

*Technical Appendix*

**to the**

**Parkland-Spanaway-Midland  
Communities Plan**

**PIERCE COUNTY  
PLANNING AND LAND SERVICES DEPARTMENT**  
Chuck Kleeberg, Director  
2401 South 35th Street  
Tacoma, Washington 98409

### Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan for Regional Open Space

The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) is a six-year plan for identifying and financing capital improvements that support the County's current and future population. LOS standards for open space passive recreation within the PSM plan area have been analyzed with the results depicted in Table A. Establishing level of service (LOS) standards is a method for identifying needed capital improvements.

As can be seen from the above inventory, a number of open space passive recreation properties are held by the Cascade Land Conservancy. The County Parks Department can count LOS only for the "...facilities owned or operated by Pierce County but not subject to the requirement for concurrency." (*Comprehensive Plan Glossary, Category C, public facilities*) Therefore, only Parkland Prairie & Wildlife Preserve and Bresemann Forest were calculated in the LOS analysis (total of 69.6 acres). Given the current Comprehensive Plan LOS of .66435 acres per 1,000 of population, there is presently a surplus amount of County-owned open space (30.45 acres) within the plan area. When the additional projected six-year population growth is factored into this equation, the open space surplus is reduced to 27.58 acres.

<b>TABLE A. PSM OPEN SPACE LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) ANALYSIS</b>							
<b>Year 2000 through Year 2006</b>							
<b>Land</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Plan Area Inventory</b>	<b>Current Comprehensive Plan CFP LOS (acres/1,000 pop)</b>	<b>Current Need</b>	<b>Current Surplus or (Deficit)</b>	<b>Projected Needs by Year 2006</b>	<b>Year 2006 Surplus or (Deficit)</b>
Passive Recreation Open Space	Acres	69.6 acres	0.66435	39.15 acres	30.45 acres	42.02 acres	27.58 acres

- Units (number of acres)
- Plan Area Inventory (current sites/facilities based upon the 1998-1999 Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan Inventory)
- Current Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Level of Service (LOS). If NA no countywide LOS standard exists.
- Current Need (LOS applied to current plan population of 58,924 people)
- Current LOS Surplus or (Deficit) (current need as compared to current sites/facilities within plan area)
- Projected Needs by Year 2006 (LOS applied to projected plan population of 63,244 people)
- Year 2006 Surplus or (Deficit) (projected year 2006 need as compared to current sites/facilities within plan area)

**Table B**

**Six-Year Wastewater CIP Projects in the Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Planning Area**

(Shaded improvements are also found in the Draft Unified Sewer Plan for the Pierce County Wastewater Utility)

PROJECT	TOTAL COST	2001 BUDGET	ESTIMATED YEAR TO BE BUILT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
168 <sup>th</sup> Street East Interceptor ("B" St to 10 <sup>th</sup> Ave Ct E)	\$840,000	--	2006 – 07	Installation of approximately 3,250 feet of 15-inch, 12-inch and 8-inch diameter gravity sewer line in 168 <sup>th</sup> Street East to eliminate the temporary pump station in the plat of East Lake Terrace.
176 <sup>th</sup> St East Interceptor Phase I ("B" St to 14th Ave E)	\$2,084,227	\$2,050,000	2000 – 01	Installation of approximately 4,800 feet of 18-inch gravity sewer pipe in 176 <sup>th</sup> Street East to redirect flows to the proper sewerage sub-basin.
22 <sup>nd</sup> Ave Trunk Sewer	\$1,500,000	--	2005	Installation of approximately 4,900 feet of 12-inch and 8-inch sewer main along 22 <sup>nd</sup> Ave between 182 <sup>nd</sup> Street to 196 <sup>th</sup> Street to extend sewer service.
Collection System Flow Meters	\$462,597	\$150,000	2000 – 03	Installation of six (6) flow meters in Parkland and Spanaway. These are meters installed in existing collection facilities, such as manholes.
Collection System SCADA Project	\$2,053,119	\$424,000	2000 – 03	Replacement of existing radio control system installed in the mid-1980s with a more up-to-date system. It will use the existing radio network, but employ new base stations, radio telemetry units, and software.
Parkland/Brookdale Interceptor Upgrade	\$23,432,900		2000 –06+	Installation of approximately 18,000 feet of gravity sewer pipeline, ranging from 42 inches to 84 inches in diameter. Extends from the intersection of Brookdale Road East and 15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue East to the intersection of Spanaway Loop Road South and 116 <sup>th</sup> Street South. FEIS 12/1/2000. The expansion will eliminate flow restrictions in the existing system.
Phase I	\$1,400,000	\$850,000	2001 - 2002	8 <sup>th</sup> to 15 <sup>th</sup> Ave on Brookdale

**Table B**

**Six-Year Wastewater CIP Projects in the Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Planning Area**  
 (Shaded improvements are also found in the Draft Unified Sewer Plan for the Pierce County Wastewater Utility)

