



## PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

July 28, 2009, 7:00 p.m.

Burien City Hall

400 SW 152<sup>nd</sup> Street (Suite 300, Miller Creek Room)

Burien, Washington 98166

### I. ROLL CALL

### II. AGENDA CONFIRMATION

**III. PUBLIC COMMENT** Public comments allowed on items not scheduled for a public hearing on tonight's agenda.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** June 9, 2009

**V. PLANNING COMMISSION ELECTION** Election of chair and vice chair

**VI. NEW BUSINESS** a. Presentation and discussion about Fee-in-Lieu of Parking Program study

### VII. OLD BUSINESS

### VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS

### IX. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

### X. ADJOURNMENT

**Future Agendas (Tentative)** Aug. 11 – To be determined  
Aug. 25 – Zoning Code amendments

#### Planning Commissioners

Brian Bennett  
Stacie Grage (Vice Chair)

Jim Clingan  
Rebecca McInteer

Joe Fitzgibbon  
Rachel Pizarro

Janet Shull (Chair)

*City of Burien*

BURIEN PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

June 9, 2009

7:00 p.m.

Miller Creek Room, Burien City Hall

MINUTES

**Planning Commission Members Present:**

Janet Shull, Stacie Grage, Jim Clingan, Brian Bennett, Rachel Pizarro, Joe Fitzgibbon, Rebecca McInteer

**Absent:**

None

**Others Present:**

David Johanson, senior planner; Jeremy Hammar, planning intern

---

**Roll Call**

Chair Shull called the meeting to order at 7:12 p.m. At the call of the roll all commissioners were present.

**Agenda Confirmation**

Commissioner Grage asked that time be allotted for Councilmember Rose Clark to address the commission. Motion to approve the agenda as modified was made by Commissioner Grage. Second was by Commissioner Clingan and the motion carried unanimously.

**Council Communications**

Councilmember Clark informed the commission about the upcoming visit to Burien on July 2 by German urban planner Thomas Sieverts, author of the book "Why We Live Where We Live," which examines why people left large cities for the suburbs and what quality of life they have in the suburbs. Mr. Sieverts is on a speaking tour of the United States and will be spending two days in Seattle and one day in Burien. In the morning he will take a self-guided tour of Burien and beginning at 1:30 in the afternoon he will meet with invited community members to discuss why Burien has done what it has done and whether Mr. Sieverts considers it successful from his perspective. Then there will be a walking tour organized by various community groups. In the evening there will be a pay-by-donation barbecue cooked in the B/IAS lot, open to the community. The donations will go to B/IAS. Also, several crews will be videotaping the activities throughout the day.

**Approval of Minutes**

Motion to approve the minutes of May 12, 2009, was made by Commissioner Clingan; second was by Commissioner Grage. The motion carried unanimously.

**New Business**

Senior planner David Johanson briefed the commissioners on the item before them tonight -- their consideration, and possible recommendation to the City Council, of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan amendment preliminary docket. The commission is to determine whether each proposed amendment has enough merit to be recommended to the City Council for inclusion on this year's docket.

This year's proposed amendments are:

- 2009-1 Economic Development Element Goal and/or policy amendments (placeholder)
- 2009-2 Sustainability Goal and/or policy amendments
- 2009-3 Northeast Redevelopment Area policy and/or map amendments
- 2009-4 Capital Improvement Program map and project list updates
- 2009-5 Broderick Architects for Ambaum Partners, LLC (owner) Comprehensive Plan map amendment and rezone request
- 2009-6 Cramer Northwest Inc. for Larry Ohrt (owner) Comprehensive Plan map amendment and rezone request.

Mr. Johanson noted that proposed amendment 2009-1, a placeholder for Economic Development Element goal and/or policy amendments, is being worked on by the Burien Business and Economic Development Partnership (BEDP) and he is confident the BEDP will be submitting something.

For 2009-2, Mr. Johanson said staff is thinking that it's time to look at a very basic level of goal and policy work relating to sustainability while continuing with the more detailed sustainability work, perhaps setting one or two goals and a few of the key policies and amending the Comprehensive Plan accordingly. Currently staff is analyzing what's currently in the Comprehensive Plan that ties in with the work being done on sustainability.

The third item is 2009-3, Northeast Redevelopment Area goals and policies. Work currently is being done with Otak and the Port of Seattle to update the Northeast Redevelopment Area study and, in fact, go into greater depth.

Item 2009-4, Capital Improvement Program map and project list updates, will incorporate language reflecting the City's new biennial budget process and will update the CIP project list.

The last two items are requests from private parties. The first, 2009-5, is a request to rezone a parcel from Office to RM-18.

Chair Shull noted that she forgot to call for agenda item #3, Public Comment, and asked if anyone present wanted to speak to anything other than the Comprehensive Plan docket. There were no comments.

Going back to the proposed Comprehensive Plan docket, Genevieve Theriault of Broderick Architects introduced herself as the architect working on the 2009-5 project, which entails construction of a leasing center for the Heights at Burien apartment complex on property previously occupied by a hair salon.

Item 2009-6 is a request to rezone from RS-7200 Residential Single Family to Intersection Commercial. The owners of the parcel were in attendance and said that since the third SeaTac Airport runway opened the parcel is no longer suitable for single-family use because of increased noise and the proximity of the planes as they take off and land.

The consensus of the commissioners was to move forward in making a recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed docket.

Motion to recommend inclusion of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment reference no. 2009-1 on the 2009 Comprehensive Plan docket was made by Jim Clingan; Joe Fitzgibbon seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to recommend inclusion of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment reference no. 2009-2 on the 2009 Comprehensive Plan docket was made by Stacie Grage; Jim Clingan seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to recommend inclusion of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment reference no. 2009-3 on the 2009 Comprehensive Plan docket was made by Stacie Grage; Rachel Pizarro seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to recommend inclusion of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment reference no. 2009-4 on the 2009 Comprehensive Plan docket was made by Jim Clingan; Stacie Grage seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to recommend inclusion of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment reference no. 2009-5 on the 2009 Comprehensive Plan docket was made by Rachel Pizarro; Jim Clingan seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to recommend inclusion of proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment reference no. 2009-6 on the 2009 Comprehensive Plan docket was made by Stacie Grage; Jim Clingan seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Shull noted that the commission's recommendation will be presented to the City Council at its July 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **Old Business**

#### **A. Continuing discussion on sustainability strategy**

Jeremy Hammar, planning intern, said he had integrated the comments from the last Planning Commission meeting into the draft goals and had met with other Planning staff to work on the language and to discuss where to go next. Staff concluded that the parts of the draft strategy that aren't currently referenced in the Comprehensive Plan should be added through the 2009 amendment process. Therefore, sections 1, 2, 5 and 6 will be included in this year's amendment process.

