and Emergency Communications.

Emergency Communications is responsible for the communication system of the County’s first responders. The system must be coordinated and compatible interjurisdictionally and between different emergency service providers to be effective and to comply with new Homeland Security requirements.

In 2008, the system went through major upgrades. This included new communication towers, microwave receivers, transmitters, and new radios for every emergency service provider in the County including City police, County Sheriff, municipal fire and emergency service providers, as well as the regional fire districts. This upgrade was funded by 1/10th of 1% sale tax approved by voters in 2008 which is to run until 2018.

911 Service

In Spokane County, 911 service is centralized at one location and functions as an emergency call screening service. When emergency calls come in, operators screen and categorize them so they can be routed to the correct dispatching agency. This critical part of emergency service provision is funded by special taxes on communication devices and telephone services.
Central Dispatch

All calls for emergency services are centrally dispatched by a joint City/County Fire Dispatch after the calls are fielded and coded by County 911 operators. The dispatch tracks over 60 fire stations and two hundred pieces of fire equipment and allocates resources from one station to another to ensure maximum fire and EMS service is available at all times. Also collocated in the same building are the County Sheriff dispatch, City of Spokane Police dispatch and the 911 Communications for the entire county. A back up dispatch facility is operated by Fire District 9 and can be used in case of an emergency. The City of Cheney handles its own dispatching for police calls.

Emergency Management

Emergency Management is a coordinating agency set up to deal with major disasters and incidents that require responders from more than one jurisdiction. Their mission is to protect people, property, and the environment through increasing the readiness level to mitigate, prepare for, respond to and recover from major emergencies and disasters. The chief threats to the County are severe storms, wildfires, hazardous material incidents, and flooding.

Emergency Management coordinates and prepares mitigation plans for disasters with a number of public service and volunteer organizations. They also coordinate search and rescue efforts. Emergency Management calls its headquarters the Emergency Coordination Center.

Emergency Medical Services (EMS)

Although regularly referred to as fire departments, firefighting is actually not the most common function for these service providers. In fact, the most common call for service is in response to an emergency medical situation. The typical response pattern would be four emergency medical calls for everyone fire/rescue call.

Emergency Medical Service (EMS) refers to organized programs designed to provide pre-hospital emergency medical services directly to the public, at the location of the emergency incident. There are two basic types of this service; basic life support and advanced life support. Basic life support personnel are required to receive between 120 to 150 hours of medical training. They are typically not allowed to administer intravenous drugs or break the skin. Advanced life support personnel are required to be trained between 1,200 to 1,800 hours and they are allowed to break skin and administer certain intravenous drugs and perform some invasive, lifesaving, medical procedures.

Inter-Agency Coordination

All the fire departments and fire districts have signed mutual aid agreements with each other and the DNR. These agreements allow service providers to receive additional help on large or multiple incidents, or where specialized expertise or equipment is needed. The departments and districts also meet regularly to plan disaster drills and build training programs for county-wide inter-agency responses.

Level of Service (LOS)

The Spokane County Steering Committee of Elected Officials adopted, in the Countywide Planning Policies, the following minimum level of service standards for fire protection, fire code enforcement, and emergency medical services:

**Emergency Medical Services:**
1. The UGA shall be served by a state certified Basic Life Support (BLS) agency.
2. The UGA should be served by:
   a. An operating Basic Life Support (BLS) unit within 5 miles; and
   b. An operating Advanced Life Support (ALS) unit within 6 miles or 10 minutes response time for those jurisdictions with urban areas in excess of 5,000 population; and
   c. BLS and ALS transport service.

**Fire Protection:**
1. The UGA, for those jurisdictions in excess of 5,000 population, shall be served by a fire department/fire district with a (Washington Survey and Rating Bureau or Insurance Services Office) Fire Protection Class 6 or better;
2. All jurisdictions, regardless of size, shall ensure that urban areas have adequate fire flow and hydrant distribution in accordance with the current edition of the International Fire Code adopted by the jurisdiction;
3. Development in the UGA must be within 5 road miles from an operating fire station that provides service with a “Class A” pumper (truck), unless:

   All structures are equipped with fire sprinkler(s) that are rated in accordance with the edition of the International Fire Code adopted by the jurisdiction and is located within 5 road miles of an operating fire station that provides service with a Class “A” rated pumper.

**Future Demand and Analysis**

The level of service (LOS) standard for fire and emergency service protection adopted in the Countywide Planning Policies requires urban areas to be served by a fire district with a Fire Protection Class rating of 6 or better. The following fire districts serve the metro Urban Growth Area: 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, and all currently meet the adopted LOS standard.

Another LOS standard requires urban areas must be within five road miles from an operating fire station that provides service with a "Class A" pumper truck. An analysis conducted for the 2012 Urban Growth Area Update indicates that this level of service is being met.
By far the most common call for assistance is for emergency medical service. The current language in the County’s adopted standard is silent with regards to Basic Life Support response time and permissive when it comes to Advanced Life Support (ALS) response time. It states the following:

1. Urban areas shall be served by a state certified Basic Life Support (BLS) service agency.
2. Urban areas should be served by:
   a. An operating Basic Life Support unit within 5 miles; and
   b. An operating Advanced Life Support unit within 6 miles or 10 minutes response time for those jurisdictions with urban area in excess of 5,000 populations; and
   c. BLS and ALS transport services

Response time to emergency medical situations is a key factor on saving lives and reducing the severity of injuries. It is a common benchmark used nationally for evaluating the effectiveness of fire and EMS service provision. A change to the adopted LOS which shifts the emphasis from distance to response time may better serve the public.

Significant growth in several of the UGA fire districts has occurred in the past 11 years. The UGA is the only area outside of cities where urban densities can occur. Within the County’s jurisdiction, District 9’s population has increased by 5,511, District 4 has gained 4,204 and District 8 has grown by 3,435 persons between 2000 and 2011.

The County’s adopted growth projection for 2037 is 583,409 persons which represents a 15.5% increase from the 2017 count of 499,348. The Growth Management Act directs that new growth be concentrated into Urban Growth Areas. All six of the fire districts noted above have territory within the UGA and each should experience service demand increases over the 20-year planning period based upon the established growth projection.

Projecting costs and expected population increased over a 20-year planning horizon to 2037, the County can estimate some long-range capital costs. There are 77 fire stations within the County and a 2017 population of 499,348. The need for new stations may be limited given the small area expansion of the UGA, however, stations may need to expand or increase employees to meet demand. Note: Table CF-13 is speculative and based on population without regarding to specific location of anticipated growth.

Table CF-13: Potential Countywide Fire Station Demand in 2037

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 Population</th>
<th>Current Fire Stations</th>
<th>Population per Station</th>
<th>2037 Population Projection</th>
<th>Fire Station Demand 2037</th>
<th>New fire stations needed by 2037</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>499,348</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6,485</td>
<td>583,409</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fire stations are the most significant capital expense associated with the provision of Fire and Emergency services. Based upon the two-proposed new urban fire stations documented within this section, we can estimate that construction of a new urban fire station will cost approximately $4.0 million. Staffing and equipment costs will add significantly to that number, underscoring the fact that station construction cost is only a fraction of the fiscal commitment to building and operating new facilities.
Table CF-14: Cost for New Metro UGA Fire Stations over the 20-Year Planning Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Metro UGA Pop Growth</th>
<th>Persons Served per Station</th>
<th>New Stations Needed by 2037</th>
<th>Costs per new Station in Millions</th>
<th>New Fire Station Expenses over Planning Period in Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52,184</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$36.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing fire stations serve approximately 6,120 persons each. The County’s Metro UGA population is expected to grow by an estimated 52,184 persons between the year 2017 and 2037. If all new development in the UGA resembles what is now built, and if that ratio of one station for every 6,120 persons is maintained, then nine new stations will be needed to serve the UGA’s forecast population growth.

This estimate assumes that all growth will occur in largely undeveloped areas and will necessitate new fire station construction. If new growth occurs predominately as infill development, fire districts may be able to remodel and expand existing stations, likely resulting in a significant reduction in capital expenditures needed to meet the projected population demand of 2037.

**Proposed Facility Improvements**

Fire and emergency services are funded by property tax assessments whether they are provided by municipal purveyors or fire districts. Capital improvements can be paid for by saving for the project or borrowing (bonding) using expected future tax revenue as collateral. When a large project that exceeds standard revenue is proposed, a voter approved levy (additional property taxes) can serve as the repayment source for a construction bond. 911 services are funded by taxes on telephone lines and communication services.

**Fire Protection Services**

The Washington Survey and Rating Bureau establish a class of fire protection for an area, which is the basis for the insurance ratings charged by the insurance industry. Ratings within each fire district may vary, based on the extent of urbanized development, level of professional staffing, type and location of fire suppression apparatus, and many other factors. While a global LOS based on fire rating may make sense within a municipality, it may not be suitable for application in a countywide context.
# Inventory of Existing Facilities and Apparatus – Fire Protection

Eleven fire districts serve Spokane County, at the station sites as shown in the table below.

**Table CF-15: Existing Fire Stations Serving the UGA by District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District/Facility Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spokane Valley Fire District</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 1 – University</td>
<td>10319 E. Sprague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 2 – Millwood</td>
<td>9111 E. Frederick Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 3 – Liberty Lake</td>
<td>2218 N. Harvard Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 4 – Otis Orchards</td>
<td>22406 E. Wellesley Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 5 – Sullivan</td>
<td>15510 E. Marietta Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 6 – Edgecliff</td>
<td>6306 E. Sprague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 7 – Evergreen</td>
<td>1121 S. Evergreen Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 8 – Pinecroft</td>
<td>2110 N. Wilbur Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 9 – South Valley</td>
<td>12121 E. 32nd Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 10 – Greenacres</td>
<td>17217 E. Sprague Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 21</td>
<td>17815 E. Thruax Rd., Fairfield, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 22</td>
<td>202 N. Railroad Ave., Fairfield, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 23</td>
<td>Arnold Rd. &amp; Valley Chapel Rd, Mt. Hope, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 31 – Cheney</td>
<td>10 S. Presley Drive, Cheney, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 32 – Medical Lake</td>
<td>13906 S. Medical Lake Tyler Rd, Cheney, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 33 – Four Lakes</td>
<td>12611 W. Melville Rd. Cheney, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 34 – Marshall</td>
<td>7616 S. Grove Rd., Spokane, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 35 – Paradise</td>
<td>1801 W. Gibbs Rd., Spokane, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 36 – Spangle</td>
<td>235 W. Second Street, Spangle, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 37 – Aspen Meadows</td>
<td>19012 S. Short Rd., Spangle, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 39 – Chapman Lake</td>
<td>8811 W. Cheney Plaza Rd., Cheney, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 310 – Amber/Williams Lake</td>
<td>20606 S. Williams Lake Rd., Cheney, WA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station 312 – Tyler</th>
<th>26801 W. SR904, Cheney, WA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 40</td>
<td>27515 N. Elk-Chattaroy R., Chattaroy, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 41</td>
<td>315 E. A. St., Deer Park, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 42</td>
<td>3219 E. Chattaroy Rd., Chattaroy, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 43</td>
<td>40116 N. Elk Camden Rd., Elk, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 44</td>
<td>17207 N. Newport Hwy., Mead, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 45</td>
<td>3929 W. Wild Rd. Deer Park, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 46</td>
<td>3818 E. Deer Park Milan Rd., Chattaroy, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 47</td>
<td>9815 E. Greenbluff Rd., Colbert, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 48</td>
<td>17711 N. Mt. Spokane Park Drive, Mead, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 49</td>
<td>302 W. Monroe Rd., Colbert, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 51</td>
<td>17217 W. Four Mound Rd., Nine Mile Falls, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 52</td>
<td>NE Corner of Charles Rd. &amp; Valley Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 81</td>
<td>6117 S. Palouse Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 82</td>
<td>12100 E. Palouse Highway, Valleyford, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 84</td>
<td>4410 S. Bates, Spokane Valley, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 85</td>
<td>3324 S. Linke Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 91</td>
<td>616 W. Hastings Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 92</td>
<td>3801 E. Farwell Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 93</td>
<td>9915 W. Charles Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 94</td>
<td>7017 N. Jensen Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 95</td>
<td>3028 W. Strong Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 96</td>
<td>11019 N. Forker Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 97</td>
<td>15222 N. Charles Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 98</td>
<td>6606 N. Regal St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station 10-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station 10-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station 10-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station 10-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station 10-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Six-Year Financing Plan – Fire Protection**

Spokane County’s fire districts are junior taxing districts, receiving a portion of property taxes paid within their jurisdictions. Their budgets are based on anticipated revenues, and they program capital expenditures based on historic trends and future forecasts. Those fire districts serving areas adjacent to the City of Spokane tend to lose jurisdiction and revenue from areas as they annex to the City, but they also have in place agreements to alleviate negative impacts to their fiscal planning. In some cases, the City of Spokane is obligated to compensate fire districts for land the City annexes for a period of time to offset expected reductions in revenue.

The structure of district financing and the agreements some districts have with the City of Spokane provide some predictability of revenues. Each district manages its own capital budget, and, based on the assurance of revenue for each, there is little need for the County to contribute toward district capital.
Map CFU - 7 West Plains Fire Districts Nearest Station
Law Enforcement and Justice

Law and justice related activities are one of the primary functions of Spokane County. The County provides law enforcement services such as patrol and criminal investigative through the Sheriff’s Department. Courts for both criminal prosecution and civil disputes are maintained. Court related functions such as prosecution, public defenders, and court record keeping are also provided. The County also operates short-term detention facilities for both adults and juveniles.

The County Campus is headquarters to both the County Sheriff and the City of Spokane’s Police Department, both of which are housed in the Public Safety Building. The Spokane County Sheriff’s Office provides law enforcement services to the unincorporated areas of the County and contract law enforcement services to the towns of Fairfield, Latah, Millwood, Rockford, Spangle, and Waverly. They also provide contract law enforcement personnel to the cities of Deer Park, Medical Lake, and Spokane Valley, where deputies serve as the municipal police force.

The campus is also home to the courts of the County. These include the City of Spokane’s Municipal Courts, County District Court, Superior Court, as well as the Juvenile Justice Court.

The County also operates detention facilities which serve all the jurisdictions within the County. The County jail and juvenile detention facilities are located on the downtown County Campus. The County also makes use of an off-campus detention facility known as Geiger Corrections, which is located near Spokane International Airport.

Inventory of Existing Facilities

The current inventory of law and justice facilities includes both on and off-campus structures and can be viewed in Table CF-16. On campus, the Sheriff and Spokane Police Department both have administration and operations offices in the Public Safety Building. The County Jail, Sheriff’s Property Room and Garage are also found on the County campus. Also housed on campus are the courts of the County, the Juvenile Detention Building and office spaces for justice system related employees including, prosecuting attorneys, defense attorneys, court clerks, court staffers, juvenile services and related support personnel. Geiger Corrections Facility is located near Spokane International Airport, on land leased from the Spokane Airport Board.

The Sheriff’s Department also operates 19 SCOPE stations throughout the County. SCOPE stands for Spokane Community Oriented Policing Effort. The majority of these stations are located in leased or shared facilities, but several stations are owned by the County.
# CF-16: Inventory of Existing Facilities – Law Enforcement & Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (square feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration/ Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Building</td>
<td>1100 W. Mallon</td>
<td>218,303 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Garage</td>
<td>1107 W. Gardner</td>
<td>6,852 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Court Services</td>
<td>902 N. Adams St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Property Room</td>
<td>1327 W. Gardner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Emergency Services</td>
<td>1121 W. Gardner</td>
<td>26,858 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Jail</td>
<td>1100 W. Mallon</td>
<td>690 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geiger Corrections Facility (leased)</td>
<td>Airport Business Park- 3507 S. Spotted Road</td>
<td>622 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Detention Center</td>
<td>902 N. Adams</td>
<td>39 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Municipal Courts</td>
<td>Court House Annex</td>
<td>4 courtrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Courts</td>
<td>Public Safety Building</td>
<td>6 courtrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1100 W. Mallon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway Center Building</td>
<td>2 courtrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Courts</td>
<td>1116 W. Broadway Avenue</td>
<td>12 courtrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Courts</td>
<td>1208 W. Mallon Avenue</td>
<td>3 courtrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheriff Community Oriented Policing Efforts (S.C.O.P.E.) Stations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Owned/Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>115 N. Evergreen</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>316 E. Crawford</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>4904 N. Harvard Road #1</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgecliff</td>
<td>522 S. Theirman Road</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk</td>
<td>40116 N. Elk-Camden Road</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWU/Cheney</td>
<td>612 3rd Avenue</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairchild AFB</td>
<td>110 W. Arnold St.</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake</td>
<td>23127 E. Mission Ave</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>124 Lefevre St.</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounted Patrol</td>
<td>13210 E. Peone Valley Ln.</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>9507 N. Division Ste. E</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.O.P.E. Main</td>
<td>12710 E. Sprague</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>4827 S. Palouse Hwy</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast SC</td>
<td>No physical address available at this time</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill</td>
<td>8717 N. Brooks Road</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trentwood</td>
<td>2400 N Wilber #79</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>10621 E. 15th, Spokane valley</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Mall</td>
<td>14700 E. Indiana Ave.</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>3102 N. Argonne</td>
<td>Leased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Detention Facilities**

The County operates three facilities that serve the short-term detention needs of the Spokane County, its cities, State Patrol, Fairchild AFB, the police departments of three universities, US Marshals and other federal agencies. Adults are housed at the County Jail, at the County Campus and at the Geiger Corrections Facility. Youths are housed at the Juvenile Detention Center.

The Geiger Correction Facility is located in a World War II vintage army barracks that has been converted for detention use and is presently used as an overflow facility for the County Jail. The Geiger Correction Facility presently houses approximately 200 detainees but has the capacity for up to 622.
Table CF-17: Detention Beds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Jail</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geiger</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Detention</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Beds</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,351</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forecast of Future Needs

*Existing Law Enforcement Demand and Forecast Need*

Current facility space for the Spokane Sheriff’s Department is at capacity today. There are no additional facilities in the area near the Public Safety building that could serve for expansion.

The Spokane Sheriff’s Department has an authorized strength of 236 commissioned officers, although vacancies, attrition, and budget constraints cause actual staffing to fall below authorized numbers. The Sheriff also has 66 full-time civilians, 2 temporary or project employees, and 364 volunteers. All but a few of the 668 Sheriff’s employees work out of the combined core facility space.

Table CF-18: Level of Service – Needed Law Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Demand Population</th>
<th>Officers per 1,000 residents (LOS)</th>
<th>Number of officers needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>408,338</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>474,746</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Detention Level of Service (LOS)*

Per resolution Settlement Agreement, BCC Resolution 2016-0464 (6.3) there is no existing LOS for detention centers. Within one year following the completion of the requirements of the MacArthur Foundation grant awarded in April 2016 or by December 31, 2020, whichever is sooner, the County will develop a capital facilities element for detention/rehabilitation services. This will include using smart justice proposals to reduce the number of inmates housed in detention centers.

*Proposed Detention Services Project*

The County is proposing to replace the Geiger facility and add capacity to serve an anticipated future need for more detention beds. The proposal calls for expanding detention capacity by building a new, detention facility, and a community resource facility on the County Campus, just north of the existing jail.
The County has completed three Essential Public Facility Siting Processes in an effort to find a suitable location for a new detention facility. The most recent considered ten off-campus sites for a new, single level facility that would have an initial configuration of 624 beds, of which, 512 would be for general population and 112 would be for mental health.

As part of the proposed project, the existing jail, located at the County Campus, will be remodeled back to 462 beds to facilitate better management of detainees with direct supervision. A new 56,000 square foot, 128 bed addition would be constructed next to the jail and house central intake and release, pre-arrainment and pre-classification housing for inmates. Also, part of the project will be a new 192 bed Community Corrections Center, which would be a non-secure facility that offers program-based, community-oriented alternatives to standard detention. No changes have been proposed for the Juvenile Detention facilities. Table CF-19 provides a bed total for the proposed project.

Table CF-19: Bed Count with Proposed Detention Services Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jail (remodeled)</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Off Campus Detention Facility (general population beds)</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Off Campus Detention Facility (mental health beds)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Community Corrections Facility</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Central Intake and Release Facility</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Detention Facility</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Beds</strong></td>
<td>1,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six-Year Financial Plan

The county plans to spend around $8.6 million on capital needs through 2023. The generalized high-priority capital needs are listed below, with actual implementation year determined through the annual budgeting process.

- Vehicle replacement program will regularly replace patrol vehicles as they age out of service.
- Communications and emergency response systems, networks, and data management software/storage will be upgraded as appropriate.
- Criminal justice center facilities will be programmed into annual budget cycles to coincide with service needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Safety</th>
<th>6-Yr cost (in $1,000)</th>
<th>Fiscal Year (in $1,000)</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Facilities/expansion</td>
<td>$82,210</td>
<td>$16,275</td>
<td>$18,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel/upgrade</td>
<td>$4,292</td>
<td>$1,675</td>
<td>$393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$86,502</td>
<td>$17,950</td>
<td>$18,477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grants, Reet 1, Debt
Special Revenue, Reet 1
Map CFU – 11 Spokane County Law Dispatch Areas
Libraries

Library services in the County are provided by the Spokane County Library District (SCLD), a special purpose district governed by an appointed Board of Trustees and having taxing authority. The District serves the entire County, except for the cities of Liberty Lake and Spokane, which provide their own library services. The District provides an interconnected network of libraries that share books and materials working together to serve County residents.