PROJECT	TOTAL COST	2001 BUDGET	ESTIMATED YEAR TO BE BUILT	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Spanaway Loop Pump Station By-Pass Interceptor	\$10,900,000	\$450,000	2000 – 03	Extension of the existing 72-inch interceptor another 6,367 feet east along 112 <sup>th</sup> Street SW then south on Steele Street and Spanaway Loop Road to 116 <sup>th</sup> Street South. The by-pass will eliminate the Spanaway Loop Pump Station and increase flow capacity under Interstate-5 for all the eastern sewerage sub-basins.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$41,272,843</b>	<b>\$3,924,000</b>		

<b>Table C</b>				
<b>Long-Range Wastewater Utility Projects in the Draft Unified Sewer Plan in the Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Planning Area</b>				
<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>SIZE (INCHES)</b>	<b>LENGTH (FEET)</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>
B Street Interceptor Phase 2	\$2,850,000.	36"	5,000'	Installation of a 30-inch interceptor pipeline between 176 <sup>th</sup> Street East and 192 <sup>nd</sup> Street East to serve South Spanaway east of Pacific Avenue.
Spanaway Interceptor	\$9,706,000.	18 – 24"	19,194'	A new interceptor conveying wastewater from the most southerly part of the Spanaway sub-basin and the B Street Interceptor. It will extend southwest along the Mountain Highway to approximately 234 <sup>th</sup> Street East.
Midland Interceptor Replacement	\$786,000.	21"	2,899'	Future capacity relief for the existing 18" pipeline. It will generally follow McKinley Avenue East between 96 <sup>th</sup> Street East to 106 <sup>th</sup> Street East to serve the eastern portion of the South Tacoma sewerage sub-basin.
West Lake Spanaway Interceptor	\$4,166,000.	18 – 36"	16,831'	A new 3.2-mile interceptor will extend sanitary sewer service to the west side of Lake Spanaway. Generally it will follow Spanaway Loop Road from Tule Lake Road to the south end of Lake Spanaway.
Spanaway Loop Road Interceptor Expansion	\$2,166,000.	60"	1,831'	Expansion of the existing 30- to 42-inch interceptor to provide future capacity relief. Generally it will follow the existing interceptor alignment and serve the East Basin, Rainier Terrace, Frederickson, Brookdale/Golden Given and Spanaway sub-basins, and Parkland sub-basins.
Parkland Interceptor Expansion	\$14,879,000.	42-54"	15,133'	Expansion of the existing 30" interceptor will provide future capacity relief as development nears build-out in the central and southern portions of the Parkland and Spanaway sub-basins. Generally it will follow Military Road to C Street, along C- Street to approximately 140 <sup>th</sup> Street, then to 14 <sup>th</sup> Ave S, along 14 <sup>th</sup> Ave S to Tule Lake Road and along Tule Lake Road to Spanaway Loop Road.

**Table C**  
**Long-Range Wastewater Utility Projects in the Draft Unified Sewer Plan**  
**in the Parkland-Spanaway-Midland Communities Planning Area**

PROJECT	TOTAL COST	SIZE (INCHES)	LENGTH (FEET)	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
North Fork Trunk	\$2,455,000.	12 – 18"	9,917'	A new trunk providing service to part of the Parkland service area to relieve future capacity restrictions in the Midland Trunk. Generally it will extend between Brookdale Road and 112 <sup>th</sup> Street East, following 30 <sup>th</sup> Ave East to Shady Lane, 14 <sup>th</sup> Avenue East to 120 <sup>th</sup> Street East and then along Aqueduct Drive East to t112th. Not needed until near build-out of existing urban service area.
Brookdale Trunk	\$2,641,000.	18"	10,670'	Will provide service to the eastern part of Parkland. The pipeline will generally follow Waller Road between Brookdale Road and 112 <sup>th</sup> Street East. The trunk will connect urban growth area along SR-512 to the Brookdale Interceptor when existing facilities serving the 112 <sup>th</sup> Street corridor reach capacity or need replacement.
Brookdale Interceptor Expansion	\$25,699,000.	72"	16,003'	Will relieve future capacity constraints in the existing 54-inch interceptor. It will follow the existing interceptor alignment along Brookdale Road, which connects the East Basin to the Parkland/Brookdale Interceptor in the Parkland sub-basin.
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$55,739,000.</b>			

Table D describes the capacity deficiencies and needs in both the Bethel and Franklin Pierce School Districts.

<b>Table D</b> Public School Facilities Bethel School District, No. 403 & Franklin Pierce School District, No.402		
Building Capacity	Bethel School District	Franklin Pierce School District
Total Building Capacity	13,031*	6,798
Total Portable Capacity	2,775 (111 portables x 25 student capacity)*	N/A
Average Full Time Enrollment (Sept. 2000-January 2001)	15, 739	7, 179.22
Net Deficiency in Building Capacity	2,708*	381.22
Proposed Individual Capacity Projects	Reconstruction of Kapowsin Elementary  Junior High #5 w/ a capacity of 750 students  Senior High #4 w/ a capacity of 1, 250 students	Elementary #8 w/ a capacity of 450 students  Two middle school auxiliary gyms (Ford & Keithley) increasing capacity by 25 students each  Two high school auxiliary gyms (Franklin Pierce & Washington) increasing capacity by 25 students each  One cafeteria at the alternative school (Gates) increasing capacity by 25 students
Capacity Project Totals	<u>2,000 students</u>	<u>575 students</u>
Capacity Projects	59,466	17,119
Non-Capacity Projects (x \$1,000)	N/A	21,897
*The total building capacity and net deficiency in building capacity are not accurate numbers due to the number of students occupying the portable facilities. Also, capacity may not be reached in the portables because of the type of program taking place. For example, many special education programs with a class size of seven students may occupy the portable.		

The Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) contains level of service (LOS) standards for regional level parks, including land and facility needs. The Park Plan identifies a five-mile radius as a service area for regional park facilities. This service area can be applied to the level of service standards within a community plan boundary. Community plan boundaries may entirely contain a service area or may be overlapped by several service areas that provide access to community plan residents.

LOS standards for parks, trails and related facilities within the PSM plan area have been analyzed with the results depicted in Table E. The analysis was based upon a year 2000 plan area population of 58,924 people. This population number was applied to the current Comprehensive Plan LOS standard to determine if the number of units within the plan area is in a surplus (has more than the current standard) or deficit (has less than the current standard) as compared to the existing and proposed countywide standards. The current need identifies the number of units that would be necessary to meet the countywide LOS for the plan area population in the year 2000. Given current growth rate trends, the plan area population is expected to increase another 4,320 people by the year 2006. The column titled Projected Needs by Year 2006 identifies the additional amount of units that would be necessary to accommodate this new population projection of 63,244 people. The last column indicates the projected surplus/deficit situation for the year 2006. Finally, current needs and surplus/deficit numbers cannot be calculated where a countywide LOS does not exist.

**TABLE E. PSM PARK AND FACILITY LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) ANALYSIS**  
**Year 2000 through Year 2006**

Plan Area Land	Units	Plan Area Inventory	Current Comprehensive Plan CFP LOS (units/1,000 pop)	Plan Area Elos	Plan Area Elos Surplus or (Deficit)	Currently Needed Surplus or (Deficit)	Projected Needs by Year 2006	Year 2006 Surplus or (Deficit)
Resource Conservancy	Acres	65	2.2	1.1	(1.1)	(65)	(9.5)	(74.5)
Resource Activity	Acres	132.9	2.6	2.2	(0.4)	(20)	(11)	(31)
Special Use	Acres	160	0.89	2.7	+1.81	+108	(4)	+104
Trail	Acres	1.9	0.76	0.032	(0.73)	(43)	(3)	(46)
<b>Plan Area Facilities</b>								
Courts, Fields, Play Areas	Areas	55	0.02	0.93	+0.91	+54	0.0	+54
Multipurpose Trails	Miles	1.3	0.099	0.017	(0.082)	(4.5)	0.0	(4.5)
Picnic and Camping Areas	Areas	230	1.0	3.9	+2.9	+171	(4)	+167
Access to Water – Parking spaces	Spaces	270	2.3	4.58	+2.28	+134	(10)	+124
Access to Water – Square Feet of Area	Square Feet	15,000	88	254.56	+167	+9,815	380	+9,435
Boat Launch Ramps	Ramps	1	0.01	0.017	+0.007	1	0.0	+1

- Units (number of acres, miles, areas, parking spaces)
- Plan Area Inventory (current sites/facilities based upon the 1998-1999 Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan Inventory)

- Current Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Level of Service (LOS). If NA, no countywide LOS standard exists.
- Plan area ELOS (Existing Level of Service) is plan area inventory divided by year 2000 plan area population-per-1,000
- Plan area ELOS Surplus or (Deficit) is Current Comprehensive Plan CFP LOS minus Plan Area ELOS
- Currently Needed Surplus or (Deficit) is Current Comprehensive Plan CFP LOS multiplied by Plan Area population-per-1,000 minus Plan Area Inventory
- Projected Needs by Year 2006 (LOS applied to projected plan population of 63,244 people)
- Year 2006 Surplus or (Deficit) (projected year 2006 need as compared to current sites/facilities within plan area)
- Existing Level of Service (ELOS) is plan area inventory divided by year 2000 plan area population-per-1,000

<b>TABLE F. PSM FACILITY INVENTORY ANALYSIS</b>							
<b>Year 2000 through Year 2006</b>							
<b>Facilities</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Plan Area Inventory</b>	<b>Proposed CFP LOS (units/1,000 pop)</b>	<b>Current Need</b>	<b>Current Surplus or (Deficit)</b>	<b>Projected Needs by Year 2006</b>	<b>Year 2006 Surplus or (Deficit)</b>
Playgrounds Covered	Playground	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Playgrounds Uncovered	Playground	4	0.016	0.1	3.9	1.01	2.99
Open Play Area-Improved	Acre	0	0.016	0.1	(0.1)	1.01	(1.11)
Open Play Area-Not Improved	Acre	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Handball Court-Uncovered/Outdoor	Court	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Basketball Court-Covered/Outdoor	Court	8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Basketball Court-Uncovered/Outdoor	Court	0	0.026	1.53	(1.53)	1.64	(3.17)
Volleyball Court-Covered/Outdoor	Court	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Volleyball Court-Uncovered/Outdoor	Court	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Volleyball Court-Sand	Court	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennis Court-Indoor	Court	4	0.013	.77	3.23	.82	3.18
Tennis Court-Lighted/Outdoor	Court	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tennis Court-w/o Lights/Outdoor	Court	6	0.032	1.89	4.11	2.02	3.98
Football Regulation Field	Field	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Football Practice Field	Field	2	0.006	.35	1.65	.38	1.62
Soccer Regulation Field	Field	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Soccer Practice Field	Field	11	0.077	4.54	6.46	4.87	6.13
Field Hockey/LaCrosse-Grass Field	Field	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