Chair Shull said the recommendation of the planner who worked on Shoreline's sustainability strategy is that the strategy be separate from the Comprehensive Plan and that the plan be supportive of the strategy. The rationale for that is that the technologies and methodologies are constantly evolving and to accommodate that the strategy should be in a document that can be updated more often than a comprehensive plan. Mr. Johanson confirmed that Planning staff is thinking along those same lines.

Commissioners asked that the drafts not only indicate what has been added but what has been deleted as well. They asked if there is a timeline for completing the strategy; Mr. Hammar said at this point there is not.

Commissioner Pizarro pointed out that the sentence on the bottom of page 6 appears to be two sentences run together.

Chair Shull asked that staff provide Commissioner Pizarro with the same background information the rest of the commissioners received at the beginning of discussions about sustainability.

Councilmember Clark said that she thinks the BEDP is working on a sustainability strategy as well. Mr. Johanson said staff would check into what the BEDP is doing and if it relates to the Planning Commission's work.

Commissioners briefly discussed having stakeholders involved at some point.

Commissioner McInteer said she felt section 6 was redundant about the improvement of the strategy. She said she thinks it can be said in one paragraph that the strategy should be a living document and forego the bullet points. Commissioner Pizarro agreed that there are areas in the draft strategy that can be tightened up, leaving room for more substantial content. She'd like to see actionable things, particularly specific ways to engage the community, included in the strategy.

Chair Shull said she doesn't want the commission to go too far before involving the community. Mr. Johanson suggested that the commissioners may want to check in with the City Council and make sure they are moving in the direction that the council envisioned, and also check with the BEDP and Sustainable Burien.

### **Planning Commission Communications**

Commissioner Pizarro asked how she should communicate scheduled absences.

Commissioner Grage said that North Hill Elementary won an award for its recycling, reusing, and community work in sustainability projects at the school.

Commissioner Fitzgibbon said he went to a discussion hosted by the Transportation Choices Coalition that included presentations from a number of groups including Sound Transit. He said there were five long-range transportation plan alternatives including one that includes a rail link between Burien, Tukwila and West Seattle; comments on the Transportation 2040 DEIS are due to the Puget Sound Regional Council on July 13<sup>th</sup>.

The discussion also included a Tacoma staff member talking about that city's long-term plan for its mixed-used centers – that city is talking about eliminating parking minimums in two of its denser centers. In the future, he said, he would like to the commission to discuss parking in Burien's downtown. Mr. Johanson said he would get Commissioners Fitzgibbon and Bennett a copy of the downtown parking study that's already been done.

Commissioner Bennett said he filed to run for a seat on the City Council.

### **Director's Report**

Mr. Johanson reminded the commissioners that Saturday, June 13, is the Town Square and transit center grand opening event, beginning with the formal ceremonies at 10 a.m.

He also said it is anticipated that the new City Hall/Library will be LEED-certified at the silver level. He pointed out some of the special components including low-E glass, with different types of the glass for each of the different exposures to reduce heat gain; roller shades; dual-flush toilets; recycled building materials; and architectural features like sunshades.

### **Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Grage; meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Janet Shull, chair  
Planning Commission

**CITY OF BURIEN, WASHINGTON**  
**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** July 28, 2009  
**TO:** Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Charles W. "Chip" Davis, Planner   
**SUBJECT:** Draft Study Related to Downtown Fee-In-Lieu of Parking Consultant Presentation and Discussion.

---

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this agenda item is for the Planning Commission to receive a Draft Study on Fee-In-Lieu of Parking Program from Steve Nolin of Transportation Solutions, Inc. and begin to discuss proposed amendments to the Burien Zoning Code to initiate a fee-in-lieu of parking program for Downtown Burien. This is an opportunity for the Commission to question the consultant, discuss the proposed draft study and provide direction to staff regarding City Council consideration of the program.

**BACKGROUND**

In April 2005, the Burien City Council authorized a study of Downtown parking focusing on existing capacity and parking demand. The study report, which was published in December 2006, recognized that proper management of parking in the downtown will contribute to the overall health and vitality of the mix of uses that were envisioned for Burien's downtown. Following completion of the parking inventory and forecasting phases a public process to develop parking management strategies was initiated, culminating in a February 2007 Stakeholder Group Recommendation. The report focused on near-term management of the existing parking supply, but recommendations were also made regarding use of a fee-in-lieu of parking program to reduce a possible development barrier and provide another tool to encourage redevelopment in downtown. The portion of the recommendation relating to fee-in-lieu of parking options is attached as background information.

On July 15<sup>th</sup>, the project consultant completed a draft study of a fee-in-lieu of parking program or FILOP which would serve as an alternative to the minimum on-site parking requirements in the Zoning Code for non-residential development in Downtown Burien. The study will serve as the basis for a public process to determine what the City's role might be as a long-term parking provider in Downtown. Staff and the consultant will also be making a presentation to the Burien Economic Development Partnership (BEDP) during the month of August.

Steve Nolin of TSI will be at the July 28<sup>th</sup> meeting to present the draft study, which is attached for your review, and staff would like the Planning Commission to begin discussing the framework of the fee-in-lieu of parking program for possible recommendation to the Burien City Council this fall.

**ACTION REQUESTED**

Receive presentation from consultant and begin discussion on program specifics and procedures for possible recommendation to the City Council.