Inventory of Existing Facilities

There are currently eleven libraries in the system, including two resource libraries, nine branch libraries, and support service offices totaling 105,550 square feet. Table CF-21 identifies the location and size of the District’s facilities. Map CFU – 12 illustrates the existing Library facilities in Spokane County.

Table CF-21: Existing Library Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Libraries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Spokane</td>
<td>44 East Hawthorne</td>
<td>18,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Valley</td>
<td>12004 East Main</td>
<td>22,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>41,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Branches</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights</td>
<td>1213 South Lundstrom</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argonne</td>
<td>4322 North Argonne</td>
<td>9,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookend (Spokane Valley Mall)</td>
<td>14700 E. Indiana Ave., Suite 2084</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>610 First</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>208 South Forest</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>305 East Main</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>321 East Herb</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran Prairie</td>
<td>6004 South Regal</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otis Orchards</td>
<td>22324 East Wellesley</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Support Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Area (sq ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration Offices</td>
<td>4322 North Argonne, Spokane</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other District Support</td>
<td>12004 East Main, Spokane Valley</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12,400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>54,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Forecast of Future Needs

### Existing Demand

Spokane County Library District serves approximately 274,000 persons. Spokane County Library system is made up of nine full-service libraries serving residents in Spokane County and the affiliated cities and towns of Cheney, Deer Park, Fairfield, Latah, Medical Lake, Millwood, Rockford, Spangle, Spokane Valley, Waverly, and Airway Heights. All libraries feature on-site technology including WI-FI, computer stations, printers, and commonly used software, as well as free use of meeting rooms. The Library District offers events and programs for all ages from story time to social security workshops and everything in between. The library system plays a crucial role in the social, economic, recreational, educational, and cultural health of the community.

### Level of Service (LOS)

The adopted County minimum Level of Service (LOS) for library service is 0.41 square feet per capita. Table # illustrates an estimate of the District’s current and future space needs. At present, the District needs to add 16,678 square feet of library space to meets its adopted LOS. Based upon the County’s adopted population projection, the District will need an additional 40,077 square feet of library space by 2037 to meet the adopted LOS.

In addition, their level of service standards are as follows:

### Table CF-22: Level of Service – Spokane Library District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square feet per capita</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Demand

The Library District has a small LOS deficiency in 2017. Based upon the County’s adopted population projections, the District will need an additional 40,077 square feet by 2037 to meet the 0.41 square foot per capita LOS. The district proposes to add 28,200 additional square feet of library space. Funding for these improvements is based upon voter supported of general obligation bonds whose revenue comes from property taxes. The County may want to revise the LOS considering changes to library services in the digital age.

Table CF-23: District Space Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>District Population</th>
<th>Square Feet Required @ 0.41 per Capita</th>
<th>Current Square Feet Available</th>
<th>Net Reserve/Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Estimate</td>
<td>273,729</td>
<td>122,228</td>
<td>105,550</td>
<td>(16,678)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Population Growth</td>
<td>57,073</td>
<td>23,399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. 2037 Population</td>
<td>330,802</td>
<td>145,627</td>
<td>105,550</td>
<td>(40,077)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The way people access information, music and books have changed significantly in the last ten years. Future population projections are subject to change, as well. It is recommended that the district review its capital plan approximately five years after its adoption and evaluate if its space needs and population projections are appropriate.

Proposed Facility Improvements

Proposed Capacity Projects

The District has developed a plan to serve their 2037 population estimate. In 2037 the library projected to be just slightly under the adopted LOS of .41 square feet per capita and will instead have a LOS of 0.39 square feet per capita. Table CF-24 details the District’s proposed capacity projects which include the addition of approximately 24,375 square feet library space.
### Table CF-24: Capacity Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2017 SF</th>
<th>Proposed 2037 SF</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argonne</td>
<td>9,650</td>
<td>11,525</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conklin Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>New Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran Prairie</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Spokane</td>
<td>18,850</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otis Orchards</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Valley</td>
<td>22,950</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin/ Support</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>105,550</td>
<td>129,925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Capital Improvement Projects**

Property taxes are the District’s chief source of operational funding. They are sufficient to cover basic operations and small improvement projects. To fund the projects outlined in their capital plan, the District is relying upon voter approved general obligation bonds to fund the expansion of the library system.

**Six-Year Financial Plan**

The Spokane County Library District is currently updating its Capital Improvement Plan to be adopted in 2019.
Parks, Recreation, Golf and Open Space

Spokane County maintains a system of parks designed to meet the needs of County residents. The County is one of several providers of public park space. Others include the cities, the state, and the federal government. Each provider has a slightly different mission to fulfill and different funding mechanisms.

The majority of County parks are located outside of cities and the Urban Growth Area (UGA) and fall into the categories of either Open Space or Regional Parks. These two categories account for approximately 86% of the County park acreage, and typically attract regional users. The County also maintains and operates Community Parks and Special Use Parks.

County parks are divided into four major categories: Community Parks, Regional Parks, Open Space Lands, and Special Use Facilities. The tables below show the acreage for each park category. Developed acres of a park land include playgrounds, sports fields, picnicking areas, and land that has been enhanced or altered by humans. Undeveloped acres are areas that are allowed to remain in their natural state. See Map CFU - 13 for Spokane County Parks and Open Space.

Park Inventory and Descriptions

Community Parks

A Community Park’s focus is on meeting the recreational needs of several neighborhoods or large sections of the community. They are typically suited for intense recreation facilities such as athletic sports fields, sport courts, formal children’s play equipment, and swimming pools. Spokane County maintains and operates 15 Community Parks consisting of approximately 233.35 acres.
### Table CF-25: Community Parks Serving the UGA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Undeveloped Acres</th>
<th>Developed Acres</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bidwell</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>19.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camelot</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Caro</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenden</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmberg</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwoods</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Ave</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine River</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>17.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shields</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>93.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>122.20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table CF-26: Rural Community Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Undeveloped Acres</th>
<th>Developed Acres</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colbert</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sontag*</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valleyford**</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>101.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>111.15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Leased from Washington State Parks

** Owned by Freeman School District and operated as a County Parks through an agreement.
**Regional Parks**

A Regional Park is a recreational area that serves the entire County population. They are generally located where unique environmental features exist and the land for acquisition has been available. These parks are intended to meet a wide range of activities and interests with emphasis on the features that make it unique. Regional Parks are areas with natural and/or man-made qualities for outdoor recreation, such as picnicking, boating or fishing access, swimming, camping, environmental education and trail uses. The County’s five Regional Parks total over 3,000 acres of land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Undeveloped Acres</th>
<th>Developed Acres</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Lake*</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>166.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Lake**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>55.52</td>
<td>67.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway***</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake</td>
<td>2,672.50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>2,722.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plante’s Ferry</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,820.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>280.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,101.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes 35 acres of surface water noted as developed.

** Includes 45.3 acres of surface water noted as developed.

***Includes portion of park leased from WSDOT

**Open Space Lands**

Open Space Lands are composed of two subcategories, Conservation Areas and Natural Areas. The main difference between the two is the funding source for their acquisition. The separate categories are used to account for those expenditures. Those lands in the Conservation Lands category were purchased or acquired with Conservation Futures funds. Those lands in the Natural Area category were acquired using other funding mechanisms.

Conservation Futures is a land preservation program funded by a special, voter supported, property tax levy. It is intended to protect and preserve lands with significant recreational, social, scenic, ecological, or
aesthetic value. The County currently has 25 Open Space areas, consisting of over 9,000 acres. These lands are primarily left in their natural condition and used for passive recreational purposes.

Table CF-29: Open Space Lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Areas</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Conservation Areas</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dishman Hills*</td>
<td>534.0</td>
<td>Antoine Peak</td>
<td>1,075.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggin</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Cedar Grove</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freddie’s</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Dishman Hills C.A. (Glenrose)</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Spokane River</td>
<td>811.0</td>
<td>Dishman Hills C.A.-Iller Creek</td>
<td>966.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>Feryn Ranch</td>
<td>164.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow Park</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman Lake</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>Hauser</td>
<td>170.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Lake</td>
<td>131.0</td>
<td>Haynes</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td>1,689.1</td>
<td>Holmberg</td>
<td>103.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Dishman Hills Natural Area is composed of 220.95 acres owned by the Dishman Hills Natural Area Association, 251.07 acres owned by Spokane County and 70.50 acres owned by Washington State Department of Natural Resources

| **Total Conservation Acres**          | 7,675  |
| **Total Natural acres**               | 1,689.1|
| **Total Open Space acres**            | 9,185.8|
**Special Use Facilities**

This category is characterized by unique, often single use recreational opportunities enjoyed by many in the Inland Northwest. The County’s special use facilities include three golf courses, two off-road vehicle parks and a motor sports racing complex and one regional trail.

**Table CF-30: Special Use Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Golf Course</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangman Valley</td>
<td>172.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake</td>
<td>123.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeadowWood</td>
<td>146.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORV/Motorsports</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights ORV</td>
<td>183.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake ORV</td>
<td>327.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raceway</td>
<td>244.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Trail</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td>1,213.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Forecast of Future Park Needs**

*Level of Service (LOS) and Need*

The County’s adopted level of service for parks is 1.4 acres of Community Park land for every 1,000 persons within the County’s Unincorporated Urban Growth Area where concentration of 7,000 or more residents are not located within three miles (using the existing road/street system) of an existing improved or unimproved County, municipal, or other public park that provides or is planned to provide amenities similar to a community park (e.g. irrigated turf, play fields)
Table CF-31: LOS Analysis for Community Parks through 2037

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UGA Unincorporated Population</th>
<th>Acres Required @ .00140 per Capita with 7,000 or more residents are not located within 3 miles of existing park</th>
<th>Park Acres</th>
<th>Net Reserve/Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>53,893</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>98.08</td>
<td>88.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Expected by 2037</td>
<td>14,224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037 Estimate</td>
<td>68,117</td>
<td></td>
<td>98.08</td>
<td>68.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOS Analysis completed in 2018 found that there was an area of the UGA that had the greatest need. This area is the rapidly growing West Plans/Thorpe Urban Growth Area this area currently has underserved residents that do not have access to a public community park, nor is an HOA-type park facility available. Based on the adopted population, the year 2037, the County will have a net reserve of 34.46 acres of Community Park Land to meet its established LOS. See Maps CFU – 14 to CFU – 33 for LOS analysis of each UGA.

Community Parks are currently meeting the adopted LOS of 1.4 acres per 1,000 persons in the UGA. Funding for future projects will rely on a variety of sources including those listed in Table CF-32.

**Proposed Facility Improvements**

Parks capital projects are funded through a variety of sources. The following tables provide a detailed capital projects and financing plan for Parks and Recreation through the year 2023. Table CF-32 covers improvements and acquisitions for Regional, Community and Special Use Park improvements. Table CF-33 provides a summary of project costs and revenues for all Parks capital improvements through the six-year capital improvement program for 2018 through 2023.
**Table CF-32: Capital Projects and Financing Summary of Costs/Revenues (in $1,000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Futures Programs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Funds</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Excise Tax 1</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>5,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Excise Tax 2</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>10,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Futures Tax</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Grants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>3,529</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>4,062</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>17,913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table CF-33: Capital Projects and Financing Parks and Recreation (in $1,000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 – Yr. Cost</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Facilities/Expansion</td>
<td>$18,788</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
<td>$8,538</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$900 Special Revenue, grants, REET 1, REET 2, debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel/Upgrade</td>
<td>$2,375</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$100 Reet 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,163</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,555</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,108</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map CFU - 13 Spokane County Parks and Open Space
Airway Heights Urban Growth Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service in UGA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres per Projected Residents</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**
Monitor LOS

**Summary**
UGA residents are currently being served by Airway Heights community parks. Current population doesn’t warrant a County community park at this time.

- **Areas of High Need**
  - Unincorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of at least 110 persons per acre in the Access to Community Parks within 3 miles.

- **Community Park Service Areas**
  - 0 - 1 Mile
  - 1 - 3 Miles

- **Community Parks**
  - City Owned
  - County Owned
  - (Undeveloped)

- **Urban Growth Area Boundary**
Map CFU – 15 Alcott Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Alcott Urban Growth Area

Population 2,593
Developed Park Acres 0
Total Park Acres 0
Level of Service in UGA Acres per Thousand Persons 0
Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal 0.41

Recommen dation
Monitor LOS

Summary
UGA residents are currently being served by City of Spokane community parks. Current population is scattered and rural in nature. May not support a County community park at this time.

Areas of High Need
Regions within the Spokane County Unincorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of 2,500+ persons per square mile or access to community parks within 3 miles.
Map CFU – 16 Cheney Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Cheney Urban Growth Area

Population Estimate: 22

Developed Park Acres: 0

Total Park Acres: 0

Level of Service in UGA: 0

Areas of High Need: Areas within the Spokane County

Summary

UGA residents are currently being served by City of Cheney community parks. Current population does not warrant a County community park at this time.
Map CFU - 17 Deer Park Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Deer Park Urban Growth Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population 2016 Estimate</th>
<th>129</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service in UGA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres per thousand persons</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation
MONITOR LOS

Summary
UGA residents are currently being served by City of Deer Park community parks. Current zoning (Rural Traditional) and population do not warrant a County community park at this time.

Areas of High Need
Regions within the Spokane County unincorporated urban growth area with preparation density of at least 10 persons per acre and no access to Community parks within 3 miles.
Map CFU -18 Fairfield Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

**Fairfield Urban Growth Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population 2016 Estimate</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service in UGA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres per thousand persons</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**

Monitor LOS

**Summary**

UGA residents are being well-served by the Town of Fairfield’s community parks. Current population doesn’t warrant a County community park at this time.

- **Urban Growth Area Boundary**
- **Community Park Service Areas**
  - 0 - 1 Mile
  - 1 - 3 Miles

**Areas of High Need**

Regions within the Spokane County Unincorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of at least 10 persons per acre and no access to Community Parks within 3 miles.
Map CFU - 19 Hillyard Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Hillyard Urban Growth Area

| Population | 2016 Estimate | 39 |
| Total Park Acres | 0 |
| Level of Service in UGA | 0 |
| Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal | 0.05 |

Recommenation
Monitor LOS

Summary
UGA residents are currently being served by City of Spokane community parks. Current population doesn't warrant a County community park at this time.

Areas of High Need
Regions within the Spokane County unincorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of at least 10 persons per acre and less than 0.02 mile access to community parks within 3 miles.

Urban Growth Area Boundary
Community Park Service Areas
0 - 1 Mile
1 - 3 Miles
City Owned
County Owned
(Developed)
(Undeveloped)
Map CFU-20 Indian Canyon Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Indian Canyon Urban Growth Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Estimate</th>
<th>51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service in UGA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres per Thousand Persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation
Monitor LOS

Summary
UGA residents are currently being served by City of Spokane community parks. Current population doesn’t warrant a County community park at this time.

Areas of High Need
Regions within the Spokane County Unincorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of at least 10 persons per acre and no access to community parks within 1 mile.
Map CFU -21 Latah Canyon Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Latah Urban Growth Area

**Population**
- 2016 Estimate: 0
- Developed Park Acres: 0
- Total Park Acres: 0
- Level of Service in UGA: Areas per thousand residents: 0
- Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal: 0

**Recommendation**
Monitor LOS

**Summary**
UGA residents are being well-served by the Town of Latah's community parks. Current population doesn’t warrant a County community park at this time.

**Legend**
- Community Parks
- County Owned
  - City Operated
  - County Operated
- Developed Acres:
  - Unincorporated
  - Within 3 Miles
- Community Park Service Areas
  - 0 - 1 Mile
  - 1 - 3 Miles
- Areas of High Need
  - Regions within the Spokane County Unincorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of at least 10 persons per acre and no access to Community Parks within 3 miles.
Map CFU - 22 Medical Lake Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Medical Lake Urban Growth Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population 2016 Estimate</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service in UGA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres per Thousand Persons</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommenation
Monitor LOS

Summary
UGA residents are being served by the City of Medical Lake’s community parks. Current population doesn’t warrant a County community park at this time.

Legend
- City of Medical Lake
- Community Park Service Area
- Area of High Need
  - Regions within the Spokane County Unincorporated Urban Growth Area with a population density of at least 10 persons per acre and no access to Community Parks within 0.1 miles.
Map CFU -23 Moran/Glenrose Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Moran/Glenrose Urban Growth Area

| Population | 7887 |
| Developed Park Acres | 17.69 |
| Total Park Acres | 17.69 |
| Level of Service in UGA | 2.24 |
| Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal | 0 |

Recommendation
Develop ten acres of Prairie View Park to meet current and future need. Softball fields should also be developed onsite to satisfy that specific need.

Summary
UGA residents are being served by Prairie View County Park, but currently underserved by developed community park acreage. The western portion of the UGA is heavily developed and steep slopes limit community park.
Map CFU - 24 North Metro Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

North Metro Urban Growth Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>28174</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Acres</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service in UGA</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**
Bidwell Park’s remaining 1.5 acres should be developed to satisfy the need for community parkland in the north portion of the UGA.

**Summary**
UGA residents in general are well-served based on proximity to a park. There is some need for developed park acreage. A large area between Hawthorne Rd and Farwell is the site of a closed Kaiser Aluminum Plant.

Urban Growth Area Boundary
Community Park Service Areas

Areas of High Need
Regions within the Spokane County Incorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of at least 16 persons per acre and no access to Community Parks within 3 miles.
Map CFU - 26 Rockford Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Rockford Urban Growth Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population: 2016 Estimate</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service in UGA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres per Thousand Persons</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**
Monitor LOS

**Summary**
UGA residents are being well-served by the Town of Rockford's community parks. Current population doesn't warrant a County community park at this time.

Legend:
- City Owned Community Parks
- County Owned Community Parks
- Community Park Service Areas
- 0 - 1 Mile
- 1 - 3 Miles
- Areas of High Need

Legend:
- Incorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of at least 10 people per acre and no access to Community Parks within 3 miles.

North St
Spring St
Willow St
Washington Ave
Campbell Rd
Maple St
Rockford Urban Growth Area
Lee St
Spring St
Emma St
Spring St
Lake St
A St
D St
D St
278
0.5 Miles

Capital Facilities Plan
12/17/21
122
Map CFU - 27 Seven Mile Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Seven Mile Urban Growth Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>90x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service in UGA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Parks
- County Owned (Undeveloped)
- County Owned (Developed)
- City Owned

Urban Growth Area Boundary
- Community Park Service Areas
  - 0 - 1 Mile
  - 1 - 3 Miles

Recommendation
Monitor LOS. As population grows, collaborate with City of Spokane Parks Department to better serve this UGA.

Summary
UGA residents are currently being served by City of Spokane community parks. Current population doesn’t warrant a County community park at this time.
Map CFU - 28 Shawnee Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Shawnee Urban Growth Area

Population
2016 Estimate: 34

Developed Park Acres: 0

Total Park Acres: 0

Level of Service in UGA
Acres per Thousand Residents: 0

Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal: 0.05

Community Parks
- City Owned
- County Owned (Undeveloped)

Urban Growth Area Boundary

Community Park Service Areas
- 0 - 1 Mile
- 1 - 3 Miles

Recommendation
Monitor LOS

Summary
UGA residents are currently being served by City of Spokane community parks. Current population does not warrant a County community park at this time.

Areas of High Need
Region within the Spokane County Unincorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of at least 10 persons per acre and no access to community parks within 3 miles.
Map CFU - 29 Spangle Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Summary
IGA residents are being well-served by the Town of Spangle's community parks. Current population doesn’t warrant a County community park at this time.

Recom mendation
Monitor LOS

Areas of High Need
Regions within the Spokane County Unincorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of at least 16 persons per acre and no access to Community Park within 3 miles.
Map CFU - 30 Upriver Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

**Upriver Urban Growth Area**

| Population | 1552 |
| Developed Park Acres | 0 |
| Total Park Acres | 13 |
| Level of Service in UGA | 8.38 |
| Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal | 2.17 |

**Recommendation**
Monitor LOS. As population grows, collaborate with City of Spokane Parks Department to better serve this UGA.

**Summary**
Upriver UGA residents are being served by John C. Shields Park as well as neighboring City of Spokane parks. Current LOS is 9.2 acres per 1,000 residents, making it among the more well-served UGAs.

[Map of Upriver Urban Growth Area]
Map CFU - 31 Waverly Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Waverly Urban Growth Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service in UGA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres per Thousand Persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation
Monitor LOS

Summary
UGA residents are being well-served by the Town of Waverly’s community parks. Current population doesn’t warrant a County community park at this time.

Areas of High Need
Regions within the Lodi County Unincorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of at least 100 persons per mile and no access to Community Parks within 3 miles.
**West Plains/Thorpe Urban Growth Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>3658</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service in UGA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Acres Needed to Meet LOS Goal</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**

Acquire a minimum ten acre community park site near the Areas of High Need and develop a minimum of five acres as community parkland. Develop remaining property as population growth warrants.

**Summary**

The area of greatest need discovered by the analysis, UGA residents in this rapidly growing area are currently underserved by public community parks nor is there a HOA-type park facility available to those residents.

**Urban Growth Area Boundary**

- City Owned
- County Owned (Undeveloped)
- County Owned (Developed)

**Community Park Service Area**

- 0 - 1 mile
- 1 - 3 miles

**Areas of High Need**

Regions within the Spokane County Unincorporated Urban Growth Area with population density of at least 10 persons per acre and no access to community parks within 3 miles.
Map CFU -33 Valley Urban Growth Area Parks LOS Analysis

Valley Urban Growth Area

Recommendation
Monitor LOS as population grows and work with the City of Spokane Valley to help meet future need.