TABLE F. PSM FACILITY INVENTORY ANALYSIS							
Year 2000 through Year 2006							
Facilities	Units	Plan Area Inventory	Proposed CFP LOS (units/1,000 pop)	Current Need	Current Surplus or (Deficit)	Projected Needs by Year 2006	Year 2006 Surplus or (Deficit)
Baseball 250+Adult Grass Lighted Field	Field	3	0.013	0.77	2.23	.82	2.18
Baseball 250+Adult Grass Unlighted Field	Field	1	0.029	1.71	(.71)	1.83	(.83)
Baseball 250+Adult Dirt/Lighted Field	Field	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Baseball 250+Adult Dirt/Unlighted Field	Field	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Baseball/Softball Practice Field	Field	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Baseball/Little League-Grass Field	Field	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Baseball/Little League-Dirt Field	Field	8	0.045	2.65	5.35	2.85	5.15
Parcourse	Stations	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jogging Track w/ Special Surface	Miles	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jogging Track w/Dirt Surface	Miles	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Picnic Tables w/o Shelter	Table	225	0.827	48.73	176.27	52.30	172.70
Picnic Shelters-Group Use	Shelter	5	0.022	1.30	3.7	1.39	3.61
Swimming Beach	Square Feet	15,000	102.129	6,017.85	8,982.15	6,459.05	8,540.95
Swimming Beach	Parking Spaces	250	2.074	122.21	127.79	131.17	118.83
Boat Launch Ramps	Each	1	0.019	1.12	(.12)	1.20	(.20)
Fishing from a Boat	Parking Spaces	20	0.274	16.15	3.85	17.33	2.67
Pier/Dock Platform	Square Feet	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Boat Slips	Each	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Power Boat-Launch	Parking Space	0	0.054	3.18	(3.18)	3.42	(3.42)
Tent Camping	Campsite	0	0.080	4.71	(4.71)	5.06	(5.06)
Vehicle Camping	Campsite	0	0.128	7.54	(7.54)	8.1	(8.1)
Park Trail-Asphalt	Trail Mile	0	0.005	0.29	(0.29)	0.32	(0.32)
Park Trail-Dirt	Trail Mile	0	0.029	1.71	(1.71)	1.83	(1.83)
Day Hike Trail-Asphalt	Trail Mile	0	0.151	8.9	(8.9)	9.55	(9.55)
Day Hike Trail-Dirt	Trail Mile	0	0.006	0.35	(0.35)	0.38	(0.38)
Backpacking/Over-night Camping	Trail Mile	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Bike Trail-Asphalt	Trail Mile	0	0.122	7.19	(7.19)	7.72	(7.72)
Bike Trail-Dirt	Trail Mile	0	0.006	0.35	(0.35)	0.38	(0.38)
Bike on a Road-Marked w/ Shoulder	Trail Mile	6 miles	0.049	2.89	3.11	3.1	2.9
Bike on a Road-	Trail Mile	1.71 miles	0.004	0.24	1.47	0.25	.24