## VI. FEE IN LIEU OF PARKING OPTIONS

The zoning code (BMC 19.20.040.3.B) contains a parking option that allows projects to meet the parking requirements by paying a per-stall fee in a municipal parking facility. The code section reads as follows:

### **19.20.040 Computation of required off-street parking spaces**

#### **3. Modification of Number of Required Parking Spaces.**

- B. In the DC zone, the *applicant* may meet his/her parking obligation, computed using BMC 19.15, in either of the following ways, or a combination thereof:
- i. By providing the required number of *parking spaces* in accordance with this Chapter.
  - ii. **With the consent of the Director, the applicant may provide, or pay the per space cost of providing the additional parking spaces in a municipal parking facility within the DC, SPA-3 or CR zones. The cost per parking space shall be established by the City Council.**

The purpose of this zoning code section is to allow flexibility for how a project can meet its anticipated parking demand without using valuable on-site space for parking. The code states the City Council shall determine the cost per stall. The parking stakeholder group was asked for input on a fee-in-lieu program.

### ***Policy Discussion***

The downtown area parking demand study has shown there is an ample supply of parking in the downtown and Old Burien zones, therefore allowing a developer to pay a fee in lieu of parking is a reasonable measure to reduce a potential development barrier and is another tool that may entice further redevelopment in the downtown. There should be a balance between the costs of the fee being high enough to assist in supplementing the parking management program but not so high that it will deter development.

### ***Stakeholder Group Recommendation***

Given the ample parking supply currently available and to further attract redevelopment and reduce potential development barriers, the stakeholder group recommends that the City pursue the creation of a fee-in-lieu parking program. The group recognized that this can be a valuable tool to encourage use of existing buildings or redevelopment of sites that may be constrained due to lot size and/or ability to provide parking on-site.

### ***Setting the fee amount***

If the fee in lieu of providing parking is greater or equal to the costs of constructing parking stalls then the program may not be used, thereby making it less attractive to develop in downtown. Conversely, if the City decides to set the fee below the actual parking construction costs, the program is likely to be used and reduce a potential development barrier, therefore enticing more redevelopment. A policy decision will need to be made on whether or not the fee is set lower than actual construction costs.

Existing parking conditions also should be considered when determining the amount of the subsidy. As more redevelopment occurs and available parking supply is reduced, the fee should be

increased to reflect additional costs associated with providing parking. It should be noted that there is merit to the notion that somewhat full parking is a more efficient use of available land and provides a visual indication of an active and vibrant downtown.

### Stakeholder Group Recommendation

The parking stakeholder group recommends that the fee-in-lieu be closer to actual costs of providing parking, thereby allowing the City to effectively purchase land and/or create additional parking supplies. When and if the available supply begins to dwindle the City should re-evaluate the fee to determine if the fee should be adjusted. The City also should begin to actively pursue additional supplies if parking utilization rate nears 85 percent.

### **Other considerations regarding a fee-in-lieu program**

It is recognized that implementation of a fee-in-lieu-of-parking program requires more detail on how a program is managed and is legally structured. The details of the program should be developed and resolved during the creation and adoption of the enabling ordinance.

The following is intended to assist in initiating and directing discussions regarding a fee-in-lieu parking ordinance.

- Fee-in-lieu of providing parking can be an annual payment or a one-time payment.
- Fee-in-lieu parking program shall not allow the use of parking demand study to determine amount of parking needed. Amount of parking required shall be based on a prescriptive approach. Using a prescriptive parking calculation method avoids potential confusion/disagreement over the amount of parking required.
- The in-lieu fee may not be used to buy out the complete parking requirement. It may be used for up to 40 percent of the required amount.
- New housing developments shall not be granted parking reductions or have access to the in-lieu fee program for the residential portions of a development project.
- The City should explore forming a Local Parking District to administer parking management, maintenance and purchase of new parking supplies. The district could use funds collected to purchase new parking supplies.

### *Use of fees collected*

The fees collected should be used to purchase land and/or pay for expanded parking facilities. **The parking stakeholder group expressed a strong desire to acquire land for additional supplies now rather than in the future.** Care will need to be taken on where those facilities are provided. There will need to be a balance between many factors when determining where to purchase land for a parking facility, including:

- 1) What land is available?
- 2) How much will it cost?
- 3) Location of available land
  - locate facilities on secondary streets so as not to use high demand commercial locations and to maintain pedestrian character
  - locate new facilities in areas experiencing or that are anticipated to experience high parking demand

- Site should have good pedestrian connectivity to high activity areas
  - Site should have adequate vehicular access
- 4) Land configuration – what will be the parking yield?
    - Parcel size and configuration should be able to accommodate a structure in the future.
  - 5) Parking fees that are collected should be used only to create new parking supplies.
  - 6) Fee-in-lieu parking program should not be made available to large developments but be directed to small business or small sites that are constrained in size.
  - 7) Parking in-lieu fees should not be collected if there is insufficient supply available (i.e. collecting a fee when there is not enough supply to accommodate the anticipated demand).





**FEE-IN-LIEU  
OF PARKING PROGRAM**

**JULY 2009  
DRAFT**

**PREPARED FOR:**



**PREPARED BY:**

**TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS, INC.  
8250 – 185TH AVENUE NORTHEAST  
REDMOND, WA 98052  
425-883-4134**