Summary
UGA residents as a whole are being served by City of Spokane, Town of Millwood, and City of Spokane Valley parks. Current level of service within the UGA 3.1 acres per 1,000 residents, more than double the LOS goal.
Sanitary Sewer

Service Area

Spokane County owns and operates a sanitary sewer (i.e. wastewater) utility which includes a system of pipes, interceptors, pump stations and sewage treatment plants (i.e. water reclamation facilities). The County bills users for sewer capital costs and sewer service and operates the sewer utility as an enterprise fund. Major capital projects have been funded with general obligation bonds, revenue bonds, grants, loans, and user rate revenue. In addition to unincorporated portions of the County within the Urban Growth Boundary in the Spokane Valley and North Spokane, the County’s service area includes a majority of the City of Spokane Valley, as well as a small portion of the City of Liberty Lake. Some unincorporated areas adjacent to the City of Spokane are served by the City of Spokane, which also operates a sewer utility. The City of Millwood owns and operates their own sewer system and discharges the wastewater from that system to the County system for treatment and reuse.

Sewer service is a direct concurrency service, meaning that it must be available at the time of construction, or be part of a planned improvement scheduled to be built within six years. Generally, sewer service can only be extended within the Urban Growth Boundary.

The Board of County Commissioners amended sewer Level of Service (LOS) standards with BCC Resolution 2016-0554, and the County’s UGA environmental impact statement analyzed sanitary sewer system impact. Both of these influence analysis of the sanitary sewer system facilities and investments are discussed in this CFP.

Inventory of Existing Facilities

The Spokane County Wastewater Collection system is currently made up of 601.0 miles of gravity sewer mains, 12,943 manholes, 32-wastewater pump stations, 32.1 miles of pressure force mains, three flow monitoring stations, and a total of 18.1 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater treatment capacity at four treatment facilities.

The wastewater is generated from residences, businesses, and industries. It is conveyed by gravity through a series of larger and larger collection lines. In low lying areas, wastewater is collected and pumped via pump stations, to higher elevations where gravity sewer mains can once again convey the wastewater into larger pipes (interceptors) that then convey the flow to a water reclamation facility.

Sewage Collection System

The majority of the County’s sewer collection system (approximately 89%) is comprised of 8-inch, 10-inch, and 12-inch gravity sewer pipes. The service areas are divided into “sewer basins”. The boundaries of the various sewer basins are based on topography, major arterials, and other factors. Sewer mains in each basin collect flows from the individual service lines for businesses and residences and then convey those flows to larger and larger pipes until connecting with an interceptor, which then runs to a treatment facility. Table CF-33 provides a breakdown of the footage of gravity sewer mains and force mains by pipe diameter. Maps CFU-34 through 38 illustrate the County’s sewer service areas for each interceptor.
Table CF-33: Pipe Line Size and Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gravity Sewer Lines</th>
<th>Force Mains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pipe Size (dia)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Footage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8” Gravity</td>
<td>2,448,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10” Gravity</td>
<td>253,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12” Gravity</td>
<td>116,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15” Gravity</td>
<td>75,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18” Gravity</td>
<td>70,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21” Gravity</td>
<td>29,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24” Gravity</td>
<td>45,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27” Gravity</td>
<td>13,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30” Gravity</td>
<td>20,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36” Gravity</td>
<td>35,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42” Gravity</td>
<td>30,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48” Gravity</td>
<td>14,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54” Gravity</td>
<td>18,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Feet</strong></td>
<td>3,173,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Miles</strong></td>
<td>601.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interceptors**

Interceptor sewers are large-diameter, main line pipes that transport wastewater to the treatment facilities. The County has three major interceptors known as the Spokane Valley Interceptor (SVI), the North Valley Interceptor (NVI), and the North Spokane Interceptor (NSI). Each is designed to handle peak wastewater flows from its respective service area. Table # CF-34 provides capacity information on each of the interceptor lines based upon gallons per day (GPD).

The County’s sewer service area is depicted on maps presented in this section. There are two distinct service areas; the North Metro UGA and Spokane Valley. Noted on the maps in red are interceptor sewers. Areas that are currently served by the County’s sewer system are shown in green.
Table CF-34: Interceptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Valley</td>
<td>Rebecca Street and Fourth Avenue to Liberty Lake</td>
<td>South Spokane Valley</td>
<td>30,800,000 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Valley</td>
<td>Elizabeth Road and Utah Avenue to Sullivan Road and Indiana Avenue</td>
<td>North Spokane Valley</td>
<td>16,150,000 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Spokane</td>
<td>Rowan Avenue and Cannon Street to Hatch Road and State Highway 395</td>
<td>North Metro UGA</td>
<td>10,150,000 GPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pump Stations

The wastewater from large portions of the County’s service area must be pumped due to topography. The County owns and operates 14 major pump stations, each with capacities in excess of 250 gallons per minute (GPM). The largest of these are the SVI and the NVI pump stations, which have a current combined pumping capacity of about 10,000 GPM. These two large pump stations are able to redirect the flow from the SVI and NVI through force mains to the Spokane County Regional Water Reclamation Facility (SCRWRF).

Other large stations include the Marion Hay Pump Station and the Whitworth Pump Station, which have current capacities to pump 2,800 GPM. The Marion Hay Pump Station pumps all the flow from the North Spokane service area through the North Spokane Interceptor to the City of Spokane’s system.

All major pump stations have been designed to allow upgrades at specific flow thresholds, so that as the flows increase, the pumping equipment may be replaced or modified to provide additional capacity.

The County also owns and operates 18 smaller pump stations. These small stations have been installed to serve individual developments or localized areas that cannot be served by standard gravity flow pipe systems.

Table # CF-35 summarizes the 14 major pump stations in the County’s system, including the location of each station, its service area and current pumping capacity.
### Table CF-35: Major Pump Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Current Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVI Pump Station</td>
<td>S. 22, T. 25 N., R. 43 E</td>
<td>Spokane Valley Interceptor Flow</td>
<td>7,000 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVI Pump Station</td>
<td>S. 10, T. 25 N., R. 43 E</td>
<td>North Valley Interceptor Flow</td>
<td>2,850 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Hay</td>
<td>S. 18, T. 26 N., R. 43 E</td>
<td>Majority of North Spokane Service Area</td>
<td>2,800 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitworth</td>
<td>S. 18, T. 25 N., R. 44 E</td>
<td>Area N. of Hawthorne, excluding Fairwood Park PS Area</td>
<td>2,800 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartford</td>
<td>S. 5, T. 26 N., R. 43 E</td>
<td>Portion of North Spokane North of Hastings Road</td>
<td>2,100 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairwood Park</td>
<td>S. 7, T. 26 N., R. 43 E</td>
<td>Fairwood Development and Adjacent Areas</td>
<td>1,800 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Spokane</td>
<td>S. 6, T. 26 N., R. 43 E</td>
<td>Portion of Fairwood Development</td>
<td>360 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella Road</td>
<td>S. 18, T. 25 N., R. 44 E</td>
<td>E. of Park Rd., South of I-90, N. of Sprague Ave.</td>
<td>2,600 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverwalk</td>
<td>S. 8, T. 25 N., R. 45 E</td>
<td>E. of Baker Rd., N. of I-90, S. of Spokane River</td>
<td>320 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena Park</td>
<td>S. 6, T. 25 N., R. 44 E</td>
<td>Northwood, Upriver Drive &amp; Upriver Terrace</td>
<td>950 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>S. 12, T 26 N., R. 42 E</td>
<td>Riverwood, Green Hollow, S. ½ of Sec. 12</td>
<td>600 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maringo</td>
<td>S. 5, T. 25 N., R. 44 E</td>
<td>Pasadena Park Sewer Project Area</td>
<td>600 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltese</td>
<td>S. 19, T. 25N., R. 45 E</td>
<td>Turtle Creek South and Most of S30, T25N, R45E</td>
<td>280 GPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercler</td>
<td>S. 3, T. 25N., R. 44 E</td>
<td>North of Trent and East of Pines</td>
<td>2,400 GPM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Spokane County owns and operates 18 additional smaller pump stations (not listed above).
**Wastewater Treatment Facilities**

Spokane County owns 10 million gallons per day (MGD) of treatment capacity at the City of Spokane’s Riverside Park Water Reclamation Facility (RPWRF). The County also completed the construction of the Spokane County Regional Water Reclamation Facility (SCRWRF), which provides an additional 8 MGD of treatment capacity. The SCRWRF went into operation in December of 2011.

Based on 2017 billing data, the County used a daily average capacity of approximately 9.9 MGD of the 18 MGD of treatment capacity and served approximately 54,000 Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs), including residential, industrial and commercial uses. However, during the month of March 2017, the average daily flow in the 3 interceptors was 10.5 MGD. The analysis of reserve capacity in the interceptors and treatment facilities uses the higher, more conservative value of 10.5 MGD as a starting point.

The SCRWRF is located within the City Limits of the City of Spokane at the old Stockyards site east of Freya and south of Trent. The facility’s initial capacity is 8 million gallons per day (MGD) and it is designed to be expandable, in 4 MGD increments, up to a maximum capacity of 24 MGD. The facility was delivered under a design-build-operate contract in which a private contractor, CH2M/Jacobs, designed and built the facility and is also responsible for day-to-day operations for twenty years from the start of operations. The SCRWRF has been designed to provide capacity for approximately fifty years of growth through incremental expansion.

In addition, the County operates two small satellite facilities constructed for remote subdivisions. Table # CF-35 provides general information for each of the treatment facilities, including location, service area, and the average daily flow that can be treated.

### Table CF-35: Wastewater Treatment Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Gallons Per Day Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Park Water Reclamation Facility (City)</td>
<td>NE ¼ S03, T25, R42</td>
<td>Spokane County Sewer Service Area</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangman Valley Wastewater Treatment Plant</td>
<td>NE ¼ S28, T24, R43</td>
<td>Hangman Valley Subdivision</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peone Pines Treatment Plant</td>
<td>S35, T27, R43</td>
<td>Peone Pines Subdivision</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County Regional Water Reclamation Facility</td>
<td>NE ¼ S15, T25N, R43</td>
<td>Spokane Valley Service Area</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,116,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Needs

Demand and Capacity

Near Term Interceptor Sewer Capacity Analysis

Tables CF-36, CF-37 and CF-38 present a near term capacity analysis of Spokane County’s three major sewer inceptors. By the end of 2023, the North Spokane Interceptor is expected to have a reserve peak flow capacity of approximately 2.4 million gallons per day (MGD). The North Valley Interceptor shows a peak flow reserve of 7.6 MGD and the Spokane Valley Interceptor will have a peak flow reserve of 9.3 MGD.

(Notes: Peak flows for each interceptor were calculated using an estimate of 200 gpd average flow per ERU and a peaking factor of 3.25)

Table CF-36: Peak Flow Capacity Analysis North Spokane Interceptor (assuming 650 GPD per ERU peak)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>ERUs</th>
<th>GPD (peak) Required @ 650 per ERU</th>
<th>Current GPD Capacity</th>
<th>Net Reserve/Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Actual</td>
<td>10,708</td>
<td>6,825,000</td>
<td>10,150,000</td>
<td>3,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2023 Growth Estimate</td>
<td>1,491*</td>
<td>969,150</td>
<td>10,150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total as of 2022</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,199</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,794,150</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,150,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,355,850</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition to projected growth, the flow generated from the Mead-Mt. Spokane area in northern Spokane County is projected to increase by approximately 818 ERUs from existing development in the area over the next 6 years.

Table CF-37: Peak Flow Capacity Analysis North Valley Interceptor (assuming 650 GPD per ERU peak)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>ERUs</th>
<th>GPD (peak) Required @ 650 per ERU</th>
<th>Current GPD Capacity</th>
<th>Net Reserve/Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Actual</td>
<td>10,977</td>
<td>7,475,000</td>
<td>16,150,000</td>
<td>8,675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2023 Growth Estimate</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>1,062,100</td>
<td>16,150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total as of 2022</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,273</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,537,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,150,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,612,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table CF-38: Peak Flow Capacity Analysis Spokane Valley Interceptor (assuming 650 GPD per ERU peak)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>ERUs</th>
<th>GPD (peak) Required @ 650 per ERU</th>
<th>Current GPD Capacity</th>
<th>Net Reserve/Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Actual</td>
<td>32,261</td>
<td>19,825,000</td>
<td>30,800,000</td>
<td>10,975,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2023 Growth Estimate</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>1,689,350</td>
<td>30,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total as of 2022</td>
<td>32,756</td>
<td>21,514,350</td>
<td>30,800,000</td>
<td>9,285,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 20-Year Wastewater Treatment Capacity Analysis

*(Note that the following analysis assumes no further connections to the Latah Creek and Peone Pines Treatment Facilities as they are currently at or near buildout capacity. The analysis includes the NSI, NVI and SVI basins only.)*

In 2017, the County provided sewer service to approximately 53,946 Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs), including residential, commercial, and industrial users, resulting in 9.9 MGD average daily demand for wastewater treatment (Again, the more conservative 10.5 MGD is used as the existing flow in the following analysis).

Additionally, the estimated increase in commercial/industrial acreage is 1,287 acres.

With the above information, an estimate of wastewater treatment demand in the year 2037 can be made.

The estimated treatment demand in 2037 can be formulated as follows:

- Maximum Average daily flow in 2017 = 10.5 MGD (measured).
- Increase in population within the County Sewer Service areas by 2037 = 28,417
  - Assuming 2.5 capita per ERU: 28,417 / 2.5 = 11,367 ERUs
- Increase in Commercial acreage within the County Sewer Service Area by 2037 = 1,287
  - Assuming 1200 gallons per acre per day or 6 ERUs per acre: 1,287 * 6 = 7,722 ERUs
  - Assuming an average daily flow of 200 gpd per ERU: 19,089 * 200 = 3,817,800 gpd = 3.8 MGD
  - Projected average daily flow in 2037: 10.5 MGD + 3.8 MGD = 14.3 MGD
  - Treatment capacity of 18 MGD – 14.3 MGD = 3.7 MGD of reserve capacity

Detailed analysis of treatment capacity titled, “Spokane County Sewer Basin Capacity, 2017-2037” is available through Spokane County and incorporated by reference.
Level of Service (LOS)

The LOS for sewers requires that public sewer service be available for areas with densities greater than two equivalent residential units (ERUs) per acre.

Funding System Improvements and Expansion

The County’s sewer system is operated as an enterprise fund. Revenue comes from monthly service fees and from new connection charges. In new developments, the developers typically install the sewer lines that connect to the County’s collection system, at their own expense.

When improvements to the system are needed, various funding sources are used, depending on the nature of the improvement. General Facilities Charges and monthly Wastewater Treatment Plant Charges typically provide the direct funding or debt service for upgrades to reclamation facilities, major pump stations, and interceptor sewers. Sewer extensions are typically funded through the Sewer Construction Fund, which receives revenue through Special Connection Charges and Trunk Charges paid by connecting properties. Reconstruction and rehabilitation of existing system elements is paid from the Sewer Operations Fund using Sewer Service Fee revenues. Grants and low interest loan funding are sought for various projects, and general obligation or revenue bonding may be used for larger projects such as upgrades to the SCRWRF and RPWRF. Revenue bonding makes use of the collection system’s capacity to generate revenue through monthly service fees to repay bonds which are sold to finance the needed improvement.

Spokane County Environmental Services Six-Year Capital Improvement Program (2018-2023)

The County’s Six-Year Sewer Capital Improvement Program is divided into three areas. While this CFP focuses on the capital investments necessary to expand the sanitary sewer system, there will also be increases in operations and maintenance as the system expands to serve areas now without sewer.

During the last quarter of each calendar year, the Environmental Services Department updates the County’s Six-Year Sewer Construction Capital Improvement Program (the “CIP”). The CIP is presented to the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) at a public hearing, and the BoCC makes a determination regarding adoption of the CIP after consideration of public testimony. The CIP outlines the anticipated expenditures for the coming six-year period for the construction of new facilities, major replacements or repairs of existing facilities, and upgrades to water reclamation facilities and wastewater pumping stations. In addition, the CIP provides an overview of the financial structure for the County’s wastewater utility, and identifies the revenue source for each of the scheduled improvements.

Tables CF-39 through CF-41 depict the most recently developed Capital Improvement Plan of the wastewater utility. Each table addresses a different category of improvement. The Six-Year Sewer Construction Capital Improvement Program 2018-2023, dated December 2017 is available from Spokane County and is included by reference.

Wastewater Collection System Improvements

These improvements include sewer trunk extensions into those areas of the Urban Growth Area that currently do not have sewer service. It also includes the construction of segments of sewer in
coordination with road reconstruction projects, new pump stations and force mains, upgrades to existing pump stations, and reconstruction/rehabilitation of aging elements of the sewer system. Map CFU-39 illustrates the UGA’s existing unsewered areas, the basins into which they drain, and the interceptors that will eventually serve them.

**Upgrades to the City’s Riverside Park Water Reclamation Facility**

The County is responsible for paying a percentage share of the City of Spokane’s water reclamation facility upgrades to meet water quality standards because 10 million gallons per day of its capacity is reserved for County use.

**Water Reclamation Facilities Improvements**

This program addresses the County’s long-term wastewater treatment capacity needs. It includes the final payments for construction of the new water reclamation facility at the Stockyards, as well as the new SVI and NVI pump stations and force mains to the SCRWRF, and the river outfall for final effluent discharge. The program also includes the development of a constructed wetlands site (Saltese Flats) to provide for a future alternative to current discharge of effluent to the Spokane River.
### Table CF-39: Wastewater Collection System Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Expenditures in $1,000’s of Dollars by Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker Road Sewer Ext, Pkg 1* (Euclid to Garland)</td>
<td>Sewer Construction Fund Reserves (403)</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker Road Sewer Ext, Pkg 2* (Garland to Trent)</td>
<td>Sewer Construction Fund Reserves (403)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker Road Sewer Ext, Pkg 3* (Euclid to Buckeye)</td>
<td>Sewer Construction Fund Reserves (403)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Force Main (Phase II) (Marion Hay PS to City of Spokane)</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund (438)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Spokane Drive Sewer Extension** (Gravity Sewer and Force Mains)</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund (438)</td>
<td>$2,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead-Mt. Spokane Sewer Ext, Pkg 1** (Shady Slope Rd PS to Hunter’s Ridge)</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund (438)</td>
<td>$775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead-Mt. Spokane Sewer Ext, Pkg 2** (Meadow View Sub to Mt Spo Pk Dr PS)</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund (438)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Slope Rd. Pump Station**</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund (438)</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Spokane Park Drive Pump Station**</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund (438)</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 2 Trunk Extension to Market Street</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund (438)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interceptor Capacity Upgrade through North City of Spokane</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund (438)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairwood Pump Station Overflow Storage Facility</td>
<td>Sewer Operations Repair/Replace Fund (401)</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Line Restoration Program</td>
<td>Sewer Operations Repair/Replace Fund (401)</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station Upgrades Electrical, HVAC, Etc.</td>
<td>Sewer Operations Repair/Replace Fund (401)</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station Reliability Enhancements (VA Study Rec.)</td>
<td>Sewer Operations Repair/Replace Fund (401)</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals by Funding Source by Year (in 1,000's)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Construction Fund Reserve (403)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$265</td>
<td>$265</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Facilities Fund (438)</td>
<td>$4,765</td>
<td>$6,490</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>$2,210</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Operations Repair/Replace Fund (401)</td>
<td>$535</td>
<td>$585</td>
<td>$735</td>
<td>$835</td>
<td>$835</td>
<td>$835</td>
<td>$4,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS – Wastewater Collection System</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,370</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,340</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,565</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,045</strong></td>
<td><strong>$835</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,755</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: These Projects are anticipated to be constructed in conjunction with City of Spokane Valley (CSV) road surfacing projects. The cost of the sewer portions of each project will be funded by Spokane County and the cost of the road surfacing portion of each project will be funded by CSV.*
**Note: The Mead-Mt Spokane Area is considered a Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRD). The Growth Management Act established this designation to recognize and contain areas of existing urban development in rural areas. In the rural element of a comprehensive plan, Counties “may allow for limited areas of more intense rural development, including necessary public facilities and services to serve the limited areas” (RCW 3670A.070(5)(d)). Spokane County is now working on a sewer system project in this area to serve urban development.

Table CF-40: Riverside Park Water Reclamation Facility (RPWRF) Upgrades (in $1,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTPF* Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds / Loans</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>9,510</td>
<td>8,770</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,510</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,770</strong></td>
<td><strong>410</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,120</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*WTPF = Wastewater Treatment Plant Fund

Notes:

--The 2018-2023 upgrade cost estimates were based upon budgets provided by the City of Spokane, Wastewater Management in their draft “2018-2023 Citywide Capital Improvement Program” report.

--Costs and payments shown in year of expenditure by the City of Spokane. Payment by County to City typically occurs in the first half of the year following year of expenditure. City collates all pertinent data, submits a draft invoice, and then the County reviews and finalizes it for payment.

--The County anticipates various ways to fund all or a portion of these expenses, including:

(a) selling Limited Tax General Obligation (LGTO) Bonds; and/or

(b) arranging an internal loan such as from Capital Reserves.

--The timing of the above-listed financing options is not specified at this time.