<b>TABLE F. PSM FACILITY INVENTORY ANALYSIS</b>							
<b>Year 2000 through Year 2006</b>							
<b>Facilities</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Plan Area Inventory</b>	<b>Proposed CFP LOS (units/1,000 pop)</b>	<b>Current Need</b>	<b>Current Surplus or (Deficit)</b>	<b>Projected Needs by Year 2006</b>	<b>Year 2006 Surplus or (Deficit)</b>
Designated Only							
Horseback Trail	Trail Mile	0	0.144	8.46	(8.46)	9.1	(9.1)
Swimming Pool-Indoor	Square Feet	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Swimming Pool-Outdoor	Square Feet	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wading Pool	Each	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indoor Gym	Square Feet	0	32.937	1,940.78	(1,940.78)	2,083.07	(2,083.07)
Physical Conditioning	Square Feet	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Racquetball (1600 each/sf)	Each/SF	4	0.013	0.77	3.23	0.82	3.18
Handball ( 1200 sf)	Each/SF	4	0.013	0.77	3.23	0.82	3.18
Arts/Crafts/Pottery Room	Square Feet	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Classrooms/Meeting Facilities	Square Feet	7,820	32.898	1,938.48	(5,881.52)	2,080.60	(5,739.40)
Auditorium/Staging/Meeting Facilities	Square Feet	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kitchen Facilities	Square Feet	240	2.298	135.41	(104.59)	145.33	(94.67)
Dining Facilities	Square Feet	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Day Care/Nursery	Square Feet	1,000	4.066	239.58	(760.42)	257.15	(742.85)
Community Center Administration	Square Feet	0	3.265	192.39	(192.39)	206.49	(206.49)
Community Center Other	Square Feet	0	5.745	338.52	(338.52)	363.34	(363.34)
Nature Interpretive Centers	Square Feet	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Museum/Historical Facilities	Square Feet	0	77.714	4,579.22	(4,579.22)	4,914.94	(4,914.94)
Golf-Park 3/18 Hole	Hole	18	0.086	5.07	12.93	5.44	12.56
Golf Driving Range	Each	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Clubhouse/Sports Arenas	Square Feet	3,500	13.57	799.6	2,700.4	858.22	2,641.78
Golf Course Maintenance Facilities	Square Feet	8,000	28.29	1,666.96	6,333.04	1,789.17	6,210.83
Gun Range-Outdoor	Range	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Archery Range-Outdoor	Range	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ice Rink	Square Feet	19,200	61.277	3,610.69	15,589.31	3,875.40	15,324.60
Parks Admin. Facilities	Square Feet	0	5.818	342.82	(342.82)	367.95	(367.95)
Parks Maintenance Facilities	Square Feet	12,900	60.352	3,556.18	9,343.82	3,816.90	9,083.10
Park Shop Yard	Square Feet	1	0.003	0.18	0.82	0.19	0.81
Parks Caretaker	Each/SF	1	0.013	0.77	3.23	0.82	3.18
Restrooms-	Fixture	110	0.472	27.81	82.19	29.85	80.15

<b>TABLE F. PSM FACILITY INVENTORY ANALYSIS</b>							
<b>Year 2000 through Year 2006</b>							
<b>Facilities</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Plan Area Inventory</b>	<b>Proposed CFP LOS (units/1,000 pop)</b>	<b>Current Need</b>	<b>Current Surplus or (Deficit)</b>	<b>Projected Needs by Year 2006</b>	<b>Year 2006 Surplus or (Deficit)</b>
Permanent							
Restrooms-Temporary	Each	0	0.029	1.71	(1.71)	1.83	(1.83)
Fairgrounds	Square Feet	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Climbing Spire	Each	1	0.003	0.18	0.82	0.19	0.81

- Units (number of acres, miles, areas, parking spaces)
- Plan Area Inventory (current sites/facilities based upon the 1998-1999 Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan Inventory)
- Current Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Level of Service (LOS). If NA, no countywide LOS standard exists.
- Plan area ELOS (Existing Level of Service) is plan area inventory divided by year 2000 plan area population-per-1,000
- Plan area ELOS Surplus or (Deficit) is Current Comprehensive Plan CFP LOS minus Plan Area ELOS
- Currently Needed Surplus or (Deficit) is Current Comprehensive Plan CFP LOS multiplied by Plan Area population-per-1,000 minus Plan Area Inventory
- Projected Needs by Year 2006 (LOS applied to projected plan population of 63,244 people)
- Year 2006 Surplus or (Deficit) (projected year 2006 need as compared to current sites/facilities within plan area)
- Existing Level of Service (ELOS) is plan area inventory divided by year 2000 plan area population-per-1,000

<b>Table G. Community Park Facilities Level of Service Standards</b>	
<b>Facility</b>	<b>Unit</b>
Community Park Land	3.5 acres per 1,000 population
Fields for softball and youth baseball for soccer, football, or pickup games	0.23 fields per 1,000 population
Multi-use outdoor paved courts (tennis, basketball)	0.4 courts per 1,000 population
Tennis court	0.3 courts per 1,000 population
Children's play area	0.35 play area per 1,000 population
Picnic area	0.5 area per 1,000 population
Trails or pathways (minor)	0.2 miles per 1,000 population
Restrooms	0.23 facilities per 1,000 population
Parking	0.23 spaces per 1,000 population

<b>Table H. Neighborhood Park Facilities Level of Service Standards</b>	
<b>Facility</b>	<b>Unit</b>
Neighborhood Park – Land	3.0 acres per 1,000 population
Multi-use paved games court (1/2 court)	0.3 courts per 1,000 population
Children's play area	0.2 play area per 1,000 population

The current 6-year Capital Facility Plan for Pierce County Water Programs includes capital projects within the plan area. Capital projects generally represent improvements and repair to existing drywells, ponds, culverts, fish ladders, floodproofing facilities, pipeline outlets, pipelines, raised roads, and habitat acquisition. The proposed financing of these capital projects is from the Surface Water Management Fund. Because storm drainage projects serve an entire watershed, some projects that are located outside the plan boundaries, but have significant impacts within the area, have been included. Table I. provides a detailed description of these capital facilities projects. Projects outside the plan area are marked with an asterisk.