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. SUMMARY ..... 3

II. BACKGROUND ..... 4

    A. SOME RELEVANT KEY PRINCIPLES DEVELOPED DURING THE 2006 PARKING STUDY..... 4

        1. UNDERSTAND THE VARIOUS DOWNTOWN PARKING NEEDS. .... 4

        2. STRATEGICALLY LOCATE PARKING FACILITIES..... 5

        3. VALUE ON-STREET PARKING. .... 5

        4. PLAN FOR THE FUTURE. .... 5

    B. RECOMMENDATIONS OF 2006 STUDY ..... 5

III. WHY CONSIDER A FEE-IN-LIEU OF PARKING PROGRAM? ..... 6

    A. POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND CHALLENGES TO A FILOP PROGRAM. .... 6

IV. POLICY ISSUES ..... 8

    A. POTENTIAL DEMAND FOR A FILOP PROGRAM IN BURIEN ..... 8

    B. WHAT SHOULD BE THE BASIS FOR THE FEE?..... 10

    C. SHOULD PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM BE REQUIRED, OPTIONAL OR BY PERMIT? .. 11

    D. SHOULD THE FEES BE SET TO PAY THE FULL OR PARTIAL COST OF PARKING? .....12

    E. WHAT IS THE COST OF PARKING?.....14

    F. WHAT ARE THE EXPECTATIONS REGARDING THE FILOP PROGRAM?.....14

    G. HOW SHOULD FILOP REVENUE BE USED?.....14

        1. CAPITAL COSTS .....15

        2. OPERATING COSTS.....15

V. HOW SHOULD THE CITY’S PARKING PROGRAM BE ADMINISTERED?.....16

    A. DIRECT ADMINISTRATION BY THE CITY .....16

    B. PARKING COMMISSION.....17

    C. PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY .....17

VI. HOW SHOULD THE CITY FINANCE AND DEVELOP PARKING FACILITIES? ..... 17

    A. DIRECT CITY FINANCING AND DEVELOPMENT .....17

    B. DELEGATION OR ASSIGNMENT OF THE CITY’S AUTHORITY .....18

    C. PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.....19

VII. COMMON ELEMENTS IDENTIFIED IN THE REVIEW OF EXISTING FILOP PROGRAMS:.....19

VIII. KEY ELEMENTS AFFECTING THE SUCCESS OF FILOP PROGRAMS .....21

IX. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 23

**TABLE OF APPENDICES**

- APPENDIX A: CITY PARKING REQUIREMENTS
- APPENDIX B: WHAT IS THE COST OF ON-SITE PARKING?
- APPENDIX C: FEE-IN-LIEU OF PARKING PROGRAMS
- APPENDIX D: DOWNTOWN BURIEN PARKING SUPPLY AND DEMAND

## I. Summary

The City of Burien is considering development of a program whereby developers could pay a fee in lieu of providing parking in certain areas of the City. The program would provide an alternative to minimum on-site parking requirements required for new non-residential development. This report identifies the issues that should be considered for implementation of such a program, as well as the attributes of other fee-in-lieu of parking programs that have been implemented in the US, Canada and Australia. This information will be used to begin a public process to determine what the City's role might be as a long term parking provider for Downtown Burien.



Based on our review of currently operating fee-in-lieu of parking (FILOP) programs, we offer the following summary of the ideal situation for success of such a program.

The likelihood of success for fee-in-lieu of parking is greater when a community experiences rapid development in a concentrated area with expensive or constrained land. FILOP funds from development should augment other City

resources to construct and manage off-street parking. City operated parking as an alternative to on-site parking can be most successful as a support to redevelopment of older commercial areas where small lots, multiple landowners, and physical constraints, such as alleys, easements, existing street patterns, impede the construction of on-site parking.

There are both potential challenges and benefits from a fee-in-lieu of parking program. In the right development environment, carefully designed programs have been shown to be quite successful.

It appears that the essential ingredients for success are in place in downtown Burien, such that the City could benefit from a fee-in-lieu of parking program. However there is no one-size-fits-all FILOP program that will work in all cities. Ultimately a successful FILOP program will be crafted to meet the needs of the City and its unique development and financial environments.

The balance of this document lays out the background, potential benefits and challenges related to FILOP programs, various policy issues the City and business community should consider in development of such a program, and experience from other cities' FILOP programs. We do not make specific recommendations related to the policy questions, but instead present this information to inform a dialogue with and among representatives of downtown Burien business representatives and City policy makers to reach the answers that satisfy their collective interests.

## II. Background

A thriving and successful downtown business district provides a diverse mix of retail, entertainment, residential, civic, and service oriented land uses in an environment that is aesthetically pleasing and accommodates efficient pedestrian and vehicular circulation. Adequate parking supports a successful business district.

In late 2006 Transportation Solutions Incorporated (TSI) conducted on behalf of the City a study of parking demand for the downtown area of Burien. It concluded that existing parking, if well managed, was sufficient to the supply area's near term parking needs (up to 10 years). The City's planning model forecasted at the time that in the far term (10 to 15 years), increased land values, coupled with



decreased building values would generate demand for commercial area redevelopment that would increase the commercial area by 93,000 SF, and that about 810 new residential units would be built within the study area.

### A. Some relevant key principles developed during the 2006 parking study.

#### 1. Understand the various downtown parking needs.

Small retail businesses require short-term customer parking that is within a few hundred feet of a business. Parking for those requiring long-term parking, such as

employees can and should be further away. The design of on and off-street parking areas should be consistent with and integrated into the design guidelines for the area. In order to make the best use of existing parking supplies, increase the public's awareness of parking locations and share off-street supplies when possible.

2. Strategically locate parking facilities.

Supplement on-street parking with strategically located off-street supplies and provide more small lots (20-40 stalls) rather than fewer large lots. Off-street public parking facilities should be located on secondary streets (6th, 2nd, 8th, 150th, and 153rd) and use way-finding to direct drivers to parking supplies

3. Value on-street parking.

Determine how to best utilize the existing public right of way to provide parking (angle, parallel, or head-in parking) or loading zones. Establish time limits to support short-term parking (1-2 hours; 9AM-6PM) and discourage long-term parking. When demand approaches the supply, consider establishing parking fees. Parking fees for on-street stalls should be consistent with off-street pricing. Enforce on-street parking policies by identifying violators and educating or ticketing offenders.

4. Plan for the future.

Forecast how much additional parking is needed and identify general locations for new parking lots. Establish the city's role as a parking provider or manager and determine what new policies/programs are needed. Policies include those associated with parking requirements and options for new development, a fee-in-lieu of program as well as parking management programs for public on and off-street supplies. Establish the role of business community as a parking provider and supporter of parking management programs.

**B. Recommendations of 2006 Study**

In line with these principles, TSI made recommendations to the City to ensure adequate future parking supplies. One of the challenges these recommendations are designed to overcome is that redevelopment of Downtown Burien, which is characterized in large part by small business storefronts on individual lots, is anticipated to be limited by the City's minimum parking requirements.

1. Consider implementation of a program that would allow developers to pay a fee in lieu of providing required parking. That fee could be used to offset the costs of development of city-owned or otherwise shared parking facilities to more efficiently provide parking to support the redeveloped Downtown commercial and residential areas.

2. Review policies regarding parking study requirements for new development and min/max parking requirements.
3. Acquire land and establish small parking lots on blocks generating high short-term demand.
4. Focus on strategies to provide for parking within the commercial core area of 152nd, 153rd, Old Burien, and intersecting streets. Strategies should focus on increasing parking supplies in the far-term while retaining the unique character of the district.