--Funds to pay debt service for bonds sold and/or loans obtained to finance the RPWRF Upgrades will come from the Wastewater Treatment Plant Fund and the General Facilities Fund, with a component of monthly billings to every customer dedicated to repayment.
Table CF-41: Water Reclamation Facilities Improvements Program (in $1,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saltese Flats Wetlands – Phase I Restoration*</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltese Flats Interpretive Center to C. V. School Dist.</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltese Flats Wetlands – Trailhead &amp; Exhibit</td>
<td>General Facilities Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using natural water only.

**Long Term Funding for Wastewater Treatment**

Spokane County’s Environmental Services Department has historically operated on a “cost of service” rate-setting approach for its wastewater utility. At regular intervals (typically every three years), the department updates the comprehensive rate model that includes all projected revenues and all operational, capital, and administrative costs for a 20-year timeframe. The model provides a financial analysis for the ensuing 20-year period, and allows for the rapid assessment of various rate adjustment scenarios. The revenue streams for the model include income from the monthly payment of sewer service fees, monthly payment of sewer connection charges (capital charges) with interest, lump sum payments of sewer connection charges, Aquifer Protection Area fees, sewer connection permit and inspection charges, interest on fund balances, grants, and other miscellaneous income. The expenditures in the model include the operational costs for all facilities, debt service schedules, outlays for construction of new facilities and repairs/replacements of existing assets, administration and management, and all other costs associated with the wastewater utility.

The rate study report and model, dated January 2016, prepared by Financial Consulting Solutions Group, entitled Final Report for Wastewater Rate Study, is available through Spokane County.
Map CFU - 36 Spokane Valley Sewer Lines

This map was published by the Spokane County Department of Building and Development, and serves in general planning. Due to the Office of Quality Assurance and Certification, this map is complete with accuracy to the best of our knowledge.
Schools

Spokane County does not own or operate school facilities. The Countywide Planning Policies discuss school impact fees which could be imposed upon new residential development to help pay for the increase in demand for public educational facilities. The policy states that if Spokane County and the school districts wish to implement impact fees for schools, each school district must develop a GMA compliant capital facilities plan. In addition, the EIS the County prepared for the UGA amendment addressed school demand and the overall costs for new school construction.

Since capital facilities plans are not mandatory for special districts under GMA, Spokane County has no way of compelling a school district to prepare a plan unless they want a school impact fee. In general, school districts receive funds for new construction and improvements to existing facilities through voter-approved bonds. School district may also qualify for state matching funds for new construction and for the renovation of capital facilities based on formula that considers a number of factors, including the assessed valuation of the property within the particular school district. In addition, school districts have the authority to request one-year capital project levies and six-year renovation and modernization levies, with voter approval. Operating funds come from the state for “basic education.” Programs that are not funded by the state are funded through maintenance and operation levies.

Existing Districts

There are 18 school districts serving Spokane County. Map CFU-40 illustrates the location of the Spokane County School Districts. Maps CFU - 40 through CFU - 56 illustrate the School Districts in Spokane Valley, North Spokane, and South Spokane and the Elementary, Middle and High School facilities in each area.

Table CF-44: School Districts Serving Spokane County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>District #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Valley</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Service (LOS)

The Countywide Planning Policies indicate that school districts establish their own levels of service. The Comprehensive Plan states the County will coordinate with school districts to ensure that school sites and facilities meet the educational needs of County residents.

School districts measure their level of service (LOS) in several ways. They often use terms like enrollment and school capacity to measure themselves. Sometimes it is expressed in a student to teacher or student to classroom ratio. Another way is to assign a certain amount of square feet of educational building space per student. When counting students, it is common to use full time equivalents instead of actual student counts. Frequently, school children are assigned to a class of students, each of which has a different LOS standard. These categories are typically elementary, middle and high school.

Proposed Facility Improvements

Schools plan for facility improvements and funding mechanisms on their own based on the adopted LOS.
Map CFU - 42 South Spokane Elementary School Service Area
Map CFU - 43 South Spokane – Middle School Service Area
Map CFU – 47 North Spokane Middle School Service Area
Solid Waste

The Spokane County Regional Solid Waste System (SCRSWS) is administered by the Spokane County Environmental Services. Prior to February 2014, the Spokane Regional Solid Waste System (System) was administered through a department of the City of Spokane. Originally created by interlocal agreement between Spokane County and the City of Spokane on October 11, 1988, the System included the twelve other regional cities and towns, as well as Fairchild Air Force Base. The interlocal agreement between Spokane County and the City of Spokane, and the agreements with the regional cities, expired on November 16, 2014.

On February 11, 2014, Spokane County and City of Spokane entered into an interlocal agreement transferring ownership of the System transfer stations to Spokane County, with the City of Spokane retains ownership of the Waste to Energy (WTE) facility and Northside Landfill (NSLF). As part of the agreement, the County agreed to direct the waste delivered to the transfer stations to the WTE facility for seven years, beginning November 17, 2014. In August 2017, an amendment to the interlocal agreement extended this commitment to September 2022. The County also has interlocal agreements in place with Fairchild Air Force Base, Airway Heights, Deer Park, Fairfield, Latah, Medical Lake, Millwood, Rockford, Spangle, and Waverly. These eleven jurisdictions, along with unincorporated Spokane County, make up the SCRSWS. Spokane County is also responsible for overseeing closure and post closure activities at the Mica Landfill, Colbert Landfill, and Greenacres Landfill.

The County is responsible for administering the Regional Solid Waste System. This includes the oversight and implementation of the Comprehensive Solid Waste and Moderate Risk Waste Management Plan. The 2015 Plan update was prepared under the direction of the County. Guidance and recommendations were provided by representatives from regional cities and the County the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC), and the general public. Ecology provided additional guidance during the planning process.

Inventory of Existing Facilities and Services

The solid waste transfer program is designed to transfer waste materials to and from various facilities as a means of efficiently and cost effectively managing the large volume of wastes generated in the Spokane County Regional Solid Waste System.

North County Transfer Station

Colbert (North County) Transfer Station handles solid waste, recycling, HHW and yard waste. The facility is comprised of two scalehouses, three scales, a free recyclables drop-off area, a transfer building that serves public and commercial customers, an administration building, an HHW area, and a white goods area. The transfer building is an open, three-sided metal building structure with one full-grade separated hopper for loadout. The Colbert Transfer Station has 8,600 square feet of covered tipping floor area. Waste loads are spread and compacted by a fixed tamping crane installed on a pedestal at the center of the loadout hopper. The tamping craned is utilized to spread the waste during loadout and achieve legal load limits for transfer vehicles.
Valley Transfer Station

Valley Transfer Station handles solid waste, recycling, HHW and yard waste. The facility is comprised of two scalehouses, three scales, a free recyclables drop-off area, a transfer building that serves public and commercial customers, an administration building, an HHW area, and a white goods area. The transfer building is an open, three-sided building structure, with one full-grade separated hopper for loadout and a hopper fed compactor unit which direct feeds into trailers for truck haul. The compactor-fed trailers can also be directed to the BNSF Parkwater Intermodal Facility located in Spokane Valley for rail haul to a regional landfill. The Valley Transfer Station has approximately 15,700 square feet of tipping floor under roof.

Closed Landfills

The County owns and operates three landfills located within the County, these are Colbert, Greenacres and Mica landfills. All three landfills are closed and going through post-closure activities. These activities typically are monitoring and treatment of groundwater contamination, managing and venting flammable gasses and general maintenance. The reclamation process typically includes covering the site with a membrane which reduces runoff of contaminants. All closed landfills have contractual agreements with environmental regulatory agencies that specifically describe required remediation activities. Table CF-45 shows landfills located in the Spokane County and post-closure status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landfill</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Date Closed and Remediation Activity</th>
<th>Post-Closure Period (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colbert</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>Closed Oct. 1986&lt;br&gt;Covered 1996</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenacres</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>Closed 1972&lt;br&gt;Covered 1996</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mica</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>Closed Dec. 1994&lt;br&gt;Covered 1994</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Landfill Facilities

The Spokane County Regional Solid Waste System uses the Roosevelt Regional Landfill located in Klickitat, Washington for disposal needs. The City also owns and operates the lined MSW landfill cell at the NSLF. The availability of MSW landfill within Spokane County is a requirement of the WTE operating permit from the Spokane Regional Health District (SRHD). The lined cell at Northside Land Fill fulfills this requirement currently and will for the next 5 years or so. The expansion of the site in a phase 2 project of
the initial design would provide this into the future. Other options to fulfill the requirements of the WTE operating permit would be to construct a new MSW landfill in Spokane County, or for Waste Management’s Graham Road landfill to be permitted as a Subtitle-D MSW landfill. Currently there are three types of waste that are eventually disposed in a landfill, either in or outside Spokane County: ash, bypass MSW from the WTE facility, and nonprocessible wastes such as sheet rock from the WTE and County transfer stations.

Table CF-46: County and City Landfill Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Landfill</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ash from Spokane WTE Facility</td>
<td>RRLF</td>
<td>Out of County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bypass waste from WTE Facility</td>
<td>RRLF or NSLF</td>
<td>Both in and out of County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprocessible wastes that are not suitable for recycling or processing at the WTE Facility or Transfer Stations</td>
<td>RRLF or NSLF</td>
<td>Both in and out of County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private Landfills and Inert Material Recyclers

Several private companies play a role in diverting materials from publicly owned landfills. They do this either by recycling materials or by land filling inert materials. Inert materials are those that do not burn or decompose. There are six privately owned landfills in the County which are licensed by the Spokane Regional Health District. In recent years, these facilities received about 90 percent of the construction and demolition waste generated within the County.
### Table CF-47: Demolition and Inert Facilities Open to the Public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited Purpose Landfills</td>
<td>Graham Rd. Recycling and Disposal</td>
<td>Graham Rd.</td>
<td>Wood waste asbestos, tires, concrete &amp; asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corner of Hwy 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inert Facilities</td>
<td>Inland Asphalt Landfill</td>
<td>Sand Rd.</td>
<td>Brock, concrete asphalt, rock, gravel, shattered glass &amp; dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busy Bee Landfill and Wood Recycling</td>
<td>14910 W. Craig Rd.</td>
<td>Concrete asphalt, glass, metal &amp; dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane Rock Products</td>
<td>2691 S. Craig Rd.</td>
<td>Concrete asphalt, dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Facilities</td>
<td>Diversified Recycling</td>
<td>8716 N. Green</td>
<td>Rock, dirt &amp; wood waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northwest Industrial Services</td>
<td>3808 N. Sullivan</td>
<td>Construction and demolition debris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collection Services

Solid waste collection and transfer operations in the County are coordinated with all elements and priorities of the Solid Waste Management Plan, including waste reduction and recycling. Spokane County’s goal is to enhance and improve the overall efficiency of waste and recyclable collection and transfer, with the following objectives:

- Provide access to cost-effective collection services for all residences, business, and industry.
- Promote effective use of the waste management infrastructure to optimize service levels and transportation efficiencies.
- Encourage competition to reduce costs of collection and processing.

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC), municipalities within Spokane County, and the Air Force share legal authority for solid waste collection within the boundaries of Spokane County. There are various collection systems currently operating in both unincorporated and incorporated service areas of Spokane County. The City of Spokane is the only municipal government that collects its own MSW through its Solid Waste Management Department. All other cities/towns in the County utilize private waste haulers. Fairchild AFB also relies on a private hauler for collection of MSW, recyclables, and yard waste. Residents in the County have the option to subscribe to solid waste collection service, or self-haul solid waste, recyclables, yard waste, and HHW to the WTE Facility and to the Colbert and Valley Transfer Stations. Also, residents can self-haul recyclables to privately owned drop-off facilities and inert material to private inert landfills. All waste collectors are required to utilize the Solid Waste System and dump their garbage at one of the two transfer stations or the WTE.
Solid waste collection in the unincorporated areas of Spokane County is provided to residents and businesses by four private collection companies that operate under certificates issued by the WUTC. The certificate provides each collection company with an exclusive collection franchise within a specified geographic area. The four collection firms are indicated in Table CF-48.

### Table CF-48: Certified Haulers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hauler</th>
<th>Certificate No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empire Disposal, Inc.</td>
<td>G-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Disposal, Inc.</td>
<td>G-199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management of Washington, Inc.</td>
<td>G-237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torre Refuse and Recycling LLC</td>
<td>G-260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recycling

Residents and businesses in unincorporated areas of Spokane County are provided recycling services and programs by the County and WUTC certificated hauling companies. County offices provide recycling programs for employees who work at county buildings, including the Spokane County Courthouse. These recycling services are provided by a private contractor which collects and hauls recyclable materials as designated by the County.

The more densely populated portions of the unincorporated area of the Spokane County receive curbside recycling collection service. Waste Management serves most of the unincorporated areas of Spokane County east of the City of Spokane, and Sunshine Disposal serves Fairchild AFB and unincorporated Spokane County west of the City of Spokane. Because collection routes cross over between unincorporated and incorporated areas, neither firm separates curbside recycling collection data in unincorporated areas from the data from incorporated areas that they service.

Waste Management, Sunshine Disposal, and Empire Disposal additionally service commercial recycling accounts in these unincorporated areas. Collection routes cross over between unincorporated and incorporated areas and neither firm is able to separate collection data between areas.

### Yard Waste and Composting

Food scraps, food-soiled paper, and yard debris are collected in the “Clean Green” programs where they are taken to a commercial composting facility to be made into a soil amendment. The County offers a financial incentive for recycling yard waste. The Clean Green tipping fee is less than for regular trash. Both Waste Management and Sunshine Disposal & Recycling offer commercial food waste recycling service.
This service is mainly used by grocery stores, food banks, organic processors, schools, and other public institutions.

The County sponsors the Spokane Master Composter/Recycler Program. Training is provided annually to citizens who are interested in learning more about home composting and recycling, and then volunteering to help teach other. Master Composters/Recyclers provide educational seminars, help staff County booths at home shoes, and sponsor the popular biannual Compost Fair that provides hands-on learning and a free compost bin to County residents.

Yard waste can be picked up in the unincorporated areas of the County that receive curbside recycling service by the certified waste haulers. Waste Management and Sunshine Disposal & Recycling provide subscription curbside yard waste collection to anyone who requests the service in its service area and within the service level requirements. The service is provided weekly from March through November and monthly from December through February. Citizens may self-haul yard waste to the yard waste collection sites at the North County and Valley transfer stations or at the WTE facility.

**Waste Stream**

In 2017 the County’s North and Valley transfer stations received approximately 94,000 tons of MSW. This tonnage was sent to WTE for incineration, with a portion being bypassed to the Roosevelt Landfill during WTE planned maintenance periods. Approximately 31,000 tons of clean green material was received. In 2017, the Spokane County Regional Solid Waste System disposed of approximately 290,000 tons of MSW. The City of Spokane was the largest generator, producing approximately 50% of disposed waste.

**Waste Reduction and Recycling**

The policies expressed in Spokane County’s 2015 Comprehensive SWMP make waste reduction and recycling the preferred methods of handling solid waste. The County Service Level Ordinance establishes certain service levels for recycling collection in the urban areas of Spokane County to further the objectives of the plan, including a high level of waste reduction and recycling; to ensure the provision of such collection systems and services as are in the public interest; and to secure a healthful environment for all citizens of Spokane County. The County Service Level Ordinance lists the recyclables that are required to be collected in a residential curbside program, and provides a service area map that designate the areas where recycling is required.

A new single stream recycling facility was constructed just south of the Waste to Energy Plant and was in operation in 2012. The 70,000 square foot facility is operated by Waste Management and is built upon land owned by the Spokane Airport Board. The facility incorporates technology for separating materials by type which eliminates the need for residential customers with curbside recycling service to sort their household recyclables prior to collection.

Because of the recycling volume data complexities, it is difficult to separate out total recycling numbers for any one municipality or unincorporated area. For this reason, recycling numbers are generally reported as county wide.

Approximately 48% of the traditional municipal solid waste generated in Spokane County is recycled. County wide, including municipalities not part of the Spokane County Regional Solid Waste System (City
of Spokane Valley, Liberty Lake, and Cheney) of the 628,819 tons of garbage processed, 300,128 tons were recycled in 2015.

Table CF-49: 2015 Tons Recycled for All Spokane County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Solid Waste (MSW)</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycled</td>
<td>300,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposed</td>
<td>328,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Generated</td>
<td>628,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Rate</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recycling and reuse of materials significantly decrease the amount of material that goes into the waste stream and then into landfills.

**Forecast of Future Needs**

According to the SWMP, the annual generation is forecast to increase from about 497,710 tons in 2012 to 592,080 tons in 2040. This forecast assumes a 0.8% annual increase in population, based on annual population estimates from 2003 to 2014 of cities in Spokane County. Based on 15-year waste disposal trends for the County, generation has been increasing on average by 0.7% annually, with disposal decreasing by 0.3% annually and recycling increasing by 1.5% annually.

The Solid Waste System has a funding mechanism that will allow it to expand its capacity. Reserves accumulated from tipping fees and the sale of electricity can be used along with revenue bonds to increase System capacity.

**Level of Service (LOS)**

Spokane County’s Comprehensive Plan states the following: “The processing of solid waste will meet all applicable federal and Washington State regulations, including maintaining required facilities licenses.”
Proposed Facility Improvements

The Spokane County Regional Solid Waste System is operated as an enterprise fund. Revenues come from the sale of electricity produced at the WTE and from tipping fees charged to individuals and garbage collectors at the County owned transfer stations. Revenues at the City’s WTE Facility come from the sale of electricity produced at the WTE and from tipping fees charged to individuals and garbage collectors. In anticipation of upcoming development in the north portion of unincorporated County, the County is currently conceptualizing the steps needed for a possible upgrade to the North County Transfer Station that will increase capacity.

Table CF-50: Transfer Station Improvements (in $1,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stormwater

Introduction

Stormwater is water that originates during precipitation events and snow/ice melt. Stormwater can soak into the soil (infiltrate), be held on the surface and evaporate, or runoff and end up in nearby streams, rivers, or other water bodies (surface water).

In natural landscapes such as forests, the soil absorbs much of the stormwater and plants help hold stormwater close to where it falls. In developed environments, unmanaged stormwater can create two major issues: one related to the volume and timing of runoff water (flooding) and the other related to potential contaminants that the water is carrying (water pollution).

Prior to the 1980’s most development had occurred on porous and well-draining valley soils. The initial problems identified related to flooding and were solved with the implementation of direct injection drywells, but another problem was soon identified. Stormwater had the potential to contaminate the Spokane Valley Rathdrum Prairie (SVRP) Aquifer, the sole source of drinking water for the majority of the County's population. Stormwater management techniques have developed significantly since then, as have the level of urban style development within the County.

The Stormwater Utility, a section of the Public Works Department, ensures that stormwater systems are planned, developed, and maintained to prevent flooding, protect water quality, and preserve natural stormwater drainageways. The Stormwater Utility strives to provide leadership and a focus for other community efforts working toward improved stormwater management that causes as little short-term and long-term harm as possible to the environment.

Existing Facilities

Spokane County implements a variety of stormwater technologies to dispose of and treat stormwater where necessary. The majority of Spokane County’s stormwater is disposed of via infiltration, as stormwater percolates into the ground and recharges groundwater supplies. This is accomplished in a variety of ways. Historically, Spokane County has relied upon its highly infiltrative soils, using drywells (Spokane County currently has 4,500+) as the preferred form of infiltration to prevent localized flooding. In recent years, stormwater treatment structures have been implemented in areas where waterways or the SVRP Aquifer is susceptible to contamination. Most stormwater structures used for treatment include some form of bioinfiltration. For example, grassed swales are commonly used to treat polluted stormwater. Pollutants are removed through interaction with bioengineered soils and plant uptake.

Spokane County operates ten stormwater facilities to handle regional stormwater needs. These facilities are specifically designed to meet the capacity, and treatment needs in some cases, of a designated drainage area. In areas where stormwater is not routed to regional facilities, it is disposed of at localized locations using stormwater structures, including but not limited to, those mentioned above (i.e. swales and drywells). It is important to note that the vast majority of unincorporated Spokane County is not served by a regional facility. Table CF-51 describes the County owned stormwater regional facilities by type, location, and size.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size/Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57ᵗʰ Avenue Ponds</td>
<td>Evaporation Ponds</td>
<td>57ᵗʰ Ave. (east of Regal)</td>
<td>57ᵗʰ Ave (west of Regal)</td>
<td>8 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennaire Storm Sewer</td>
<td>Storm Sewer</td>
<td>57ᵗʰ Ave. between Palouse Hwy &amp; Cook</td>
<td>57ᵗʰ Ave. between Palouse Hwy &amp; Cook</td>
<td>5300 lineal ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenrose Channel</td>
<td>Grass-line channel</td>
<td>Browne Mtn.</td>
<td>N &amp; W of Glenrose Rd; S of 37ᵗʰ Ave.</td>
<td>2300 lineal ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaglewood Pump System</td>
<td>Groundwater Pump System</td>
<td>Eaglewood Subdivision</td>
<td>Low Rd &amp; Mt. Spokane Park Drive</td>
<td>65 gallon/min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne Mtn. Property</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Browne Mtn.</td>
<td>46ᵗʰ &amp; Sumac area</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennaire Drive Storm Sewer</td>
<td>Storm Sewer</td>
<td>Browne Mtn.</td>
<td>Glennaire Dr./Glenrose Rd.</td>
<td>5000 lineal ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price &amp; Wall Tracts</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>5-mile Drainage Basin</td>
<td>N of Price Rd; W of Wall St.</td>
<td>8 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palouse &amp; Julia</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Palouse/Yale Rd.</td>
<td>N of 57ᵗʰ Ave. &amp; E of Palouse Hwy</td>
<td>7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29ᵗʰ Ave.</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>East Branch Glenrose Drainage Basin</td>
<td>N of 29ᵗʰ; E of Havana</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenrose 5-acre Tract</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>East Branch Glenrose Drainage Basin</td>
<td>S of 37ᵗʰ; W of Glenrose Rd.</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Service

The level of service for stormwater is as follows:

- New development shall not increase runoff volume off-site.
- Prevent flooding of property during a 25-year storm.
- Prevent damage to buildings from a 100-year storm.
- Stormwater discharge to any surface or ground waters will be allowed unless the discharge will degrade water quality below standards.