<b>TABLE I.-Surface Water Management Capital Facilities Plan Funding (x \$1,000)</b>							
<b>Project/Year</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>Total Project Cost**</b>
D327 – 128 <sup>th</sup> St. E. and 14 <sup>th</sup> Ave (W-1)*	125.0	125.0					4,760.0
D402 – 136th St. E. – A St. E. to B St. E.	47.5						920.9
Clover Creek Channel Modification					27.0	67.0	94.0
D145 – Spanaway Airport	110.0		320.1				540.1
Spanaway/Maury Cr. Habitat Acquisition	505.0	500.0	500.0		500.0		2,030.0
Clover Creek Habitat Acquisition	710.0	700.0	700.0	600.0			2,735.0
D146 – Glen Oaks	125.0						185.0
Parkland Ditch						450.0	595.0
D143 – North Fork Clover Cr.*		100.0	550.0	1,600.0	3,000.0		6,250.0
<b>Total Cost per Year</b>	<b>1,522.5</b>	<b>1,425.0</b>	<b>2,070.1</b>	<b>2,200.0</b>	<b>3,527.0</b>	<b>517.0</b>	<b>18,110.0</b>

\*\*Total project cost may include expenses prior to 2002.

**Table J.  
Prioritization of Transportation Projects**

Map ID #	Project Location	Proposed Facility	Estimated Cost	Priority
1.	5 Av Ct E – 172 St E to 168 St E	Path.	\$13,000	LOW
2.	6 Av and 8 Av – 128 St to 121 St	Path.	\$49,000	LOW
3.	8 Av E – 208 St E to SR-7	Paved shoulders or trail.	\$104,000	LOW
4.	12 Av E -- 80 St E to 72 St E	Path.	\$26,000	MEDIUM
5.	13 Av Ct E/188 St E – 192 St E to 14 Av E	Paved shoulders.	\$97,000	MEDIUM
6.	14 Av E/15 Av E – 188 St E to 168 St E	Path.	\$53,000	MEDIUM
7.	18 Av E -- 93 St E to 85 St E	Path.	\$28,000	HIGH
8.	21 Av Ct E -- 172 St E to 168 St E	Path.	\$14,000	LOW
9.	22 Av E -- 176 St E to 152 St E	Paved shoulders.	\$395,000	MEDIUM
10.	22 Av E -- SR-7 to 176 St E	Paved shoulders or path.	\$755,000	HIGH
11.	24 Av E -- 96 St E to 90 St E	Path.	\$22,000	LOW
12.	26 Av/Sales Rd/102 St -- 96 St to Ainsworth	Paved shoulders.	\$274,000	HIGH
13.	72 St E – McKinley Av E to Portland Av E (Tacoma Lead)	Add center turn lane; improve intersections, add sidewalks. @Golden Given - Traffic signal, illumination and turn lanes.	\$1,600,000	Year 2000
14.	72 St E – Portland Av E to 25 Av E	Improve road, add paved shoulders or wide curb lanes & sidewalks	\$1,300,000	HIGH
15.	80 St E – Golden Given Rd E to 24 Av E	Paved shoulders, wide lanes, or trail.	\$230,000	MEDIUM
16.	85 St E/84 St E – McKinley Av E to 24 Av E	Paved shoulders.	\$109,000	PREMIER
17.	90 St E -- McKinley Av E to 24 Av E	Path.	\$59,000	MEDIUM
18.	93 St E -- Tacoma/Rainier Rail Trail (NTAC24A) to 24 Av E	Path.	\$35,000	LOW
19.	95 St E -- Golden Given Rd E to 20 Av E	Path.	\$32,000	LOW
20.	96 St S -- Yakima Av S to Steele St S (Tacoma Lead).	3 lane road with 5' bike shoulders and 5'-7' sidewalks.	\$2,300,000	Year 1999
21.	96 St E/97 St E – McKinley to 24 Av E	Realign and improve intersections, path.	\$2,736,000	LOW
22.	96 St E -- Pacific Av to McKinley Av (Tacoma Lead).	3 lane road with 5' bike shoulders and 5'-7' sidewalks.	\$1,500,000	Year 2000
23.	99 St/24 Av – Golden Given Rd to 96 St E	Paved shoulders.	\$277,000	LOW
24.	104 St E – McKinley Av E to 24 Av E	Improve alignment, add turn pockets, channelize, paved shoulders.	\$2,993,000	HIGH
25.	104 St E – 18 Av to Ainsworth Av	Path.	\$13,000	LOW
26.	104 St E -- A St E to D St E	Paved shoulders.	\$57,000	LOW
27.	106 St S – Park Av S to SR-7	Paved shoulders.	\$76,000	LOW
28.	106 St S – Sales Rd to Ainsworth Av	Path.	\$26,000	LOW
29.	112 St -- Steele St S to Golden Given Rd E	Widen road, construct sidewalks, wide curb lanes, traffic signals, drainage, channelization and turn lanes.	\$2,586,000	HIGH