A discussion of Burien's minimum parking policies in is included in Appendix A.

### **III. Why consider a fee-in-lieu of parking program?**

Fee-in-lieu of parking (FILOP ) programs are implemented to reduce the cost of development, encourage shared parking, improve urban design, reduce congestion, and reduce the number of parking requirement variances.

#### **A. Potential benefits and challenges to a FILOP program.**

##### Potential benefits

1. It provides an alternative and additional flexibility for developers to meet the minimum parking requirements, when complying with the requirements would be difficult, expensive or incompatible with project design goals.
2. Removing the requirement of minimum on-site parking reduces pressure for the local government to grant parking variances.
3. Removing the requirement for minimum on-site parking makes it easier to develop small parcels and reuse buildings.
4. Public parking can be shared among different sites. Shared parking is more efficient because of greater flexibility and because fewer spaces are needed to meet total parking demand. This is especially true when parking is shared among uses with different peak periods of parking demand.



5. Cities can locate parking in facilities that reduce vehicle congestion and improve pedestrian and other non-motorized circulation on downtown streets. Less on-site parking allows for continuous storefronts on more pedestrian friendly streets.

### Potential Challenges

1. Individual developments may need onsite parking to make them attractive to lenders, tenants and/or customers. In most programs developers have the option of providing parking instead of paying the fee.
2. Cities generally do not guarantee parking availability in return for payment of the fee. Others may make parking available in return for the fee but do not guarantee it will be convenient for the user. The city's approach to providing parking facilities has a large effect on parking availability for end users and the willingness of developers to participate.
3. Fees charged per parking space may be higher for publicly developed parking than for privately developed parking. Higher costs may be attributable to structured parking, architectural upgrades, public bidding requirements, etc.
4. Timeliness of the use of funds and provision of parking can be a financial and political challenge. A city where there are few projects that would take advantage of a FILOP program may not be able to generate enough revenue quickly enough to support a viable program.
5. To be effective, parking should be provided within reasonable walking distance of the properties contributing to the program.
6. An in-lieu program can be at odds with other parking strategies that allow reductions. For example, policies that allow shared parking or provide for reductions to required parking based on proximity to transit service can reduce funding for the FILOP program.
7. Sufficient funding must be provided to ensure that parking is provided. At least initially other public funding to support parking development is typically required.
8. Lenders may be reluctant to finance development of a property if there is no assurance of timely and convenient parking.
9. Sufficient City staff time must be dedicated to establishing and implementing the program.

## **IV. Policy Issues**

There are several key questions that should be addressed in designing a successful FILOP program that fits the needs of a given community:

1. Does the City foresee sufficient public benefit from consolidating parking facilities to establish a fee-in-lieu of parking program?
2. Does the City have the capacity to develop and manage parking facilities?
3. How much potential demand is there for a FILOP alternative to required minimum on-site parking?
4. What should be the basis for the fee?
5. Should the program be optional or required for certain properties?
6. Does program simplicity – both for developers and the City – create sufficient value to the success of the program to justify fees that are less than the true cost of developing parking?
7. What is a fair rate that will support program success, and how often should the rate be updated?
8. What should be the expectations of developers who pay fees in lieu of providing on-site parking?
9. What should be the expectations of existing property and business owners?
10. How should FILOP revenues be used?
11. How should the City parking program be financed and administered?

The City's interest in developing a potential FILOP program provides a preliminary answer to the first two questions. However, the answers to the subsequent questions may affect the City's ultimate decision to move forward to implement a FILOP program. We explore issues surrounding these questions in the following sections.

### **A. Potential demand for a FILOP program in Burien**

Small lot size and diverse ownership in downtown properties create challenges for redevelopment of Downtown Burien. Incorporating on-site parking into new development on many of the existing downtown parcels would be difficult, without tearing down existing buildings and aggregation of several lots for a new development. While that might be possible in some cases, the City has an interest in providing an alternative to on-site parking as a means to retain continuous storefronts and promote a pedestrian friendly downtown environment.



The 2006 parking study indicated that with proper management and use of shared parking agreements, there was sufficient parking to satisfy the parking needs in downtown until about 2016. Thereafter, additional parking will be needed to allow for expected commercial and residential development. FILOP programs address only commercial development, as it generally is considered inappropriate to provide a fee alternative to minimum residential parking requirements. Additional information regarding Burien parking supply and demand is included in Appendix D.

**B. What should be the basis for the fee?**

Options include:

1. Calculate fees based on a case-by-case basis

Typically fees charged on a case-by-case basis are determined using a project-specific analysis of the cost of developing parking. This approach usually is based on actual appraised land value and development costs per space for the type of parking facility that would be constructed in the vicinity of the development.

This approach has largely been abandoned, as the process is time consuming, creates significant cost uncertainty for the developer, and is complex and staff-intensive to administer.



2. Charge fees based on location or sector.

For example, fees may be charged at a lower rate for properties farther from the City Center. This approach requires a sophisticated up-front parking cost analysis and regular updates of the fee component costs. It can take into account differing costs for land and development in central vs. outlying areas of the City.

3. Charge a uniform fee per parking space to all projects

This is the most common approach. It is much easier for City staff to administer and is easier for developers to choose between providing parking or paying the fee. This approach requires a very thoughtful process to set fees and an ongoing process to adjust fees to keep the program viable. This approach, while unlikely to generate fees that accurately reflect the true cost of developing parking, tends to be used in most successful programs.

### **C. Should participation in the program be required, optional or by permit?**

Typically in the United States, FILOP programs are optional. However some cities have identified some potential benefits for the community from a required program. Some of the attributes of required and optional FILOP parking programs are:

#### **1. Required**

Requiring all new development to contribute to a FILOP program is uncommon in the U.S., due primarily to lack of a clear justification for the cash contribution if the property developer can provide sufficient on-site parking. However, there are a few cities (Berkeley and Carmel, CA) that do not allow on-site parking in downtown areas

and require contribution to a FILOP program. There also may be specific circumstances where FILOP participation could be required for some -- but not all -- developments. One such circumstance would be a change in use for an existing building that increases parking demand without increasing on-site parking supply (Kirkland, WA).