Stormwater Utility Financing Plan and History

The following table details the Stormwater Utility’s financial report, identifying revenues, expenses, net income, and proposed expenditures for the last four years, as well as projected totals anticipated over the next 20 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Net Income/Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,637,206</td>
<td>$894,283</td>
<td>$742,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1,651,712</td>
<td>$915,888</td>
<td>$735,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,709,110</td>
<td>$603,619</td>
<td>$1,105,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,758,640</td>
<td>$913,330</td>
<td>$845,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,876,761</td>
<td>$791,979</td>
<td>$1,084,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,832,706</td>
<td>$831,165</td>
<td>$1,001,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-year totals</td>
<td>$10,466,134</td>
<td>$4,950,265</td>
<td>$5,515,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>$1,744,356</td>
<td>$825,044</td>
<td>$919,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>Net Income/Loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,851,033</td>
<td>$839,477</td>
<td>$1,011,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$1,869,544</td>
<td>$847,871</td>
<td>$1,021,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,888,239</td>
<td>$856,350</td>
<td>$1,031,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$1,907,121</td>
<td>$864,913</td>
<td>$1,042,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$1,926,193</td>
<td>$873,563</td>
<td>$1,052,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$1,945,454</td>
<td>$882,298</td>
<td>$1,063,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$1,964,909</td>
<td>$891,121</td>
<td>$1,073,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$1,984,558</td>
<td>$900,032</td>
<td>$1,084,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$2,004,404</td>
<td>$909,033</td>
<td>$1,095,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$2,024,448</td>
<td>$918,123</td>
<td>$1,106,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$2,044,692</td>
<td>$927,304</td>
<td>$1,117,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$2,065,139</td>
<td>$936,577</td>
<td>$1,128,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$2,085,791</td>
<td>$945,943</td>
<td>$1,139,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$2,106,648</td>
<td>$955,403</td>
<td>$1,151,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>$2,127,715</td>
<td>$964,957</td>
<td>$1,162,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>$2,148,992</td>
<td>$974,606</td>
<td>$1,174,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>$2,170,482</td>
<td>$984,352</td>
<td>$1,186,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>$2,192,187</td>
<td>$994,196</td>
<td>$1,197,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>$2,214,109</td>
<td>$1,004,138</td>
<td>$1,209,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>$2,236,250</td>
<td>$1,014,179</td>
<td>$1,222,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>$2,258,612</td>
<td>$1,024,321</td>
<td>$1,234,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-year totals</td>
<td>$43,016,519</td>
<td>$19,508,757</td>
<td>$23,507,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>$2,048,406</td>
<td>$928,988</td>
<td>$1,119,417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six-Year Capital Improvement Projects Plan

Spokane County Stormwater Utility has several Capital Improvement Projects planned over the next six years. Funding for this project is secured through the Department of Ecology at 75% of the project cost, with Spokane County Stormwater Utility covering the remaining 25%. These projects are retrofit projects, meaning that existing conditions provide adequate stormwater disposal for the project area. These projects instead address adding a treatment component to polluted stormwater prior to infiltration into the ground. This reduces the susceptibility of contamination to the SVRP Aquifer and associated waterbodies.

Table CF-53: Stormwater Capital Improvement Plan (in $1,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenrose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 57th Ave – Perry to Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Spokane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1 Wall Street Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1 Wall Street Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3 Regina Drive – Mill to Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4 Mill Road – Hastings to Wilson</td>
<td>$997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Lyons Avenue- Wall to Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-6 Cascade Way – Wall to Normandie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-7 Bellwood Drive – Mill to Hastings</td>
<td>$467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8 Hastings Road – Mill to US 395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$3,829</td>
<td>$2,560</td>
<td>$2,144</td>
<td>$1,998</td>
<td>$1,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Year 2024 is not calculated due to Ecology match funding budget not passed by legislature at this time.
Transportation

Introduction

Transportation facilities within Spokane County are part of an integrated system used to transport people and goods to and from their destinations. This system is vital to commerce and must function efficiently to provide maximum benefit to the local economy.

Roadways in the unincorporated areas are the primary concern for the County transportation planning efforts. There are three jurisdictions that administer the roadways within the County; State, cities, and Spokane County. Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) is the regional coordinating agency for transportation planning.

This section of the Capital Facilities Plan includes transportation facilities that Spokane County is responsible for providing, including the improvement and expansion of roads, bridges, pathways, sidewalks and County owned rail lines. Maintenance activities, including snow plowing, sanding, chip sealing and street cleaning are not considered capital improvements and therefore, are not included as part of the Capital Improvement Plan.

Existing Facilities

Spokane County maintains a significant amount of roadway in a number of classifications. Table CF-54 identifies the number of road miles within the County’s jurisdiction by surface type. Tables CF-55 identifies the current and projected LOS for select major intersecting roads within the County’s jurisdiction. All existing arterial and collector intersections were analyzed for LOS at existing conditions, 6-year forecast and 20-year forecast.

CF-54: Miles of County Roadway by Type (in 1,000’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dirt and Summer</th>
<th>Gravel</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Oil and Paved</th>
<th>Total Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>2,528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Service

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires jurisdictions adopt Level of Service (LOS) standards for roadways. The GMA requires that each jurisdiction’s LOS standards be coordinated within the region and be supported by local regulations.

Spokane County has adopted LOS standards for urban arterial intersections within the Urban Growth Boundary. This LOS is based upon travel time delay and is expressed as letters “A” through “F”. When an intersection has an “A” designation, it represents the highest or best travel condition possible with the least delay, while an “F” represents the poorest condition or the greatest delay. Table CF-55 describes LOS standards applied to intersections.
The adopted LOS standards within Spokane County’s jurisdiction are:

- The lowest acceptable for signalized intersections is “D”.
- The lowest acceptable for non-signalized intersections is “E”.

LOS standards can help jurisdictions identify where and when transportation improvements are needed, and when development or growth will affect system operation. LOS standards can provide benchmarks that allow jurisdictions future improvements based upon where the greatest needs are located. They can also be used to evaluate the impact of proposed developments on the surrounding road system. They can also be used to identify problems, suggest remedial actions, and apportion costs between public and private sources. LOS standards are a cornerstone in the development of an equitable traffic impact fee system. They allow jurisdictions to require new development to pay proportional costs for improvements to the local transportation infrastructure based upon that development’s impact.

**Table CF-55: Description of Arterial LOS Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>Describes primarily free flow operations at average travel speeds, usually about 90% of the free flow speed for the arterial class. Vehicles are completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream. Stopped delay at signalized intersections is minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>Represents reasonably unimpeded operations at average travel speeds, usually about 70% of the free flow speed for the arterial class. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted and stopped delays are not bothersome. Drivers are not generally subjected to appreciable tension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>Represents stable conditions; however, ability to maneuver and change lanes in mid-block location may be more restricted than in LOS B, and longer queues and/or adverse signal coordination may contribute to lower average travel speeds of about 50% of the average free flow speed for the arterial class. Motorists will experience appreciable tension while driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>Borders on a range in which small increases in flow may cause substantial increases in approach delay and, hence, decreases in arterial speed. This may be due to adverse signal progression, inappropriate signal timing, high volumes, or some combination of these. Average travel speeds are about 40% of free flow speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS E</td>
<td>Characterized by significant approach delays and average travel speeds of one-third the free flow speed or lower. Such operations are caused by some combination of adverse progression, high signal density, extensive queuing at critical intersections, and inappropriate signal timing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS F</td>
<td>Characterizes arterial flow at extremely low speeds below one-third to one-quarter of the free flow speed. Intersection congestion is likely at critical signalized locations, with resultant high approach delays. Adverse progression is frequently a contributor to this condition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Highway Capacity Manual, Chapter 16
Forecast of Future Needs and Financing Plan

Spokane County adopts a six-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and an Annual Construction Program yearly through requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA). It also adopts a longer-range transportation element to assure transportation improvements are consistent with the pace, location, and intensity of forecast growth described in the comprehensive plan. The transportation element is attached to this Capital Facilities Plan as Appendix D.
Map CFU - 57 North Spokane Arterial Roads
Map CFU – 59 Spokane Valley Arterial Roads
Map CFU – 60 West Plains Arterial Roads
Private Utilities

Introduction

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires a utilities element consisting of the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines.

In December 1995, a Regional Utility Corridor Plan (RUCP) was developed to fulfill the requirements of the Countywide Planning Policies. This plan includes an inventory and analysis of existing and proposed electric, gas, telephone/fiber optic, water, and sewer “corridors.” Through the inventory and mapping of existing and proposed utility corridors, it was determined that opportunities to share corridors may be limited. A utility corridor map is contained in the Spokane County Comprehensive Plan, which identifies electric, gas, and telephone/fiber optic corridors for various utility providers. The RUCP provides policies and action statements that are used to guide the goals and policies of all comprehensive plans prepared in Spokane County.

Spokane County recognizes that planning for private utilities is the primary responsibility of the service providers. Zoning regulations may place restrictions on the location and site development of the utilities and may require a public review process before utility facilities may be located.

Many private utilities are under directive by their licensing agency and franchise agreements to provide a specific level of service to their service area. In many instances, this regulating agency is the Washington Utility and Transportation Commission (WUTC). Services are provided on an “on demand basis.” Any new development within a service provider’s area must be served. Most service providers monitor development plans and try to build excess capacity into their facilities at the time of construction to allow for future demand.

Private utilities may be restricted by their environment. Competing districts or limited service areas may limit future expansion. For example, packaged sewage treatment plants may serve only the development for which they were originally intended. Water providers may be limited by the quantity of their water rights or surrounding providers. Telecommunication companies are not restricted by these types of limitations; however, they are regulated by the WUTC.

Maps CFU-61 through Map CFU - 64 identifies the locations of existing major utility transmission lines, substations, and other regional serving facilities in Spokane.

Utilities

Electricity

Avista Utilities and Inland Power are the electricity providers within Spokane County. Other providers may be found in the surrounding area. The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) provides electricity from the federal power grid to Avista Utilities and some private businesses in the area. BPA has a number of substations in the area, which allow the power coming from Grand Coulee Dam and other locations on the grid to be stepped down to a level that is compatible with local needs.
With population growth, Avista anticipates increases in future system demands. Planning for future substation upgrades and new substations are forecasted periodically to adequately keep the correct capacity to meet demands of the increasing population. Enhancements include the installation of additional equipment, the replacement of existing equipment with larger capacity, and other technological enhancements to facilitate improved system performance methodologies. Avista continually strives to keep updated with state of the art technologies and endeavors to research, design, and implement those innovations and technologies that provide the greatest benefits to the community. Other new substation locations are being evaluated. Plans for rebuilding and constructing several new transmission lines are under consideration. New transmission line construction is primarily being considered on the outskirts of the city.

**Natural Gas**

Existing gas service covers a majority of the developed areas of the city and peripheral area. Natural gas is provided at the time of development. Avista Utilities has stated that regulators and piping additions would not produce any major impacts and are not planned for beyond three years. In addition, changes are planned for the main distribution facilities in the near future.

**Telecommunications**

Telecommunications travel many paths throughout Spokane County. However, changing technology provides potential new methods of communication and changing types of investment in communications facilities. What may be shown in this plan can be made obsolete quickly by new technologies, new investment, and new ways of communicating.

Cable television is provided by franchise from Spokane County. It provides services on demand through a distribution system generally located on the same poles as traditional telephone lines. In addition, satellite television is increasingly providing competition to cable and free television.

The Spokane area is served by eight cellular providers: Verizon, Airtouch, Sprint, AT&T, Nextel, VoiceStream, GTE, and Qwest. Cellular calls use signals to and from mobile phones. Cellular calls are routed by a series of low-powered transmitting antennas through a central computer, which connects the call to its destination. Transmitting antennas are located at “cell sites”, and their coverage areas are known as “cells.” A network of strategically placed antennas allows a “handing off” of the signal as the carrier of the phone travels.

Capacity overload and cellular system expansion are in response to several factors: an increase in the number of customers residing within a designated area, a shift in traffic volumes affecting cellular users, or a record of service inadequacies, such as dropped calls or poor sound quality. In these cases, additional antennas are then planned with site selection influenced by topography and other engineering constraints.
Utility Services Summary

Table CF 68 provides a general summary of utility services provided in Spokane, including the existing and planned capacity of the service provider, to the extent information is available for inclusion in this document.

**Table CF 56: Private Utility Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Existing Capacity</th>
<th>Planned Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>Avista Utilities</td>
<td>Within the WA service territory, the average daily demand is 137,110 dekatherms.</td>
<td>Within the WA service territory, the forecast levels in 2035 is projected at 159,541 dekatherms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>Avista Utilities</td>
<td>Several internal and external company standards require adequate capacity to serve</td>
<td>Planned capacity will be sufficient to meet the increase in customer demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inland Power &amp; Light</td>
<td>the expected customer demand. The summer peak load within the general city boundary in 2015 was 575 MW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td>Verizon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T-Mobile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nextel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voicestream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comcast/Xfinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Century Link</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map CFU - 61 South Spokane Transmission and Substations
Map CFU - 63 Spokane Valley Transmission Lines and Substations
Map CFU - 64 West Plains Transmission Lines and Substations
Appendix C: Baseline Assessment for Expanded UGA

A priority of this baseline assessment is to verify that the county’s various service purveyors can provide services to the expanded UGA included in the settlement agreement. In preparing this baseline assessment, the County assumes that areas included within the existing UGA are adequately served or there are plans in place to ensure that the UGA can be served when developed to urban densities. The degree to which existing areas are or will be served is covered elsewhere in this plan. This assumption is consistent with the UGA Update EIS. That EIS studied an area larger and with greater impact than what was eventually affirmed by the settlement agreement. Since this revised area is smaller, with less forecast growth and reduced demand for services, fiscal impact will also be less.

This initial phase of the work focused on the new UGA expansion, and interviews with service providers concentrated on understanding the extent of service impact this new UGA expansion involves. These service providers already participated in the UGA Update EIS, and the intention of this part of the capital facilities plan work revolved around the degree to which the reduced area included in the settlement agreement may challenge their abilities to serve beyond what was first proposed. In every case, providers indicated that the demand on their services would be either reduced or unchanged from the initial UGA proposal.

In the absence of information from providers to the contrary, the fiscal analysis incorporated in the UGA Update EIS remains a useful tool to evaluate relative revenues and costs of the UGA expansion.

This baseline assessment identifies the individual UGA expansion areas by name, listing the appropriate service purveyors and the results of our conversations with them. It then identifies the additional investment necessary to provide services in support development in these areas, if any.

Results from this assessment will inform our continuing work to update the countywide capital facilities element. Any identified deficiencies and corrective action and investments included here will be incorporated in the overall element, included in recommended actions to ensure development within the county’s urban growth area will have services in place to support it.

Below is a summary of conversations with the service purveyors responsible for public services within each of the settlement agreement UGA expansion areas. If the purveyor is not able to provide services now, there are notes of what must be done to enable services provision and if those actions should be included in the updated capital facilities plan. We have assumed that those purveyors who have not responded to requests for comment are capable of providing services as necessary to support urban development, consistent with the findings of the initial UGA Update EIS.

**Domestic Water**

**City of Spokane**

The City did not respond to requests for comment. However, those areas within the UGA either are already served by or are within the planned water service area for the City of Spokane.
Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible

Consolidated Support Services
The District did not respond to requests to comment.

Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible Spokane County Water District 3
The District confirms that it can adequately serve the additional UGA expansion. Comments from the District referenced the consolidated water plan for the metro area, indicating that areas included within the plan’s geography have already been planned for service.

Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible

Whitworth Water District
The District confirms that it can adequately serve the additional UGA expansion. Most of the area is already built-out, and other major properties include a County park unlikely to be developed into other uses in the future.

Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible

UGA Update EIS 2011

Fire & Emergency Services

Fire District 1
The District did not respond to requests for comment.

Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible

Fire District 3
The District confirms that the incremental addition of property within the UGA will have negligible impact to its ability to provide fire and emergency services.

Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible

Fire District 8
The District has not yet been able to get us comments.

Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible

Fire District 9
The District confirms that the incremental addition of property within the UGA will have negligible impact to its ability to provide fire and emergency services.
**Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible**

**Fire District 10**

The District did not respond to requests for comment.

**Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible**

**UGA Update EIS 2011**

**Law & Justice**

The county sheriff’s office believes that the addition of the land will make “a bad situation insignificantly worse.” The Sheriff believes that the department is under-resourced, with too few deputies and support staff to adequately serve Spokane County. The office prepared a staffing study in 2012 exploring the Spokane County Sheriff’s Office deputy count and how it relates to similar jurisdictions with similar demands and urban development patterns. The study showed that the department would need to hire an additional 75 deputies and relevant support personnel to reach a comparable level of service provided by similar counties. The Sheriff also underscored the need for a comprehensive and appropriate annexation policy to ensure that land, once in the UGA, be annexed in large areas to adjacent jurisdictions. This would more equitably transfer the cost/revenue balance to the annexing city and simplify the mechanics of patrol and response for law enforcement.

**Net UGA expansion impact: negligible**

**UGA Update EIS 2011**

**Parks**

Spokane County Parks has developed a level of service that calls for park acreage based on a combination of population density and proximity to existing parks. The LOS standard calls for 1.4 acres per 1,000 UGA residents. That standard applies when there are more than 7,000 UGA residents three road miles or more from an existing County park. As of now, there are no conditions in the settlement agreement UGA where that LOS standard would point toward parkland acquisition. This also reflects a shift in mission for the County Parks department, where the focus is more on community and regional parks provision than on neighborhood parks provision.

**Net UGA expansion impact: negligible**

**UGA Update EIS 2011**

**Public Buildings**

Spokane County provides regional services to the entire county jurisdiction, whether it falls within an urban growth area or not. According to the County, the incremental intensification of development as a result of the incremental UGA expansion will have negligible impact on its needs for public buildings. The need for public building inventory is driven more by population growth than its spatial distribution. The
County’s long-range capital planning – particularly for its central facilities – is not contingent on UGA boundary.

**Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible**

**UGA Update EIS 2011 Public Libraries**

The Spokane County Library District operates 10 libraries in the County, will open an eleventh soon at the Spokane Valley Mall, and plans to construct three more within the Spokane metro area. The District already owns the land for those three new facilities. The District recently renovated its Hawthorn branch, but it may eventually move it further north to serve land in the northern UGA more conveniently.

**Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible**

**Public Schools**

**Central Valley School District (District 81)**

The district needs additional land for its planned facilities, particularly in the southeast portion of its service area. Growth in student enrollment and the recent State requirements for facility expansion compel the district to build more schools, influences that would exist independently of this UGA expansion. While the UGA expansion included in the settlement agreement does not have an appreciable impact on service provision, the District urgently needs land to meet its own service standards.

**Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible**

**Cheney School District**

The district did not respond to requests for comment.

**Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible**

**East Valley School District**

The district did not respond to requests for comment.

**Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible**

**Mead School District**

The district did not respond to requests for comment.

**Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible**

**Medical Lake School District**

The district did not respond to requests for comment.

**Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible**
Spokane Schools (District 81)

The district needs additional land for its planned facilities, particularly in the southeast portion of its service area. Growth in student enrollment and the recent State requirements for facility expansion compel the district to build more schools, influences that would exist independently of this UGA expansion. While the UGA expansion included in the settlement agreement does not have an appreciable impact on service provision, the District urgently needs land to meet its own service standards.

*Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible*

West Valley School District

The district did not respond to requests for comment.

*Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible*

UGA Update EIS 2011

Sanitary Sewer

**City of Spokane**

The City of Spokane did not respond to comment. However, the consolidated wastewater plan for Spokane County indicates that the City is planning to provide sewer services generally compatible with development within the expanded UGA, with service offered in response to individual development proposals.

*Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible*

**Spokane County**

Spokane County’s wastewater utility did not respond to comment. However, the consolidated wastewater plan for Spokane County indicates that the City is planning to provide sewer services generally compatible with development within the expanded UGA, with service offered in response to individual development proposals.

*Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible*

**UGA Update EIS 2011**

**Solid Waste**

The City of Spokane contracts with Waste Management for solid waste disposal services. Services can expand or contract to meet demand, and solid waste handling facilities have adequate capacity to accommodate the incremental increase caused by the UGA settlement agreement expansion.

*Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible*
Stormwater

Spokane County generally manages storm water on a project-by-project basis, employing the appropriate storm water manuals and best practices to ensure minimal impact to water quality and storm water flows. The incremental expansion of the UGA has little impact on the County’s ability to provide storm water services, with development-related impacts evaluated and managed as part of development permitting, design, and construction.

*Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible*

UGA Update EIS 2011

Transportation

Spokane County generally manages transportation impacts via 6-year CIP and on a project-by-project basis and requiring transportation impact analyses as appropriate for development proposals. Transportation mitigation measures attached to development approvals impacts to the transportation system are addressed concurrent with development. The incremental expansion of the UGA has little impact on the County’s ability to provide transportation services, with development-related impacts evaluated and managed as part of development permitting, design, and construction. Development associated with larger, more regional initiatives, however, may influence transportation system design and demand, and the County continues to participate with other jurisdictions and the Spokane Regional Transportation Commission to plan for the future of transportation in the region.