**Table J.  
Prioritization of Transportation Projects**

Map ID #	Project Location	Proposed Facility	Estimated Cost	Priority
30.	116 St S – Park Av to SR-7	Paved shoulders.	\$66,000	LOW
31.	116 St S/Steele St S – Spanaway Loop Rd S to Sales Rd S	Sidewalks, & paved shoulders or wide curb lanes.	\$895,000	PREMIER
32.	117 St and 118 St – Spanaway Loop Rd S to SR-7	Path.	\$129,000	MEDIUM
33.	120 St S -- Ainsworth Av S to C St S	Sidewalks and wide lanes.	\$689,000	HIGH
34.	121 St E – SR-7 to A St E	Sidewalks on south side only.	\$101,000	HIGH
35.	121 St E -- A St E to Golden Given Rd E	Paved or gravel shoulders or path.	\$205,000	LOW
36.	121 St S/8 Av Ct S/ Wheeler St S – Ainsworth Av to SR-7	Sidewalks.	\$549,000	PREMIER
37.	123 St E -- A St E to 6 Av E	Path.	\$21,000	LOW
38.	127 St/6 Av/128 St -- SR-7 to Golden Given Rd	Reconstruct to design standards; add turn lanes, improve drainage, pave shoulders and add sidewalks.	\$2,184,000	MEDIUM
39.	138 St -- SR-7 to Golden Given Rd E	Paved shoulders.	\$243,000	HIGH
40.	143 St E/D St E – SR-7 to 138 St E	Path and intersection improvements at SR-7.	\$171,000	LOW
41.	152 St E -- B St E to Waller Rd E	Paved shoulders.	\$504,000	PREMIER
42.	159 St/160 St/Old Military Rd -- SR-7 to 27 Av E	Paved shoulders or wide lanes, sidewalks SR-7 to 5 Av	\$826,000	PREMIER
43.	166 St S – Park Av to SR-7	Path on north side.	\$13,000	HIGH
44.	168 St E -- SR-7 to 22 Av E	Paved shoulders and sidewalks.	\$1,307,000	PREMIER
45.	172 St/5 Av -- 176 St E to 22 Av E	Paved shoulders and path.	\$464,000	HIGH
46.	176 St E – SR-7 to 27 Av E	Widen roadway, add turn lanes and sidewalks, preserve paved shoulders.	\$3,223,000	PREMIER
47.	192 St E -- B St E to 22 Av E	Paved shoulders.	\$343,000	HIGH
48.	196 St E/6 Av E – SR-7 to 192 St E	Path.	\$23,000	MEDIUM
49.	204 St E/208 St E – SR-7 to 22 Av E	New arterial with paved shoulders.	\$2,875,000	LOW
50.	A Street -- 138 St S to 131 St S	Paved shoulders.	\$124,000	MEDIUM
51.	A Street -- 104 St E to 96 St E	Paved shoulders or wide lanes.	\$135,000	MEDIUM
52.	Ainsworth Rd – Spanaway Loop Rd to Wheeler St	Sidewalks: Paved shoulders exist.	\$153,000	HIGH
53.	Ainsworth @ 112 St S	Reconstruct existing traffic signal. Widen to provide turn lanes.	\$500,000	PREMIER
54.	Alaska St -- 106 St to 102 St	Path.	\$14,000	LOW
55.	B St E -- SR-7 to 152 St E	Paved shoulders and sidewalks.	\$2,239,000	PREMIER
56.	Brookdale Rd E - 14 Av E to Waller Rd E (Tacoma Rail Trail)	Paved shoulders.	\$297,000	LOW
57.	C St S -- 122 St S to 112 St S	(Bike route) Keep existing wide lanes and sidewalks.	\$0	SIGNING
58.	C St S @ 138 St S	Install traffic signal and illumination.	\$200,000	PREMIER
59.	C St S – Military Rd S to 122 St S	Build matching paved shoulder to provide for both sides of road.	\$228,000	PREMIER