Reasons for considering required participation could include:



- Centralization of parking
- Maximizing funding for developing new parking supply
- Putting more of the supply under public management
- Encouraging more efficient shared parking
- Encouraging development of continuous storefronts
- Improving pedestrian circulation
- Reducing traffic congestion
- Improving urban design

## 2. Optional

Most U.S. programs are optional. A decision is made solely by the developer about which approach to providing parking better supports the development.

The FILOP rate, site constraints, cost of developing on-site parking, the anticipated value of on-site parking, and the anticipated impact on business success of parking availability are key developer decision factors.



Success of optional programs may require significant subsidy by government.

## 3. Special Use Permit Required

This is a hybrid of the optional program, in which the developer must apply and make the case for participation in a FILOP program (Lake Forest, IL; Corvallis, OR). Typically, this approach is used in cases where available land for parking is scarce and use of the FILOP mechanism is highly valued by developers as an alternative to developing onsite parking. This approach may be coupled with case-by-case establishment of the fee.

### **D. Should the fees be set to pay the full or partial cost of developing parking?**

There are several factors to consider in determining a fair and workable fee:

- The value of not requiring onsite parking could be considered in setting the fee. The cost of required minimum parking is a hidden impact fee on development that varies from city to city and use to use.
- The full cost of providing centralized parking may be more or less than the cost to develop equivalent on-site parking. While equivalent numbers of parking spaces are typically somewhat more costly when constructed by a municipality, the overall cost for parking could be less. That is because fewer overall parking spaces should be needed to meet demand, especially if the parking serves a variety of uses with different peak demand periods.



- Will there be demand for use of the FILOP option at a given rate? The answer to this will depend on site constraints, and whether the perceived cost of on-site parking is considered by the developer to be significantly higher than the fee or if the feasibility of providing parking on the site constricts development potential.
- Will a rate that generates demand for use of the program be adequate to support City development of parking facilities? The City may wish to determine if other funding sources could be available and appropriate for supplementing FILOP revenue.

### **E. What is the Cost of Parking?**

There are some commonly overlooked elements in answering this question.

- There may be a lack of available land on the private development site to accommodate parking without incurring other negative impacts to the site.
- There may be increased site development and revenue potential when parking is not required on-site.
- Property tax must be paid for the land and onsite parking facility, but these facilities do not usually generate direct revenue to the development.

A more complete discussion of the cost of parking is included in Appendix B.



### **F. What are the expectations regarding the FILOP program?**

In establishing a FILOP program, expectations should be made clear to the development community and existing business and property owners about what the program is intended to deliver. Most programs operating in the U.S. require that the FILOP revenue be used for developing parking. Some programs allow revenue to be used

for parking studies and/or facilities or services that reduce the need for parking. None of the programs reviewed for this report specifically required development of parking. As a practical matter, most businesses will expect convenient available parking within a reasonable period of time in exchange for contribution to the FILOP program.

### **G. How should FILOP revenue be used?**

Options for use of the fee revenue include:

- Purchase land and develop small distributed surface parking lots
- Purchase land and develop larger structured parking facilities
- Purchase rights for use of surplus existing parking

- Develop transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- Support operational costs for the City parking program
- A combination of the above

1. Capital Costs

In general costs for purchase of land or development of parking or other facilities should be supported by “one-time” revenue, such as a one-time fee in lieu of parking payment, or by use of other capital funds available to the City. The City could provide funding through any combination of: 1) direct expenditure of legally available capital funds or 2) grants and loans 3) municipal bonds, 4) direct expenditure of fee-in-lieu-of-parking revenue.

The City could use the one-time funds for: 1) purchase of property, 2) development of parking facilities on available land and 3) contribution to satisfy a public/private partnership agreement with a private developer.

The revenue from the parking fee-in-lieu program can be used to: 1) purchase property and develop parking 2) repay the City for its initial expenditure, 3) augment the City expenditure and 4) service debt incurred by the City for parking development.

2. Operating Costs

Ideally, ongoing parking or other facility operating costs should be supported by ongoing revenue streams with growth that tracks growth of operating costs. Operating costs could be satisfied by 1) parking fees 2) earnings from investment of fee-in-lieu-of-parking funds, 3) providing for periodic FILOP installment payments with a portion set aside for operating costs, 4) earmarking of local taxes generated by local businesses or properties and 5) expenditure of the City’s general fund revenue.

## **V. How should the City’s parking program be administered?**

The FILOP program will provide revenue to the City’s parking development and operation program. Some cities directly administer their parking programs. Others, such as Miami, Florida, have delegated that responsibility to a parking authority. The Miami Parking Authority is a semi-autonomous entity created in 1955 by a special act of the Florida Legislature and incorporated into the City of Miami’s charter in 1968. It develops and manages on-street and off-street parking in the city, and shares responsibility for enforcement with the police department.



In Washington, there are several mechanisms potentially available to Cities for administering parking programs including:

### **A. Direct Administration by the City**

Washington State law appears to limit the operation of city owned parking facilities with city employees to those where the primary purpose is to provide parking for “persons who use ... park or civic center facilities.” However, the statutes also indicate that cities



can contract with a private parking management company to operate other city owned or leased parking for other than park and civic center users. (See RCW 35.86A).

### **B. Parking Commission**

Washington State RCW 35.86A also enables first and second class cities to establish parking commissions. The 5-member commissions are authorized and empowered in the name of the municipality to lease, own, develop and operate off-street paid and free-parking facilities, within certain limitations. However these commissions are limited to providing parking “for persons who use ... park or civic center facilities.” It is not clear if this RCW would allow for city commissions to purchase and develop parking for other than park or civic center purposes. We suggest that this statute be reviewed by the Burien City Attorney if this approach is of interest to the City.

### **C. Public Development Authority**

RCW 35.21.730 allows cities and counties to establish public development authorities (PDA). These PDAs are allowed to perform public functions that the creating city or county could perform itself. Typically PDAs are created to manage the development and operation of a single project that the city or county determines is best managed outside of its bureaucracy and lines of authority. Such projects may be entrepreneurial in nature and may include relationships and/or partnerships with the private sector. Examples of facilities developed and/or operated by Public Development Authorities include the Pike Place Market in Seattle, the Lynnwood Convention Center, the Meydenbauer Center in Bellevue, and the Spokane Parking Public Development Authority.