*Net UGA expansion impact: Negligible*

UGA Update EIS 2011
Findings

Based on conversations with representatives from the various purveyors, the following service expansions and investments will be necessary to serve the expanded UGA settlement agreement areas.

Table CF-57: Settlement Area Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement area</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All within School District 81</td>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>Increasing pressure to provide additional school facilities in response to legislation and population growth is a critical issue.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro UGA</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Continuing study of the transportation system will inform regional improvements and system capacity management.</td>
<td>Short-term Long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>Consolidated Support Services</td>
<td>Consolidated Support Services 509-565-4631</td>
<td>Only for southern portion, other two portions aren’t serviced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #3</td>
<td>509-624-7103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Ozzie Knezovich <a href="mailto:oknezovich@spokanecounty.org">oknezovich@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase <a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Gil Haubert <a href="mailto:ghaubert@spokanecounty.org">ghaubert@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Patrick Roewe <a href="mailto:proewe@scld.org">proewe@scld.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>Superintendent Timothy Ames <a href="mailto:tames@mlsd.org">tames@mlsd.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gene Repp <a href="mailto:GRepp@spokanecounty.org">GRepp@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor <a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Matt Zarecor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Matt Zarecor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mzarecor@spokanecounty.org">mzarecor@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>477-7255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #3 &amp; FD #10</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scfd3@scfd3.org">scfd3@scfd3.org</a> 509-624-7103</td>
<td>Approximately top 1/3 is FD #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase <a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a> 477-4730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Patrick Roewe <a href="mailto:proewe@scld.org">proewe@scld.org</a> 893-8200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>Superintendent Timothy Ames <a href="mailto:tames@mlsd.org">tames@mlsd.org</a> 509-565-3100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor <a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a> 755-2489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Jail Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #3</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scfd3@scfd3.org">scfd3@scfd3.org</a>, 509-624-7103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase, <a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a>, 477-4730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Patrick Roewe, <a href="mailto:proewe@scl-d.org">proewe@scl-d.org</a>, 893-8200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>Sharon Throop, <a href="mailto:sthroop@cheneysd.org">sthroop@cheneysd.org</a>, 509-559-4599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor, <a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a>, 755-2489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #3</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scfd3@scfd3.org">scfd3@scfd3.org</a> 509-624-7103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase <a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a> 477-4730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td><a href="mailto:proewe@scld.org">proewe@scld.org</a> 893-8200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbroop@cheneysd.org">sbroop@cheneysd.org</a> 509-559-4599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a> 755-2489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Daniel Kegley 509-625-7821</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dkegley@spokanecity.org">dkegley@spokanecity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #10</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@scfd10.org">info@scfd10.org</a> 509-244-2425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase <a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a> 477-4730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Patrick Roewe <a href="mailto:proewe@sclld.org">proewe@sclld.org</a> 893-8200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>Sharon Throop <a href="mailto:stthroop@cheneysd.org">stthroop@cheneysd.org</a> 509-559-4599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor <a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a> 755-2489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Daniel Kegley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dkegley@spokanecity.org">dkegley@spokanecity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(partial)</td>
<td>509-625-7821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #10</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@scfd10.org">info@scfd10.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509-244-2425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>477-4730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Patrick Roewe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:proewe@sclid.org">proewe@sclid.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>893-8200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Terri Lefors</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terril@spokaneschools.org">terril@spokaneschools.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509-354-7395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>755-2489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Daniel Kegley 509-625-7821</td>
<td>(North area - Whitworth Water District #2 serviced by Spokane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dkegley@spokanecity.org">dkegley@spokanecity.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #9</td>
<td><a href="mailto:admin@scfd9.org">admin@scfd9.org</a> 509-466-4602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase <a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a> 477-4730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Patrick Roewe <a href="mailto:proewe@scld.org">proewe@scld.org</a> 893-8200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Mead</td>
<td>Jolene Anders <a href="mailto:jolene.anders@mead354.org">jolene.anders@mead354.org</a> 509-465-6014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td>Jesses Bluff / Jesses Bluff 1st Add</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor <a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a> 755-2489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Little Spokane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Domestic water       | Whitworth Water District #2 | Susan McGeorge 
susan@whitworthwater.com  
509-466-0550          |                              |
| Fire & emergency svcs| FD #9                      | admin@scfd9.org                  |                              |
| Law & justice        | County                     | Doug Chase 
dchase@spokanecounty.org  
477-4730              |                              |
| Parks                | County                     | Patrick Roewe 
proewe@scld.org  
893-8200              |                              |
| Public buildings     | County                     |                                  |                              |
| Public libraries     | Library District           | Jolene Anders 
Jolene.anders@mead354.org  
509-465-6014          |                              |
| Public schools       | Mead                       | Scott Windsor 
swindsor@spokanecity.org  
755-2489              |                              |
<p>| Sanitary sewers      | Glenden                    |                                  |                              |
| Solid waste          | City of Spokane            |                                  |                              |
| Stormwater           | County                     |                                  |                              |
| Transportation       | County                     |                                  |                              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD#9</td>
<td><a href="mailto:admin@scfd9.org">admin@scfd9.org</a></td>
<td>509-466-4602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Patrick Roewe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:proewe@sclrd.org">proewe@sclrd.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Terri Lefors</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terri@spokaneschools.org">terri@spokaneschools.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #9</td>
<td><a href="mailto:admin@scfd9.org">admin@scfd9.org</a></td>
<td>509-466-4602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>477-4730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Patrick Roewe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:proewe@scld.org">proewe@scld.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>893-8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Orchard Prairie</td>
<td>(509) 467-9517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>755-2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Monte Del Ray

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>Pioneer Water Company &amp; Consolidated Irrigation District #19</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pioneerh2o@gmail.com">pioneerh2o@gmail.com</a>, 509-951-0171 Shane Shepard, <a href="mailto:consolidatedirrigation@comcast.net">consolidatedirrigation@comcast.net</a>, 509-924-3655</td>
<td>Both are partial – center of area is not serviced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #1</td>
<td>509-928-1700 (Spokane Valley)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase, <a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a>, 477-4730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Patrick Roewe, <a href="mailto:proewe@scld.org">proewe@scld.org</a>, 893-8200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>East Valley</td>
<td>Jodi Brown, <a href="mailto:brownj@evsd.org">brownj@evsd.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td>Monte Del Rey - Ph 1 &amp; Ph 2, Highland Est - 2nd Add</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor, <a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a>, 755-2489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>Consolidated Irrigation District #19</td>
<td>Shane Shepard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:consolidatedirrigation@comcast.net">consolidatedirrigation@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509-924-3655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #8 &amp; #1</td>
<td>Carol Trescott (District Secretary)</td>
<td>#1 is a very small northern portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509.926.6699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ctrescott@scfd8.org">ctrescott@scfd8.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>477-4730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Nancy Ledeboer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:nledeboer@scld.org">nledeboer@scld.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>893-8200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Central valley</td>
<td>Caroline McRoberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmcroberts@cvsd.org">cmcroberts@cvsd.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>Consolidated Irrigation District #19</td>
<td>Shane Shepard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:consolidedirrigation@comcast.net">consolidedirrigation@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>509-924-3655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #8</td>
<td>Carol Trescott (District Secretary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509.926.6699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ctrscott@scfd8.org">ctrscott@scfd8.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>477-4730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Nancy Ledeboer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:nledboer@scld.org">nledboer@scld.org</a></td>
<td>893-8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>Caroline McRoberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmcroberts@cvsd.org">cmcroberts@cvsd.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>755-2489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>Vera Irrigation District #15</td>
<td><a href="mailto:operations@verawaterandpower.com">operations@verawaterandpower.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #1</td>
<td>509-928-1700 (Spokane Valley)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Nancy Ledeboer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>Caroline McRoberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>Spokane County #3</td>
<td>Ty Wick</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scwd3@comcast.net">scwd3@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #8</td>
<td>Carol Trescott (District Secretary)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ctrescott@scfd8.org">ctrescott@scfd8.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509.926.6699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>477-4730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Nancy Ledeboer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nledeboer@scld.org">nledeboer@scld.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>893-8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>Caroline McRoberts</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmcroberts@cvsd.org">cmcroberts@cvsd.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td>Mica View Est &amp; Whispering Winds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>755-2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #8</td>
<td>Carol Tresco (District Secretary)</td>
<td>509.926.6699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ctrescott@scfd8.org">ctrescott@scfd8.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>477-4730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Nancy Ledeboer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nledeboer@scld.org">nledeboer@scld.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>893-8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Terri Lefors</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terril@spokaneschools.org">terril@spokaneschools.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509-354-7395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>755-2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Domestic water        | City of Spokane | Daniel Kegley  
509-625-7821  
dkegley@spokanecity.org |                            |
| Fire & emergency svcs | FD #8        | Carol Trescott (District Secretary)  
509.926.6699  
ctrescott@scfd8.org |                            |
| Law & justice         | County       | Doug Chase  
dchase@spokanecounty.org  
477-4730 |                            |
| Parks                 | County       | Nancy Ledeboer  
nledeboer@scl.org  
893-8200 |                            |
| Public buildings      | County       | Terri Lefors  
terriL@spokaneschools.org  
509-354-7395 |                            |
| Public libraries      | Library District | Scott Windsor  
swindsor@spokanecity.org  
755-2489 |                            |
<p>| Sanitary sewers       |              |                                              |                            |
| Stormwater            | County       |                                              |                            |
| Transportation       | County       |                                              |                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic water</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Daniel Kegley</td>
<td>509-625-7821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(partial)</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dkegley@spokanecity.org">dkegley@spokanecity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; emergency svcs</td>
<td>FD #3</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scfd3@scfd3.org">scfd3@scfd3.org</a></td>
<td>509-624-7103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; justice</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Doug Chase</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dchase@spokanecounty.org">dchase@spokanecounty.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>477-4730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>Nancy Ledeboer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nledeboer@scld.org">nledeboer@scld.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>893-8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public schools</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Terri Lefors</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terril@spokaneschools.org">terril@spokaneschools.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509-354-7395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary sewers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Scott Windsor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:swindsor@spokanecity.org">swindsor@spokanecity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>755-2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Transportation Element and Technical Analysis

The following pages present the transportation element and its technical analysis, describing the transportation system, anticipated demand, and a long-range perspective on its overall management, funding and incremental improvements.
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Section 1: Introduction

This Transportation Element (TE) provides a 20-year vision for Spokane County’s transportation network. It encompasses projects and implementation measures which respect the region’s character and support anticipated growth and planned land use throughout the unincorporated county. The TE is a required element in a Growth Management Act (GMA) Comprehensive Plan for a county under RCW 36.70A.070(6).

The county’s transportation network is comprised of integrated road, rail, air, transit, and non-motorized modes of travel. Efficient transportation links that connect people, goods, services, and activities both within and to points outside the county are essential to sustain and grow economic activity, promote health and a sense of well-being, and support a vibrant community.

A. Purpose

The purpose of the TE is to present a plan for transportation facilities and services needed to support the county’s 2017-2037 future land use map. The TE recommends specific transportation projects for the unincorporated county in order to meet safety and capacity needs.

B. Planning Requirements

The County must coordinate its transportation planning with a variety of jurisdictions, including the City of Spokane, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC), neighboring jurisdictions, and the State of Washington as required by the Growth Management Act. Figure 1 shows the location of Spokane County within eastern Washington.

1. Growth Management Act

The State’s Growth Management Act (GMA) requires local governments to prepare a transportation plan consistent with that jurisdiction’s land use plan and financial planning. This Transportation Element update fulfills that mandate.

The following GMA planning goals are relevant to the TE:

- **Transportation.** Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans (Revised Code of Washington [RCW] 36.70A.020(3)).
- **Urban growth.** Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner (RCW 36.70A.020(1))
- **Environment.** Protect the environment and enhance the State’s high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water (RCW 36.70A.020(10)).
- **Citizen participation and coordination.** Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts (RCW 36.70A.020(11)).
- **Public facilities and services.** Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards (RCW 36.70A.020(12)).

C. Role of the Transportation Element

The Transportation Element services both as a functional plan to guide the County’s transportation investments, and as a required element addressing the overarching framework for transportation in Spokane County’s Comprehensive Plan. The document also ensures coordination with the other elements of the County’s Comprehensive Plan, including the Land Use Element.
The Transportation Element guides the development of the County's project planning document, the Transportation Improvement Program, by identifying the types of projects the County should undertake to support future travel needs. The plan also evaluates how these projects coincide with the community's priorities and financial resources.

D. Regional Coordination

The Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) serves as the federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Spokane County, as well as the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO). As an MPO, SRTC provides a forum for local decision-making on transportation issues of a regional nature. Required to represent localities in all urbanized areas (UZAs) with populations over 50,000, MPOs are mandated under federal law; when submitting transportation improvement programs (TIPs) to the state for inclusion in the statewide program, MPOs self-certify that they have met all federal requirements.

SRTC is made up of cities, towns, counties, ports, tribes, transit agencies, and state agencies. The agency has created policy for Spokane County through the Metropolitan Transportation Plan titled; Horizon 2040, which lays out long-term goals and policies for growth management, economic development, and transportation infrastructure.

RCW 47.80.26 requires SRTC to certify this Transportation Element is consistent with Horizon 2040. The County’s Transportation Element must:

- Reflect guidelines and principles established pursuant to RCW 47.80.026;
- Be consistent with the adopted 2040 Plan; and
• Conform to the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070.

Horizon 2040 identifies Guiding Principles to achieve its vision and mission for transportation in the region:

**Economic Vitality**
- Focus on people, freight and goods movement to improve regional, national and global competitiveness
- Enhance accessibility and connections to economic activity centers
- Prioritize multi-modal investments

**Cooperation and Leadership**
- Provide a regional forum to develop priorities
- Identify funding strategies
- Coordinate with stakeholders

**Stewardship**
- Protect the environment
- Follow federal, state and local legislation and policies
- Measure performance
- Share the use of infrastructure

**System Operations, Maintenance and Preservation**
- Preserve and prolong the life of infrastructure
- Use fiscal resources prudently
- Provide adequate funding
- Improve efficiency of system operations

**Safety and Security**
- Draw on best-practice design
- Utilize education and outreach
- Make use of operational strategies
- Protect critical infrastructure from external threats
- Improve maintenance of the transportation system

**Quality of Life**
- Offer safe and convenient forms of active transportation that support public health objectives
- Consider the needs of all transportation users regardless of ability
- Increase public transit access and improve service
- Improve transportation system connections
- Design to support social, cultural and commercial activities

This Transportation Element is consistent with and supports the Horizon 2040 Guiding Principles.
Section 2: Existing and Future Conditions

A. Transportation Network

The Spokane County transportation network is comprised of roadways, freight corridors, railways and air travel facilities, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and public transit. This network is represented in the figures below, and tables 1-11. To monitor the performance of the system, State highways are also included.

1. Existing Road and Highway Network

Highways, roads and streets are given a federal functional classification by the character of service they provide. This system was developed for transportation planning purposes by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Basic to this process is the recognition that individual routes do not serve the traveling public independently in any major way. Rather, most travel involves movement through a network of roads. Comprehensive transportation planning, an integral part of total economic and social development, uses functional classification to determine how travel can be channelized within the network in a logical and efficient manner. Functional classification defines the part that any particular route should play in serving the flow of trips through a highway/roadway network. Spokane County’s roadway network is comprised of an urban and rural roadway network with the following classifications:

a) Urban Road Functional Classifications (Figure 2)

i. Principal Arterials: The principal arterial is a two (or more)-lane, moderately fast facility designed to permit relatively unimpeded traffic flow between major traffic generators such as the central business district, major shopping centers, major employment districts, etc. They are generally in the highest-volume non-highway corridors and serve the longest trip desires. These arterials are the framework road system for the urbanized portion of the County and should be located on community and neighborhood boundaries. Frequently, the principal arterial system carries important intra-urban and intercity bus routes. Principal arterials should not bisect homogeneous areas such as residential neighborhoods, shopping centers, parks, etc. Access to principal arterials should be managed.

ii. Minor Arterials: Minor arterials interconnect and augment the principal arterial system. They are two (or more)-lane facilities, yet provide less mobility than principal arterials, with greater access to adjacent property frontage. Minor arterials may carry local bus routes and provide intra-community continuity, but should be located on community and neighborhood boundaries. They should not bisect residential neighborhoods.

iii. Collector Arterials: Collector arterials provide both access and circulation within residential neighborhoods, commercial and industrial areas. They primarily serve individual neighborhoods, distributing traffic from such generators as elementary schools and neighborhood stores to minor and principal arterials. Collector arterials are relatively low-speed, two-lane facilities that often provide for on-street parking.

iv. Local Access Roads: Local access roads provide access to adjacent property and
generally do not support through traffic. They are in the urban and rural areas. The alignment and traffic control measures on local access roads should encourage a slow, safe speed.

b) Rural Road Functional Classifications

i. **Minor Arterials**: Minor arterials provide service for trips of moderate length, serve geographic areas that are smaller than their higher Arterial counterparts, and offer connectivity to the higher Arterial system. Minor Arterials in rural areas are typically designed to provide relatively high overall travel speeds, with minimum interference to through-movement. They also provide service to corridors with trip lengths and travel density greater than those served by Rural Collectors and Local roads.

ii. **Major Collectors**: Rural major collector roads serve larger towns not already served by higher class roadways. This road classification may also serve to connect one portion of the urban area to another portion of the urban area. They are moderately fast facilities that are two or four lanes wide. Rural major collector roads are wider and carry more traffic than the rural minor collectors.

iii. **Minor Collectors**: Rural minor collector roads are moderately fast facilities that are two lanes wide and provide a link between the major collector arterials and rural local access roads. They typically provide service to remaining smaller communities and link locally important traffic generators with their rural hinterland.

iv. **Local Access Roads**: Local access roads provide access to adjacent property and generally do not support through traffic. They are located in the urban and rural areas. The alignment and traffic control measures on local access roads should encourage a slow, safe speed.
Figure 2 - Federal Functional Classification (for larger image CLICK HERE)
c) Interstates and highways

i. **Interstates:** Interstates provide high speed, highly managed access control, and generally the highest volume free-flow travel between regional and national destinations. These facilities are typically managed by State Department of Transportations and are guided by federal guidelines.

ii. **State Highways:** State highways generally provide limited managed access control free-flow travel between regional destinations. These facilities within Spokane County generally connect smaller towns and cities and typically have higher speeds in the rural settings.

B. Motorized Vehicles

The majority of travel within unincorporated Spokane County consists of motor vehicles as their primary mode of transportation. The motor vehicles travel along roadway segments and pass through intersections, both of which have been evaluated based on their ability to accommodate travel demands. Each corridor and intersection studied have been rated into one of six level of service (LOS) categories based on the volume of traffic that they accommodate compared to the general threshold of similar type of facilities. Ratings from an LOS A to a LOS F correspond to a typical range of uncongested/free-flowing to congested facilities. The LOS definitions, as described in Chapter 16 of the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), are utilized by Spokane County and are summarized below:

- **LOS A:** Primarily free flow conditions. Motorists are completed unimpeded and can maneuver freely.
- **LOS B:** Reasonably unimpeded conditions. Motorist maneuvers may be slightly restricted.
- **LOS C:** Stable conditions. Motorist maneuvers may be more restricted by other vehicles.
- **LOS D:** Less stable conditions. Motorists can still maneuver, but may incorporate additional delays.
- **LOS E:** Unstable and near capacity conditions. Motorists will experience significant delays and reduced speeds.
- **LOS F:** At or over capacity conditions. Motorists will experience significant delays and extremely slow speeds.

Spokane County has established LOS criteria for County owned facilities:
- **LOS D** for signalized intersections
- **LOS E** for unsignalized intersections
- For evaluation of system performance, **LOS D** for roadway segments

WSDOT establishes LOS standards for interstates and highways of statewide significance (HSS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOS for Non-HSS</th>
<th>LOS for HSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Existing segment volumes and Level of Service (LOS)
Spokane County, in conjunction with WSDOT, compiled traffic counts along roadways segments and at arterial intersections throughout the unincorporated County. Figure 3, Figure 5 and Figure 7 illustrate the existing rural, urban arterial and state highway traffic volumes as well as the corresponding segment LOS.

a) Intersection Level of Service (LOS)

The County arterial intersections and County road/state highway intersections were evaluated utilizing the latest traffic counts conducted by Spokane County and WSDOT. The results of this analysis are contained in intersection inventory Tables 1-12.

2. Existing Deficiencies

A review of the existing Spokane County road system and state highway system indicates an overall good LOS on roadway/highway segments. The segments of county arterials and state highways indicating LOS deficiencies are listed below. The review of existing intersections LOS is covered in Tables 1-12. For urban arterials and urban state highways, the standard is set at LOS D; for rural arterials and rural state highways, the standard is set at LOS C.

a) Urban area county arterials that show existing LOS deficiencies are:

- Country Homes Boulevard from Excel Drive to Wall Street
  This segment has one lane in each direction with a landscaped median. Traffic signals control traffic on each end, these signalized intersections have multi-lane approaches. With this configuration, a special LOS table specifically for this segment was developed which indicates an LOS D.

- Argonne Road from Spokane River Bridge to Maringo Drive
  See section B.