**Table J.  
Prioritization of Transportation Projects**

Map ID #	Project Location	Proposed Facility	Estimated Cost	Priority
60.	Clover Creek Trail -- C St/Tule Lk Rd to Waller Rd E	Trail	\$999,000	HIGH
61.	Croft St -- 100 St to 96 St	Path.	\$13,000	LOW
62.	Cross Base Corridor Study	Corridor study, environmental impact statement, and major investment study.	\$2,005,000	PREMIER
63.	Cross Base Highway -- 176 St S/SR-7 to I-5	New arterial and trail.	\$70,000,000	PREMIER
64.	Golden Given Rd E -- 1,500' N/O Brookdale Rd E to 112 St E	Widen, improve drainage, add paved shoulders. Install traffic beacon signal at 128 <sup>th</sup> Street.	\$2,810,000	MEDIUM
65.	Golden Given Rd E -- 104 St E to 72 St E	Sidewalks: Paved shoulders exist.	\$1,082,000	HIGH
66.	Golden Given Rd E -- Clover Creek Trail to 138 St E	Path.	\$25,000	LOW
67.	McKinley Av E -- 72 St E to 96 St E (Tacoma Lead).	Improve roadway with 2 travel lanes, bike lanes and sidewalks.	\$3,800,000	Year 2000
68.	McKinley Av E -- 96 St E to 104 St E	Paved shoulders.	\$137,000	HIGH
69.	Military Rd S -- Spanaway Loop Rd S to SR-7	Paved shoulders, path, or wide curb lanes.	\$309,000	PREMIER
70.	Military Rd S/152 St -- SR-7 to B St	Sidewalks on 1-side that does not exist.	\$72,000	HIGH
71.	Park Av S -- 134 St S to 125 St S; and 121 St S to 116 St S	Sidewalks and paved shoulders.	\$456,000	PREMIER
72.	Patterson Av -- 106 St to 96 St	Paved shoulders.	\$160,000	LOW
73.	Portland Av E -- SR-512 to 72 St E	Sidewalks: Paved shoulders exist.	\$1,202,000	PREMIER
74.	Sheridan St S -- 108 St S to 96 St S	Path.	\$41,000	LOW
75.	Spanaway Lake Trail	Trail	\$1,335,000	HIGH
76.	Spanaway Loop Rd S -- 14 Av S to vicinity of Coffee Creek	Widen and reconstruct roadway; paved shoulders and sidewalks.	\$996,000	PREMIER
77.	Spanaway Loop Rd S -- Coffee Creek to 176 St S/SR-7	Construct new arterial roadway with paved shoulders & sidewalk.	\$5,500,000	PREMIER
78.	Spanaway Loop Rd S -- Tule Lk to 116 St S	Sidewalks and paved shoulders or wide curb lanes.	\$436,000	MEDIUM
79.	SR-512 HOV lanes -- Steele St E to 24 Av E (WSDOT)	Add HOV lanes, trail, and landscaping. Keep paved shoulders.	\$23,000,000	PREMIER
80.	SR-7 -- SR-512 to Roy Y (WSDOT Project)	Improve with bike lanes, sidewalks, drainage, raised crosswalks, refuge islands, and bus pullouts.	\$8,000,000	HIGH
81.	SR-7 -- SR-512 to 96 St E (WSDOT Project)	Improve intersections & channelize. Minor widening. Add sidewalks.	\$3,813,000	HIGH
82.	SR-7 -- 22 Av E to Roy Y (WSDOT Project).	Paved shoulders and sidewalks, or trail.	\$2,003,000	STATE
83.	Tacoma/Rainier Rail Trail -- (72 St/McKinley) to SR-512 (Tacoma ROW)	Trail	\$852,000	TACOMA
84.	Tule Lake Rd -- Spanaway Loop Rd S to SR-7	Path. Curb ramps on west side Tule Lake Rd at Ainsworth.	\$21,000	HIGH
85.	Yakima Av (7 Av S) -- 144 St to 138 St	Sidewalks and wide curb lanes.	\$293,000	MEDIUM
86.	Waller Rd E -- Brookdale Rd Intersection	Intersection improvements.	No Estimate	MEDIUM

The following information explains the Prioritization of Transportation Projects table:

**Map ID#** is used to locate the project on the plan map.

**Project Location** lists the road or trail being improved and the limits of the project.

**Proposed Facility** lists the type of project that is being recommended. The types of projects being recommended and their associated costs are shown in Table K below:

<b>Table K. Estimated Project Costs</b>		
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Project Detail</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>
Paved shoulders	5-foot wide and striped, shoulder sub-base, both sides of the road	\$50/per linear foot
Wide lanes	14-foot wide, road sub-base, both sides of the road	\$50/per linear foot
Sidewalks	6-foot wide with curb and gutter, both sides of the road (unless noted as 1-side)	\$100/per linear foot
Trail	12-foot wide paved surface with a 2' wide gravel buffer	\$65.40/per linear foot
Path	6-foot wide gravel or natural surface path (unless noted as paved), one side of the road	\$10/per linear foot
Possible bike route	A candidate for bike lane markings or bike route signs	No cost estimate

**Estimated Cost** is based on varying levels of engineering studies depending on the status of the project. Many of the nonmotorized projects are based on an average linear foot cost estimate listed above. The cost estimate includes all associated costs of building the facility such as engineering, right-of-way purchases, and drainage improvements. Depending on the factors involved with each location, the estimated cost will be higher or lower than the actual cost. The per-linear-foot cost figures provided above are an average cost for all the recommended projects. The estimates are provided in current dollars and do not account for inflation. Therefore, the cost estimates for construction of the recommended projects may be low over a 20-year period depending on the effects of inflation.

If a proposed facility is listed as paved shoulders or trail, then the project listed first (paved shoulders) is the cost that was estimated. If a proposed facility is listed as paved shoulders and trail, then the estimated cost includes both projects. In many cases, the cost estimate is based on a more detailed engineering study of the project rather than only an average cost per linear foot. Where studies and cost estimates have been developed, those cost estimates are used.

**Priority** is based on how the project compares to other recommended projects. Projects were evaluated based on the following criteria: access to destinations (schools, parks, ferries, libraries, transit centers/park-and-ride lots, shopping malls/business districts, hospitals, major employers, government offices, trailheads, military base entrances, and other traffic generators), history of collisions, links to existing facilities, traffic counts, project cost, volume to capacity ratio in 2020, encouraging alternatives to SOV travel, technical feasibility, environmental constraints, community support, and impact on economic development. In most cases, the PSM

Transportation Committee concurred with the previously established priorities, but in some cases, changes were made based on updated information affecting these criteria.