## **VI. How should the City finance and develop parking facilities?**

The City has a variety of options for financing and developing parking facilities. Typically cities issue bonds for construction of major capital facilities. In Washington State, municipalities have a variety of potential funding and development options available for parking facilities. The following list is not meant to be all-inclusive. Each of the various approaches has legal limitations, which should be carefully reviewed by the City attorney for applicability to the City. Specific financing and development options available to the City of Burien may be constrained by its decisions regarding administration of the parking program.

### **A. Direct City Financing and Development**

**Parking Fund** – Typically the City will establish a dedicated fund or funds for financing its parking program. Revenues to the fund could come from FILOP funds, parking revenue and/or a variety of other sources including:



General Obligation Bonds – The legal limit for all voter approved debt is 7.5 percent of assessed value. The limit for non-voted debt is 1.5 percent.

Revenue Bonds -- Revenue bonds require a pledge of parking revenues and other dedicated revenue sources to repay the bonds, but do not require pledging of the full faith and credit of the issuing authority. Revenue bonds are not appropriate if the overall debt limit of the issuing authority's debt limit is a factor or if there is insufficient certain revenue to cover debt service. Interest rates typically are higher than general obligation bonds.

State and Federal Grants – Historically state and federal grant funds have been used to supplement locally available funds. While there may be some opportunities for grants, we are unaware of any active grant funding available for city parking facilities.

General Fund Contributions – the City may contribute general fund revenue toward development of parking facilities when the facilities further the City's identified public interests.

### **B. Delegation or assignment of the City's authority**

60-20 Financing -- This is a somewhat controversial form of financing in which a non-profit corporation acts as an agent for the government in issuing bonds.

Public Development Authority – As noted in the previous section, the City can authorize a Public Development Authority, which would have many of the same options for financing as the City. Generally, tax-exempt bonds issued by a PDA must be backed by the enterprise revenues, although the authorizing City may lend its credit to the PDA to secure more favorable bond or other financing terms. An example of this approach is the City of Miami's Housing Authority, which is authorized to issue revenue bonds for parking facility development. In 2004 the City authorized issuance up to \$45 million in bonds. The parking authority issued \$40.7 million in revenue bonds in 2006 for a variety of projects to be built over 5 years.



### **C. Public Private Partnerships**

The City or PDA could enter into a public-private partnership to develop and/or operate parking facilities. For example, the City or PDA could purchase land and enter into an agreement with a private developer to develop parking in exchange for the air rights and the ability to develop offices, residential units or commercial space over the parking facility.

## **VII. Common elements identified in the review of existing FILOP programs:**

Fee-in-lieu of parking programs are authorized in a number of cities in the U.S., Canada, Europe and Australia. Fees and approaches vary widely but there are some common elements to many of the programs. Additional information in Appendix C.

1. Most cities have found that uniform fees are the most practical approach. Areas where case-by-case rate setting is successful have highly constrained expensive

land, and there is high developer demand for alternatives to on-site parking requirements.

2. Programs are limited to specific areas, such as a downtown commercial district.
3. Programs are limited to non-residential uses.
4. A dedicated parking fund is established to receive FILOP and other funds to support publicly provided parking.
5. With few exceptions, programs are optional. Successful programs with required participation generally have determined that on-site parking for individual developments is detrimental to preservation of the character of the area or to the functioning of the transportation network.
6. Most successful programs supplement FILOP revenue for development of parking facilities.
7. Payment typically is due prior to issuance of a building permit or certificate of occupancy.
8. Some of the more successful programs allow installment payments to encourage participation, although this does not appear to be a critical element for success. Programs that allow installment payments may charge interest at a fairly high rate and typically include strict enforcement with significant penalties for non-payment.
9. All the U.S. programs we identified require that the FILOP revenue be spent on parking facilities and/or other activities or facilities that reduce the demand for parking.
10. None of the programs have strict standards that guarantee parking will be developed in exchange for the FILOP payment, although program success tends to be correlated with successful parking development that meets the expectations of developers.
11. It appears that fees typically recover between 40 percent and about 80 percent of the full cost of developing parking. Most do not have an expressed policy that sets the percentage of cost to be recovered through the fee.
12. Most cities also do not have a mechanism to keep rates current, which can negatively affect the ability of the city to fund parking. Two that do are:

- a. Corvallis, OR, which updates the rate yearly based on changes to the Engineering News Record Cost Index, which is a measure of inflation for capital construction projects.
- b. Miami, FL, which updates the rate every five years based on changes to the Consumer Price Index – U.

The state of Washington provides a construction cost index for highway and road construction, which could serve as a reasonable index for updating the FILOP fee for the City of Burien.



13. Several cities have reduced fees and/or simplified their programs over the years to generate more developer participation. For example, Davis, CA effectively reduced the fee from \$8,000, which was established in the 1970s to \$4,000 in 1998, because it had only generated \$190,000 in total. In 2004, a complex implementation system was dramatically simplified to encourage participation.

## **IIX. Key Elements affecting the success of FILOP programs**

Balancing key FILOP program elements within the context of the availability of land and cost of developing otherwise required parking leads to program success.

Rapid development activity, land scarcity, small lot size and high price for developable land create demand for use of FILOP programs.

FILOP revenue rarely is sufficient to fully fund a successful City parking program.

Fee amount and availability of parking through the FILOP program or other means are important considerations for developers in deciding whether to use the program or not.



If the City establishes an optional program and decides to charge the full cost of developing parking, developers may decide that providing onsite parking is preferable to paying a fee for similar or higher cost offsite parking space, especially if the parking is not convenient or guaranteed.

The program likely will not generate enough revenue to build needed parking without significant public subsidy.

Fees and program parameters should be periodically evaluated and updated to keep the program viable.

## **IX. Conclusions and Recommendations**

The likelihood of success of fees-in-lieu of parking is increased when a community experiences rapid development in a concentrated area with expensive or constrained land. Where major developments are proposed, there may be sufficient funding to support construction of off-street parking. The FILOP funds from development generally should augment other City resources to construct and manage off-street parking. City operated parking as an alternative to on-site parking can be most successful as a support to redevelopment of older commercial areas where small lots, multiple landowners, and physical constraints, such as alleys, easements, existing street patterns, or design considerations impede the construction of on-site parking.