- Hawthorne Road from US 395 to US 2
  The existing traffic volumes do indicate an unsatisfactory segment LOS, however, the signals on each end of the segment indicate an acceptable LOS D.

b) Rural area county arterials that show existing LOS deficiencies are:

- Bigelow Gulch Road from Palmer Road to Weile Road
  projects for Bigelow Gulch/Forker Connector are planned and in the current six-year TIP.

- Freya Street from Francis Avenue to North Spokane Corridor ramp roundabout
  This segment has very high existing volume of traffic, this is due to the NSC terminating at Francis Avenue. With the planned extension of the NSC to I-90, this will reduce traffic on Freya to an acceptable LOS.

- Forker Road from Bigelow Gulch to Palmer Road
  projects for Bigelow Gulch/Forker Connector are planned and in the current six-year TIP.

- Trails Road from Hayford Road to Government Way
This segment is not over capacity but has an unsatisfactory LOS.

3. Future Conditions

The Transportation Element forecasts future traffic volumes and impacts to the county arterial and state highway system assuming the development described in the Land Use Element. There is a direct link between land use and subsequent transportation impacts, and this element captures the relationship.

The future forecasting (year 2040) documented in this element reflects the approved land uses as described in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Land uses are closely tied to future forecasting of traffic on the roadways and are further explained below. For further information on land use, see Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 of the Spokane County Comprehensive Plan.

Spokane County uses the Regional Demand Model to forecast future travel behavior. The Regional Demand Model is developed by SRTC, utilizing computer software to analyze future travel behavior. After a base travel demand model is created, population and employment numbers are adjusted to represent future conditions (anticipated for the year 2040). Forecast year for this Transportation Element is 2037; by using the 2040 regional transportation model, this analysis offers a more conservative look into travel in Spokane County. This growth is then overlaid into the base model to forecast future travel demand.

The Regional Demand Model is post-processed to account for known population and employment growth that could not have been foreseen in the forecast model inputs. This is achieved by reviewing current land actions, including building permits, preliminary plats, binding site plans and other land actions that have been approved.

The post-processing of the Regional Demand Model results in a forecast of average daily traffic on county arterial and state highway segments. The daily forecast traffic volumes show overall increases on the road and highway system. Capacity improvement projects such as the North Spokane Corridor (NSC) and Bigelow Gulch, offer relief to arterials in areas around the NSC.

Future segment volumes and Level of Service (LOS): Figure 4 and Figure 6 illustrate the existing rural and urban arterial traffic volumes as well as the corresponding segment LOS. Detailed discussion and methodology, of the future traffic forecasting are provided in the Appendix to this element.
Figure 3 - Existing LOS - Rural (for larger image CLICK HERE)
Figure 4 - 2040 LOS - Rural (for larger image CLICK HERE)
Figure 5 - Existing LOS Urban (for larger image CLICK HERE)
Figure 6 - 2040 LOS Urban (for larger image CLICK HERE)
Figure 7 - Existing LOS State Highways (for larger image CLICK HERE)
Figure 8 - 2040 LOS State Highways (for larger image [CLICK HERE])
A. Intersection Level of Service (LOS)

The County arterial intersections and County road/state highway intersections were evaluated for future conditions in both the 6-year forecast and for the year 2040. The results of this analysis are contained in intersection inventory tables 1-12. Where deficiencies were identified by the analysis, mitigation projects were proposed and listed in the footnotes in the tables for both the 6-year forecast and in the year 2040.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Arterial</th>
<th>Principal Arterial</th>
<th>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</th>
<th>Current LOS (2017)</th>
<th>6-Year Projected LOS (2022)</th>
<th>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market St. @ Hawthorne Rd.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St. @ Farwell Rd.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Rd. @ Hastings Rd.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan Rd. @ 32nd Ave.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall St. @ Country Homes</td>
<td>Signal / add turn lanes</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F/D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Arterial</th>
<th>Minor Arterial</th>
<th>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</th>
<th>Current LOS (2017)</th>
<th>6-Year Projected LOS (2022)</th>
<th>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams Rd. @ 32nd Ave.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argonne Rd. @ Upriver Dr.</td>
<td>Signal / add turn lanes</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Rd. @ Euclid Ave.</td>
<td>Stop / add Channelization</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F/E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki Rd. @ Hawthorne Rd.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Rd. @ Parksmith Dr.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St. @ Parksmith Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market St. @ Magnesium Rd.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Rd. / Waikiki @ Waikiki Rd.</td>
<td>Roundabout / add slip lane</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E/C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe St. @ Wall St.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palouse Hwy. @ 57th Ave.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan Rd. @ Saltese Ave.</td>
<td>Stop / Signal or roundabout</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F/C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Rd. @ Wellesley Ave.</td>
<td>all-way / Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F/C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleway Ave @ Wellesley Ave. Extension</td>
<td>Stop / roundabout</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F/C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Rd. @ Kaiser Blvd. (New)</td>
<td>roundabout</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Minor Arterial Intersecting Minor Arterial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Arterial</th>
<th>Minor Arterial</th>
<th>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</th>
<th>Current LOS (2017)</th>
<th>6-Year Projected LOS (2022)</th>
<th>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forker Rd.</td>
<td>@ Progress Rd. / Evergreen</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenrose Rd.</td>
<td>@ Carnahan</td>
<td>Yield / Roundabout</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenrose Rd.</td>
<td>@ 29th Ave.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Rd.</td>
<td>@ Thorpe Rd.</td>
<td>4 Way Stop / Roundabout</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regal Rd.</td>
<td>@ 57th Ave.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Ave.</td>
<td>@ River Rd.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Ave.</td>
<td>@ Starr</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geiger</td>
<td>@ Hayford</td>
<td>Stop/Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F/D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandermere</td>
<td>@ Dartford</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill / Dartford</td>
<td>@ Little Spokane Drive</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Spokane Drive</td>
<td>@ Colbert</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Principal Arterial Intersecting Collector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Arterial</th>
<th>Collector Arterial</th>
<th>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</th>
<th>Current LOS (2017)</th>
<th>6-Year Projected LOS (2022)</th>
<th>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wall St.</td>
<td>@ Cascade Way</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argonne Rd.</td>
<td>@ Columbia</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall St.</td>
<td>@ Whitworth Dr.</td>
<td>Stop / channelization</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F/C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argonne</td>
<td>@ Maringo</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>@ Peone</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>@ Eastmont</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall St.</td>
<td>@ Holland</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>@ Regina</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>@ Lincoln</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>@ Five Mile</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Homes Blvd.</td>
<td>@ Warn Way</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Homes Blvd.</td>
<td>@ Weipert Dr.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>Collector Arterial</td>
<td>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</td>
<td>Current LOS (2017)</td>
<td>Projected LOS (2022)</td>
<td>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upriver</td>
<td>@ Maringo Dr.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upriver</td>
<td>@ Farr Road</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>@ Lyons</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aero</td>
<td>@ Westbow</td>
<td>Stop / Roundabout</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/B&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57th</td>
<td>@ Freya</td>
<td>Stop / Roundabout</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/B&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57th</td>
<td>@ Crestline</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57th</td>
<td>@ Helena</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th</td>
<td>@ Glenrose</td>
<td>Stop / improvement</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F/C&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>@ Dartford</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Ave.</td>
<td>@ McKinzie Rd.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Rd.</td>
<td>@ Whitworth Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Rd.</td>
<td>@ Rowan Ave.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starr Rd.</td>
<td>@ Rowan Ave.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starr Rd.</td>
<td>@ Joseph</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Ave.</td>
<td>@ Idaho Rd.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Ave.</td>
<td>@ Campbell Rd.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road</td>
<td>@ Starr Rd.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid Road</td>
<td>@ Lynden</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starr Rd.</td>
<td>@ Kildea</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Rd.</td>
<td>@ Kildea</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Ave.</td>
<td>@ Kenney</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Ave.</td>
<td>@ Lynden</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Ave.</td>
<td>@ Chase</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regal</td>
<td>@ 63rd</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>@ Assembly</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Spokane Dr.</td>
<td>@ Midway</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Spokane Dr.</td>
<td>@ Cincinnati Dr.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandermere</td>
<td>@ Glencrest Dr.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st. Ave (New)</td>
<td>@ Craig Rd.</td>
<td>Stop / improvement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>F/B&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6: Principal Arterial Intersecting Local Access (Signalized)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Arterial</th>
<th>Local Access Road</th>
<th>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</th>
<th>Current LOS (2017)</th>
<th>6-Year Projected LOS (2022)</th>
<th>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argonne</td>
<td>@ Wellesley</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: Selected Urban Arterial Intersecting Rural Arterial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Arterial</th>
<th>Rural Arterial</th>
<th>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</th>
<th>Current LOS (2017)</th>
<th>6-Year Projected LOS (2022)</th>
<th>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hayford</td>
<td>@ Deno</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Selected Rural Arterial Intersecting Rural Arterial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Arterial</th>
<th>Rural Arterial</th>
<th>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</th>
<th>Current LOS (2017)</th>
<th>6-Year Projected LOS (2022)</th>
<th>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argonne</td>
<td>@ Bigelow Gulch</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker Rd.</td>
<td>@ 32nd Ave.</td>
<td>All Way Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleway Ave.</td>
<td>@ Spokane Bridge Road</td>
<td>Stop / improvement</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F/D17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Urban Arterial Intersecting future arterial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Arterial</th>
<th>Future Arterial</th>
<th>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</th>
<th>Current LOS (2017)</th>
<th>6-Year Projected LOS (2022)</th>
<th>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barker Road</td>
<td>Chapman Road</td>
<td>Stop / Roundabout</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F/A18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32st</td>
<td>Chapman Road</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hayford</td>
<td>Thorpe Rd.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Rd.</td>
<td>@ Kaiser Blvd. (New)</td>
<td>roundabout</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: Urban Minor Arterial Intersecting City Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Minor Arterial</th>
<th>City Street / Private Access</th>
<th>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</th>
<th>Current LOS (2017)</th>
<th>6-Year Projected LOS (2022)</th>
<th>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hayford Rd.</td>
<td>@ Northern Quest Drive</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Way</td>
<td>@ Ft. George Wright Dr.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Collector</td>
<td>Urban Collector</td>
<td>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</td>
<td>Current LOS (2017)</td>
<td>6-Year Projected LOS (2022)</td>
<td>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbow</td>
<td>@ Hayford</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>@ Thorpe (east)</td>
<td>Stop / improvement</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F/D&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>F/C&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandermere</td>
<td>@ Hatch</td>
<td>Stop / Roundabout</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F/B&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake Road</td>
<td>@ Liberty Dr.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>@ Euclid</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenney</td>
<td>@ Euclid</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>@ Rowan</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td>@ Joseph</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestline</td>
<td>@ 63rd</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>@ 63th</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freya</td>
<td>@ 65th</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr</td>
<td>@ Maringo</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>@ Belle Terre</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starr</td>
<td>@ Kildea</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch</td>
<td>@ Midway</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>@ Sprague</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>@ Henry</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weipert</td>
<td>@ Price</td>
<td>All-way Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>County Arerial</td>
<td>Existing Intersection Control / Proposed mitigation</td>
<td>Current LOS (2017)</td>
<td>6-Year Projected LOS (2022)</td>
<td>20-Year Projected LOS (2037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2 (Newport Hwy) @</td>
<td>Farwell Rd.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E/D²²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2 (Newport Hwy) @</td>
<td>Nevada Rd.</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 206 (Mt. Spokane Park Dr) @</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 290 @</td>
<td>McKenzie Rd.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N/A²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 395 (Division St.) @</td>
<td>Hawthorne Rd.</td>
<td>Signal / NSC</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 395 (Division St.) @</td>
<td>Hastings Rd.</td>
<td>Signal / NSC</td>
<td>*D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 395 (Division St.) @</td>
<td>Whitworth Dr. / Regina Dr.</td>
<td>Stop / channelization</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F/C²⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2 (Newport Hwy) @</td>
<td>Day Mt. Spokane Rd</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 290 (Trent) @</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Stop / BTV</td>
<td>*E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F/C²⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 290 (Trent) @</td>
<td>Starr</td>
<td>Stop / roundabout</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F/B²⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2 (Newport Hwy) @</td>
<td>Costco Access Road</td>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2 (Newport Hwy) @</td>
<td>Aluminum Ave. (New)</td>
<td>N/A / Roundabout</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farwell Road @</td>
<td>Altamont (New)</td>
<td>N/A / Channelization</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2 (Newport Hwy) @</td>
<td>Colbert</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 902 @</td>
<td>Geiger</td>
<td>Stop / roundabout</td>
<td>F/B²⁷</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F/B²⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 902 @</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 902 @</td>
<td>Hayford (New)</td>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2 @</td>
<td>21st (New)</td>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 27 @</td>
<td>40th</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2 (Newport Hwy) @</td>
<td>SR 206</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E/D²⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2 (Newport Hwy) @</td>
<td>Green Bluff Rd.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Spokane Corridor @</td>
<td>Farwell Rd.</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Spokane Corridor @</td>
<td>Parksmith Road</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 291 @</td>
<td>Seven Mile Rd.</td>
<td>Stop / improvement</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F/D³⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footnote number</td>
<td>Proposed mitigation project to achieve acceptable LOS</td>
<td>Footnote number</td>
<td>Proposed mitigation project to achieve acceptable LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>add E/W Lt turn lanes, add N/S Rt. turn lanes, replace signal &amp; revise signal phasing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Realign intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>add E/W left turn lanes, replace signal &amp; revise signal phasing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>install roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>install channelization</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Realign intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>add northbound slip lane to roundabout</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>intersection improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>install traffic signal or roundabout</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>install roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Replace all-way stop with traffic signal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Add second NB Left Turn Lane and intersection improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>install roundabout</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Road Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>New intersection, install roundabout</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Channelization - Right in / Right out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>install roundabout (safety project)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bridging the Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>install roundabout</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Install Roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>install traffic signal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Install Roundabout (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>install channelization</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Roundabout Reconfiguration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>install roundabout</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>intersection improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>install roundabout (safety project)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>intersection improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>intersection improvement</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Roundabout Reconfiguration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>intersection improvement</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Turning counts estimated from ADT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turning counts estimated from ADT</th>
<th>underlined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B. Future Mitigation

i. Urban area County arterials requiring future mitigation strategies are:
   - Country Homes Boulevard from Excel Drive to Wall Street

   The increase in forecast volumes does lower the LOS on this segment, the LOS table indicates a forecast LOS F. The traffic signal improvement indicated in Table 1 for the intersection of Country Homes and Wall will improve the operation to acceptable LOS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Homes Boulevard from Excel Drive to Wall Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Argonne Road from Spokane River Bridge to Maringo Drive (LOS F)
  This segment of Argonne indicates a failing existing LOS. The future traffic volume is
  influenced by the construction of the NSC. Traffic volumes decrease in the forecast
  year to 30,000 vehicles per day, bringing the segment to an acceptable LOS D.

- Hawthorne Road from US 395 to US 2
  The traffic volumes do increase in the forecast year, however, the signals indicate an
  acceptable LOS D. Since the traffic signals are the controlling capacity factor on
  segments, no capacity improvements are recommended to the segment. Spokane
  County will continue to monitor this roadway segment into the future.

- Hawthorne Road from Nevada to Kaiser Blvd.
  Future forecast volumes (18,900 vehicles per day) will degrade LOS below acceptable
  standards. Therefore, a capacity improvement project will need to be planned to
  coordinate with the area’s development and growth as warranted.

### Hawthorne Road from Nevada Street to Kaiser Blvd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation measure</th>
<th>Capacity improvement project. Construct 5 lane urban arterial.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
<td>unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
<td>Tax increment financing, State/Federal grants, Development contribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. Rural area county arterials that show forecast LOS deficiencies are:

- Trails Road from Hayford Road to Government Way
  This segment is not expected to be over capacity but will have an unsatisfactory LOS.

iii. State highways that show forecast LOS deficiencies are:

- US 395 from Monroe Road to Stevens County Line
  This segment has a future forecast LOS D
  There are northbound and southbound passing lanes that were not reflected in the
  LOS analysis that may indicate an acceptable LOS for this segment. No mitigation
  measure is proposed for this segment.
-US 2 from Nevada to North Access Road (Costco)
This segment has a future forecast LOS E/F, and is currently governed by the traffic signal at Nevada and the roundabout at North Access Road (Costco).

The completion of the NSC will have an impact to this segment of highway, many commuter trip and the majority of freight trips will be shifted to the NSC. Area development will also add arterial and collectors in the surrounding area that will improve local circulation, and thus, reduce stress on this segment of US 2. The future extension of transit service north of Hawthorne should be studied for the beneficial impacts to this highway segment. Additionally, a transit center park and ride is planned at Farwell and the North Spokane Corridor, this may also impact travel demand on this segment of US 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US 2 from Nevada to North Access Road (Costco)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- US 2 from Milan Road to Pend Oreille county line
This segment has a future forecast LOS D

This segment of 2-lane highway, is served by 4-lane highways at the north (in Pend Oreille County) and south (at Westwood Ave.). There are northbound and southbound passing lanes that were not reflected in the LOS analysis that may indicate an acceptable LOS for this segment. No mitigation measure is proposed for this segment.

- US 2 from Espanola Road to Fairchild Airforce Base
This segment has a future forecast LOS D
Improving local area network and circulation will improve highway performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US 2 from Espanola Road to Fairchild Airforce Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-US 2 from Fairchild Airforce Base to Craig
This segment has a future forecast LOS E
21st Avenue is currently being planned by Spokane County, Airway Heights and City of Spokane. This parallel arterial to US 2 has the potential to relieve congestion on US 2 and provide improved circulation. 10th and 12th Avenue in Airway Heights, City of Spokane and Spokane County are planned to be improved / constructed by the year 2040, Deno Road is also being planned for improvement, these parallel routes to US 2 are part of the plan to reduce future congestion on US 2 and improve circulation. The West Plains / US 2 transportation study is currently underway in 2019/2020, this study will also explore opportunities for maintaining the highways performance to acceptable LOS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US 2 from Fairchild Airforce Base to Craig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-SR 290 from Barker Road to Starr Road
This segment has a future forecast LOS E
Adding passing lanes on 2-lane highways improves LOS. Bridging the Valley (BTV) will also improve the highways performance by removing friction at intersections, by both grade separation and closing low volume at-grand railroad crossing at adjacent intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR 290 from Barker Road to Starr Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-SR 904 from Cheney City Limits to I-90
This segment has a future forecast LOS E
Adding passing lanes on 2-lane highways improves LOS. STA has express transit service from Downtown Spokane to City of Cheney, and this is on STA’s High Performance Transit (HPT) Network. The HPT and additional transit service should be studied to improve LOS on this highway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR 904 from Cheney City Limits to I-90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-SR 902 from Medical Lake City Limits to Hayford (New)
This segment has a future forecast LOS D
This segment of highway is on the Urban / Rural border. It is anticipated by the year 2040, SR 902 will be in the Urban area. LOS D is acceptable LOS for Urban Highways, therefore, no mitigation would be required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR 902 from Medical Lake City Limits to Hayford (New)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- SR 902 from Hayford (New) to I-90
  This segment has a future forecast LOS F
  With the realigning of Hayford Road around the proposed SIA 3rd runway, this segment is forecast to have failing level of service and a capacity improvement project should be planned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR 902 from Hayford (New) to I-90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- State Highway / County Road intersections
  Table 12 outlines the 6-year and 2040 forecast LOS for each State Highway / County Road intersection. The footnotes to the table list the mitigation projects that should be planned to mitigate the LOS deficiency. Intersections requiring mitigation are covered below. Two intersections; US 395 at Hawthorne and US 395 at Hastings, do not show mitigation for the forecast LOS deficiency. These two intersections will be greatly influenced by the completion on the NSC and should not plan or allocate future funding to improve capacity at these intersections until the full effect of a completed NSC is known. Intersections with a “(New)” designation on the County Road name in Table 12, indicates proposed State/County intersections, these will also be covered in the mitigation measures listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US 2 (Newport Highway) @ Farwell Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SR 290 @ McKenzie Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>US 395 (Division St.) @ Whitworth Dr. / Regina Dr.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SR 290 (Trent) @ Harvard Road</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SR 290 (Trent) @ Starr Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation measure</th>
<th>Install roundabout.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
<td>State/Federal grant funding, safety funding, regional legislative request for funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SR 902 @ Geiger Blvd. (2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation measure</th>
<th>Install roundabout.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
<td>funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
<td>This project is funded by state gas tax.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SR 902 @ Geiger Blvd. (After realignment of Hayford Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation measure</th>
<th>Reconfigure roundabout.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
<td>unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
<td>State/Federal grant funding, regional legislative request for funding and development contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2 (Newport Highway) @ SR 206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation measure</strong></td>
<td>Local roadway network circulation improvements and intersection LOS &amp; safety improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning level costs</strong></td>
<td>Local area network: $7,350,000 Intersection improvement: $2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding status</strong></td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential funding sources</strong></td>
<td>State/Federal grant funding, safety funding, Tax increment financing and developer contribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US 2 @ 21st Ave. (New)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation measure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning level costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential funding sources</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR 902 @ Hayford Road (New)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation measure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning level costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential funding sources</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### US 2 @ Aluminum Ave. (New – Kaiser US 2 south entrance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation measure</th>
<th>Install roundabout.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
<td>Tax increment financing and development contribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Farwell Road @ Altamont (New – Kaiser Farwell entrance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation measure</th>
<th>Turn Restrictions and Channelization.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
<td>Tax increment financing and development contribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SR 291 @ Seven Mile Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation measure</th>
<th>Intersection improvement (mini roundabout).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning level costs</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding status</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential funding sources</td>
<td>State/Federal grant funding, regional legislative request for funding and development contribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv. **Arterial Road Plan**

The Arterial Road Plan (ARP) is a map of existing and proposed Spokane County Arterials. The ARP shows; existing roadways, future proposed roadway changes, future proposed County arterials and Transportation Study Areas. See Figure 9.
Figure 9 - Arterial Road Plan (for larger image CLICK HERE)
C. Freight Movement, Rail Facilities, & Air Travel Facilities

1. Freight and Good Transportation System (FGTS)

The Washington State Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS) is a classification system for roadways, railways, and waterways based on freight tonnage. The FGTS is updated every two years to establish funding eligibility for Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board grants, support transportation planning processes, and support freight investment decisions. (WSDOT, 2019)

FGTS truck freight corridors are classified into five categories, T-1 through T-5, based on annual gross truck tonnage:

- T-1 more than 10 million tons per year
- T-2 4 million to 10 million tons per year
- T-3 300,000 to 4 million tons per year
- T-4 100,000 to 300,000 tons per year
- T-5 at least 20,000 tons in 60 days and less than 100,000 tons per year

T1 corridors are the most heavily used freight corridors; T1 corridors within Spokane County include I-90 and Argonne Road from I-90 to Bigelow Gulch Road. T2 corridors have high freight movement and include corridors such as Bigelow Gulch, Bruce Road and US 195. The Spokane County Freight and Goods System is shown in Figure 10. Spokane County Road Standards support freight movement and are consistent with SRTC’s regional freight network.

a) Future Conditions: Freight movement is vital to a region’s economy. Reducing bottlenecks and monitoring congestion are essential steps to maintaining efficient movement of goods, allowing freighters to avoid shipping delays, keep costs down, and maintain delivery reliability. The Bigelow Gulch/Forker Road Connector is an important project for freight movement in Spokane County: this project is currently underway, with a scheduled completion date of 2022. Bridging the Valley (BTV), another significant freight project, will construct grade separation at SR 290 and Harvard Road. Spokane County will coordinate with SRTC, BNSF and WSDOT as funding becomes available.
Figure 10 - Freight & Goods Transportation System and Air Travel Facilities
(for larger image CLICK HERE)
2. **Rail Facilities**

The Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF), the Geiger Spur (Spokane County), Washington Idaho Railway (WSDOT), and the Eastern Washington Gateway (WSDOT) operate rail facilities within Spokane County. All railway lines have crossings at county infrastructure intersections; the county continuously reviews opportunities to enhance safety for at-grade crossings to further enhance the movement of goods throughout the region.

3. **Air Travel Facilities**

Spokane County supports air transportation by coordinating regionally the roads and railways that serve Spokane International Airport (SIA). SIA is planning an expansion through the construction of a 3rd runway. To accommodate this development, Spokane County and regional partners are planning a Hayford Road realignment project. Long range planning efforts which include air transportation are essential to supporting the movement of goods and people.

D. **Pedestrian Facilities**

1. **Existing Facilities**

Spokane County is comprised of both rural and urban characteristics. As such, rural roadways may not have sidewalk but may have a gravel or paved shoulder for pedestrians use. Urban roadways may include sidewalks, curb ramps, and crosswalks along the facilities for pedestrians. These facilities aid in the safety of pedestrian users of all ages and abilities, including children attending schools, commuters taking the bus or connecting with a carpool to get to work, and senior citizens making midday trips.

Generally, sidewalks are provided along many of the principal and minor arterials within the urban limits of the county. Separated sidewalks are desired along roadways. Spokane County Road Standards help to facilitate the development of such accommodations as new development occurs. Generally, wide paved or gravel shoulders are provided along the rural arterials to aid in pedestrian access, although pedestrian activity typically occurs at a lesser rate in rural areas than urban.

Both the rural and urban systems contain gaps which may cause an increase in short vehicle trips due to lack of pedestrian facilities. Gaps may include the lack of curb ramps, the lack of adequate shoulders between destinations, and the interruption of sidewalk due to lack of connectivity. **Figure 11** illustrates the existing pedestrian facilities within Spokane County.

The county also has an ADA Transition Plan, to enhance the pedestrian facilities across the county.
Figure 11 - Pedestrian Facilities (for larger image CLICK HERE)
2. Pedestrian Plan
   The development of a pedestrian plan, see Figure 11, is important to the goals outlined in the Spokane County Comprehensive Plan. This plan shows the inventory of sidewalks, barriers to pedestrians, and potential gaps in paths of travel. A pedestrian plan is a vital piece in identifying planning improvements where they are most needed, such as developing routes to priority destinations, including transit bus stops and schools.

3. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
   As a federal mandate, the ADA requires public facilities to be made accessible to all users regardless of ability. This requirement includes public sidewalks and pathways. Public agencies possessing non-compliant facilities must develop an ADA transition plan. In compliance with ADA, Spokane County developed an ADA transition plan in 2015; this document guides the improvement of the county’s public facilities. It inventories barriers to individuals with disabilities, and outlines an infrastructure and financial plan to bring these facilities into compliance.

4. Existing Deficiencies
   The Pedestrian Plan plays a vital role in the improvement of pedestrian facilities. The plan indicates barriers and gaps in the system for pedestrian travel, facilitating the develop of projects to correct these deficiencies. Gaps in pedestrian facilities, limited and/or inadequate crossings, and other deficiencies may isolate areas of the County and lead to individuals driving for short trips which may otherwise be made on foot or bicycle, adding unnecessary trips to the County roadway network. Federal and state grant funding sources may be sought to fund the improvement of existing gaps and other deficiencies.

5. Future Conditions
   The Pedestrian Plan, see Figure 11, guides short-term (6-year TIP) and long-range (7 to 20-year) planning efforts, allowing for the identification of needed improvements of Spokane County’s pedestrian facilities. Spokane County Public Works will continue to coordinate with school districts in planning and seeking grant funds to facilitate safe walking routes to school. To encourage transit ridership, pedestrian routes to transit stops will be reviewed for feasibility and integrated into planning and capital project development when appropriate. The pedestrian plan will be used for supporting regional trails such as the Centennial Trail and the Children of the Sun Trail; Spokane County will continue to work to develop plans and seek funding for eliminating gaps in the multi-use path system of the Centennial trail, such as the Argonne Road gap. To support the Children of the Sun Trail, Spokane County will identify local system and development needs to improve connectivity to the Children of the Sun Trail.

E. Bicycle Facilities

1. Existing Facilities
   Bicycle facilities are crucial to the facilitation of safe non-motorized travel throughout Spokane County. These facilities are accessed by a variety of users, from school-age bicyclists and families, to commuter cyclists and those who travel over 20 miles in one cycling outing. A variety of bicycle facilities exist throughout the county, including dedicated bike lanes, shared-use paths, and shared-bike friendly routes. Much like the pedestrian facilities, there are gaps in the bicycle network that may cause bicyclists to cross, or travel with, vehicle traffic.
2. Bicycle Plan
The Bicycle Plan serves to promote bicycle transportation countywide, as well as increasing safety and convenience for non-motorized modes of travel (Goal T.3e). In addition, supporting the regional trail system is a cornerstone of Spokane County bicycle facilities goals and policies.

The Spokane County Comprehensive Plan supports the development of a bicycle plan. This plan shows the inventory of bike routes, and facilities including bike lanes and pathways, as well as potential gaps in bike routes. The plan is also critical to identifying and planning improvements where they are most needed. The Spokane County Bicycle Plan was developed through coordination with the regional bike plan (published by SRTC), area city bicycle plans (City of Spokane and City of Spokane Valley), and WSDOT. The Spokane County Bicycle Plan is shown in Figure 12.

i. Planning for Growth
To plan for growth, promote a healthy community, and to provide for alternative modes of travel, Spokane County Road Standards require new urban developments located on bike routes to accommodate bicycles through frontage developments.

3. Existing Deficiencies
The Bicycle Plan plays a vital role in planning the improvement of bike facilities. The plan indicates barriers and gaps in the system for bicycle travel, laying the groundwork for planning projects to address deficiencies. Gaps in the network may create “high stress” environments in which cyclists must navigate through vehicle traffic or difficult arterial crossings to complete their journey. Federal and state grant funding sources may be sought to fund the improvement of existing gaps and other deficiencies.

4. Future Conditions
The Bicycle Plan helps to guide short-term (6-year TIP) and long-range (7 to 20-year plan) bicycle infrastructure needs, identifying and planning for the improvement of Spokane County’s bike facilities. Spokane County will continue support regional trails such as the Centennial Trail and the Children of the Sun Trail. To support the Centennial Trail, Spokane County will continue planning efforts to develop plans and projects, and seek funding for gaps in the multi-use path system, such as at Argonne Road. To support the Children of the Sun Trail, Spokane County will plan local system and development activities to allow for connectivity to the trail.

F. Public Transit
Public transit within Spokane County is provided by Spokane Transit Authority (STA), a municipal corporation operating within the voter-established Public Transportation Benefit Area. This is a vital service for many county residents, connecting commercial and activity centers to residential areas, and is crucial to the reduction of trips on the County roadway network. STA routes within Spokane County are illustrated in Figure 13. Spokane County coordinates closely with STA on current and planned routes to serve existing and future development. The STA Comprehensive Plan contains the development of a High Performance Transit (HPT) Network, shown in Figure 14. The STA Comprehensive Plan can be found at:

https://www.spokanetransit.com/projects-plans/comprehensive-plan
Figure 12 - Bicycle Plan (for larger image CLICK HERE)
Figure 13 - STA Existing Routes (for larger image CLICK HERE)
Figure 14 - STA High Performance Transit Network (for larger image CLICK HERE)
G. Commute Trip Reduction

In 1993, Spokane County implemented the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Law (RCW 70.94.521-5 5 1) to reduce traffic congestion, air pollution and petroleum consumption through employer-based programs that encourage the use of alternatives to driving alone. Alternatives include riding the bus, carpooling, vanpooling, bicycling, walking, working a compressed work week or teleworking.

The law requires major employers to develop and implement an employee commute program to reduce the number and length of drive-alone commute trips made to the worksite. Local jurisdictions implemented ordinances to define how the law would apply to employers in their area.

To further the Goals (T.11) and Policies (T.11.1 – T.11.6) of the Spokane County Comprehensive plan, Spokane County operates the Smart Commute Northwest Program (formerly the Commute Trip Reduction Program).

H. Forecast of Future Needs and Financing Plan

1. Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Spokane County adopts a six-year transportation improvement program (TIP) each year. In addition, Spokane County amends this plan throughout the year for a variety of reasons, including updating funding sources and project estimates. This allows Spokane County to program projects based upon need and funding.

County intersections showing deficiencies in the 6-year horizon of the TIP, are listed in the footnotes to Tables 1-11 as mitigation projects. The projects have been added to the six-year TIP, and potential funding sources are also identified for the projects.

The current Six-Year TIP can be found at:

https://www.spokanecounty.org/983/Program-Development

2. 20-year Financing plan and proposed mitigation financing – Transportation

The yearly adoption of the TIP as mentioned above will continue for the foreseeable future to the end of the 20-year financing plan. The 20-year financing plan outlines the expected revenue for the years beyond the current 6-year TIP, which would be the years 7 through 20.

This 20-year financing plan outlines the expected average revenue for the years beyond the six-year TIP. **Table 13** below shows the average yearly projected revenue by revenue source to finance the 20-year transportation program.
The 20-year financing shows revenue that will be spent on capital projects, such as; improvements projects, pavement preservation, stormwater, safety improvements, multi-modal (Ped/Bike) projects and proposed mitigation for level-of-service (LOS) deficiencies shown in this Transportation Element. The projects to mitigate the intersection LOS deficiencies shown Tables 1-11 for the 20-year financing plan total approximately $5 million. For County road segment projects, such as; Hawthorne Road, Deno Road and 21st Avenue, a combination of County revenue and grant funding is projected to be used to construct the projects. For the 20-year financing plan, these projects total approximately $8.3 million. The sources of revenue shown in Table 13 will be projected to be used to fund intersection LOS deficiency projects and road segment projects.

Expenditures for the 20-year financing plan are expected to fall within the yearly average and the total revenue shown in Table 13. The 20-year financing includes financial commitments from the impacts of development that are made concurrent with the development. Spokane County will continue to balance anticipated expenditures and revenues against the needs of the community and to appropriately accommodate current and future growth through the use of funding mechanisms aforementioned over the 20-year horizon.

### TABLE 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yearly average transportation projected improvement revenue</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yearly average ($1,000's)</td>
<td>$11,387</td>
<td>$6,684</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$2,153</td>
<td>$5,653</td>
<td>$25,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Years 7 – 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$363,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

To update the Spokane County Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element, the transportation system is inventoried in its existing condition and shown in its future condition (year 2040). This document describes the methods used to update the Transportation Element.

Transportation Element Maps

For the update, maps of the transportation system have been developed. Level of Service (LOS) intersection inventory tables that were developed for the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) are also being brought into the transportation element update by reference. The maps show the existing condition and the future year 2040 condition. The list of maps developed are;

- Existing conditions map of the entire county showing rural arterial roadway level of service (LOS)
- Existing conditions map of the county’s urban area showing arterial roadway LOS
- Future conditions (year 2040) map of the entire county showing rural arterial roadway LOS
- Future conditions (year 2040) map of the county’s urban area showing arterial roadway LOS
- State highways existing condition
- State Highways future condition (year 2040)
- Arterial Road Plan (ARP)
- STA routes; existing condition
- STA routes future conditions (STA High Performance Transit Network)
- Bike plan Map
- Pedestrian Plan Map
- Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS) and Rail Facilities Map
**Transportation Element Existing and Future conditions**

The following describes the process taken to develop the maps and LOS mentioned above.

**Existing conditions**

1. Provide Volume & LOS maps (segments)
2. Provide LOS at intersections (table and map in Capital Facilities Plan)
3. Provide text to summarize existing conditions

**Future forecasting**

1. Provide Volume & LOS maps (segments)
   a) Use SRTC 2040 model
      (1) Only if model volumes exceed existing and are appropriate
      (2) If not, use appropriate linear growth rate applied to existing volumes
          (a) Show map for Urban area
          (b) Show map for Rural area
          (c) Show map for State highways
2. Provide LOS at intersections (table and map currently prepared for CFP)
3. Provide future transit route map
4. Provide pedestrian and bicycle map
5. Provide text to summarize future forecasting

**2040 post-processing forecast methodology**

For links that have undeveloped areas or areas of know development that has not been captured in the regional model, trip generation was developed for the undeveloped area and distributed to the roadway volumes. Generally, the area of influence around a road segment will be reviewed for vested/known development. These trips will be added to the existing if not accounted for in the model. Flow Bundles from the model are then generated and subtracted from the added trip generation to avoid double counting (see below). The SRTC regional growth is stated in Horizon 2040 (the Spokane regional metropolitan transportation plan) at 23% by the year 2040. This 23% growth rate will be used for general forecast growth on roadways that are not anticipated to see anything more than general growth and the growth is not reflected in the model outputs. If the trips appear to be accounted for in the model, the models growth will be reviewed and applied accordantly.
List of land uses reviewed in the Spokane County Transportation Element
(for the purposes of post-processing forecast volumes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Project type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Park</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spokane Valley Northeast industrial area</td>
<td>Planned Action Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spokane Valley South Barker</td>
<td>Corridor Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Tribe Casino</td>
<td>Mixed Use Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XL 5657 SR902 &amp; Geiger Interchanges - Memo</td>
<td>Balanced volumes for Post-processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Rose (Amazon distribution center)</td>
<td>Commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country View Meadows</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Mallen PUD</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidd’s Dental</td>
<td>Commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoda Park West</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beau west Apartments</td>
<td>Multifamily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aero Road PUD</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needham Hill</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Terrace 5th - 3rd Addition</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont Cemetery</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead / Mt. Spokane area</td>
<td>Estimated growth (Mixed Use &amp; MFDU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village at Midway</td>
<td>Binding site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundance</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams &amp; 28th</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams &amp; 31st</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Springs South</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki / Five mile apartments</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Bridges</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside Heights</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southridge</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twisted Willows</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trickle Creek</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels 34031.9018 &amp; 34031.9014</td>
<td>Estimated Growth (SFDU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Terre</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison Ranch</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mead SD Middle School</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Springs Villa</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Bluff</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead SD new Market campus</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidwell Estates</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Quest Casino</td>
<td>Mixed Use Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Estates</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA 01-16</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Cottages</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Mt.</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponderosa PUD</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFB growth</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Woods</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parcels 24063.0501 &amp; 24065.0507</td>
<td>Estimated Growth (industrial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Heights</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Mallen TIF</td>
<td>Estimated Growth (industrial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Plains area management plan phase 1 US 2 vicinity</td>
<td>New Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitetail Ridge</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ambient Growth and Flow Bundles**

Ambient growth will be reviewed in areas that are mostly built out but have some known developable land remaining. For example, an area has a known development, these trips will be added to the system, but the 23% regional growth will not be added in all cases. As the system gets more congested, growth in trips slows, therefore, would expect roads with good LOS, would see more growth so adding the full regional growth may be appropriate, as the LOS reaches LOS F (capacity) there is no room for vehicle trip growth. Ambient growth is used sparingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>% growth above known development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – B</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flow bundles in Visum (Transportation Forecast modeling software) will be used to eliminate double counting of trips. Projects not accounted for in Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ’s) growth is estimated using Institute of Transportation Engineer (ITE) Trip generation rates, the model growth is then added, then areas TAZ flow bundles are analyzed, link volumes are then reduced by flow bundles to strip out trips accounted for in the growth from the TAZ.
**Arterial Segment LOS tables**

The arterial LOS tables were produced using Florida DOT Quality/Level of Service Handbook tables. The table were adjusted by the divided/undivided, Median & turn lane adjustments. Individual arterials with unique characteristics were adjusted if necessary and these adjustments are indicated specifically below. The segment LOS shown on the Transportation Element maps are developed using these tables.

**Rural County Arterial Road system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural 2-lane arterials*</th>
<th>Rural 4-lane arterials*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 4,700</td>
<td>A or B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,800 – 8,400</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,500 – 14,300</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,400 – 28,600</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,700+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2-lane base table data was used, for 4-lane the table data was adjusted by the undivided adjustment

**Urban County Arterial Road system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban 2-lane arterials*</th>
<th>Urban 3-lane arterials**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 7,300</td>
<td>A - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,400 – 14,800</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,801 – 15,600</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,700+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class II signalized arterial table used, 2-lane base table data was used
**Class II signalized arterial table used, 2-lane the table data was adjusted by the left turn lane adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban 4-lane arterials*</th>
<th>Urban 5-lane arterials**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 10,880</td>
<td>A - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,880 – 24,300</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,301 – 25,350</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,351+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class II signalized arterial table used, 4-lane table data was adjusted by the undivided adjustment.
** Class II signalized arterial table used, 5-lane table data was adjusted by the undivided with left turn lane adjustment.
LOS Tables for Developed for Specific Arterials

There are County arterials that have unique characteristics, specific LOS and ADT tables had to be calculated individually for these arterials;

Country Homes Blvd.  A divided 2-lane arterial, on each end is 4-lane signalized termini’s.  Country homes capacity is metered by the upstream and downstream signals.  The Class II will be used with the non-state adjustment of -10% and the no turn lane adjustment (net -15%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 12,300</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,301 – 27,500</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,501 – 28,700</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,701+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Argonne road, north of Bigelow Gulch to Lindgren Road. An undivided 3 lane arterial, the 2 and 4 lane undivided tables were used with ½ of daily volumes and then summed;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 11,400</td>
<td>A-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,401 – 18,450</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,451 – 23,700</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,701 – 35,150</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,151+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Highway System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural 2-lane Highway*</th>
<th>Rural 4-lane Divided Highways*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 4,700</td>
<td>A - B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,800 – 8,400</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,500 – 14,300</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,400 – 28,600</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,700+</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2-lane and 4-lane base table data was used
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban 4-lane Signalized Divided Highway*</th>
<th>Urban 4-lane Signalized Undivided Highways**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A - B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 37,900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37,901 – 39,800</td>
<td>0 – 36,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class I
** Class I with exclusive left turns lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban 2-lane Highway*</th>
<th>Urban 4-lane Highways (divided)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 -8,600</td>
<td>A - B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,601 – 17,000</td>
<td>0 – 36,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,001 – 24,200</td>
<td>36,701 – 51,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,201 – 33,300</td>
<td>51,801 – 65,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33,301+</td>
<td>65,601 – 72,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2-lane and 4-lane base table data was used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban 6-lane Highway*</th>
<th>Urban 4-lane Freeway*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 55,000</td>
<td>A - B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,001 – 77,700</td>
<td>0 – 45,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77,701 – 98,300</td>
<td>45,801 – 61,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98,301 – 108,800</td>
<td>61,501 – 74,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108,801+</td>
<td>74,401 – 79,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*base table data was used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural 4-lane Freeway*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 28,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28,801 – 43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43,001 – 52,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52,301 – 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,001+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*base table data was used
Spokane County Public Works Department

2019 Mead / Mt. Spokane Transportation Area Plan

The Mead / Mt. Spokane Transportation Area Plan can be found at;

https://www.spokanecounty.org/4356/Mead-Mt-Spokane-Transportation-Area-Plan