It appears that these essential ingredients for success are in place in downtown Burien, such that the City could benefit from a carefully crafted fee-in-lieu of parking program.

Benefits to the City from development of a successful FILOP program could include: increased sales and business activity, revitalization of an aging commercial area, reduction in traffic congestion and enhanced urban design.

To achieve these benefits through a successful FILOP program, the City of Burien will need to strike an appropriate balance of parking availability, cost and value.

We recommend that the City consider implementing a FILOP program for Downtown Burien with the following elements:

- Participation should be limited to non-residential uses.
- Participation should be optional, except that participation should be required for existing buildings with a change of use that requires parking in excess of that available on-site or through a shared parking agreement.
- The minimum number of stalls to be provided – or avoided through payment of FILOP – should be based on a published schedule derived from ITE standards. The city may wish to retain the option for a developer to provide fewer stalls if verified by a parking study certified by a professional transportation engineer.
- The per-stall fee should be uniform and initially set to recover approximately 70 percent to 80 percent of the City's cost for developing a surface parking stall, based on City of Burien cost data and other potential parking development revenue sources. As the downtown develops into a dense urban environment, the City may increase the fee to more closely reflect the full cost of developing structured parking.
- The fee should be adjusted annually for inflation, based on changes in the State of Washington Department of Transportation's Construction Cost Index.
- The fee should be payable in full at or before the issuance of building permits at the rate in effect at the time of payment.

- The fee amount and program performance should reviewed at the end of years two, four and six, thereafter at least every fifth year.
- The City should establish a Parking Capital Fund, with one-time revenues such as FILOP payments, Real Estate Excise Tax, grants, loans, and bond proceeds for the sole purpose of development and major maintenance of parking facilities.
- The City also should establish a Parking Operations Fund for the sole purpose of operating the parking program, with ongoing revenues such as parking fees and fines, or regular transfers from the City's General Fund of utility tax, sales tax, property tax, or business and occupation tax derived from Downtown businesses.
- The City may wish to consider formation of a Public Development Authority with the sole purpose for developing and administering the City's parking program.
- If the City chooses to administer the program with City staff, we recommend that parking program positions (or partial positions) be clearly identified within the organizational structure of the City and funded directly from ongoing Parking Operations Fund revenues.
- The City should set financial policies related to the use of FILOP revenue and non-FILOP funding related to the development and maintenance of parking facilities, and staffing and administration of the parking program.
- The City may wish to consider pledging the full faith and credit of the City toward repayment of revenue bonds issued by either the City or PDA for development of public parking. The debt service on such bonds should be supported primarily by FILOP and other Parking Capital Fund revenues.
- The City should consider strategic purchase and/or options to purchase undeveloped or underdeveloped parcels for use in the near term as surface parking and for potential future development as structured parking or contribution to a public private partnership to develop parking.
- The City and/or PDA should seek opportunities for long term leases (10 years or longer) of excess private parking and for public-private partnerships for development of structured parking.



## **Appendix A: City Parking Requirements**

The City has established minimum off-street parking requirements for many residential and office uses. In general commercial uses in downtown Burien, off-street parking is determined for an individual use on a case-by-case basis, according to Burien Municipal Code 19.20.030

*Parking Plan Required. Prior to issuance of any permits for a new building, structure or use, or for the enlargement of an existing building, structure or use that requires off-street parking, the applicant shall submit a parking plan for approval by the Director. This plan shall contain all design features and elements necessary to show compliance with this Chapter.*

*2. Parking Requirement Not Specified. If this Code does not specify a parking requirement for a use, the Director shall establish the minimum requirement based on a study of anticipated parking demand. In the study the applicant shall provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the parking demand for a specific use will be satisfied. Parking studies shall be prepared by a professional engineer with expertise in traffic and parking analyses, unless an equally qualified individual is authorized by the Director.*

There are provisions for satisfying the parking requirements by shared parking agreements.

## Appendix B: What is the cost of On-Site Parking?

The cost of onsite parking has three major variables. 1) the number of required spaces, 2) the cost to develop each space, and 3) the lost potential profit from development of that space. It is the multiple of those three variables that ultimately determines the cost of onsite parking, which we will examine independently and then as they affect one another.

A simplified formula:

*Developer's onsite parking cost = the number of required spaces x the cost to develop each space x lost potential profit from development of that space*

- 1) The minimum number of parking spaces required by a City may or may not provide a sufficient parking supply, in the developer's view, for the intended purpose. In some cases, the developer will propose to build more parking spaces than required by the City. More often, developers provide the minimum or near the minimum required by a jurisdiction. Because the City of Burien does not set specific minimums for all commercial uses, for this illustration we will assume typical ITE parking rates for retail uses and Burien rates for office uses.
- 2) The cost to develop a surface parking space in an urban area tends to range from \$5,000 to \$12,000, depending primarily on the cost of land. The cost to develop structured parking in an urban area tends to range from \$ 9,000 to \$16,000 for an urban 3-level garage to \$ 27,000 or more for underground parking in a dense central business environment. For the purposes of this analysis, we assume surface parking cost of \$8,000 and structured parking to be \$15,000.
- 3) The cost of lost rent and profit from development of the parking space also could be considered. In downtown Burien, rent for commercial retail and office space ranges from \$10 to \$27 per square foot.
- 4) A 10,000sf office development with a requirement for 3 parking spaces per 1,000sf would require 30 spaces of approximately 270sf each or a total of 8,100sf dedicated to parking. The lost annual rent for 8,100sf of office space at \$20 per square foot would be \$162,000. Over 10 years that would be \$1.62 million of lost rent to parking. At a 10 percent profit rate for the rented space that would be lost profit of \$162,000
- 5) A 10,000sf retail development with a typical requirement of 4 parking spaces per 1,000sf would require 40 spaces for a total of 10,800sf dedicated to parking. At \$20 per square foot rent and 10 percent profit, that equates to a 10-year profit loss of \$216,000.

While these hypothetical costs are not intended to represent actual costs, they illustrate that the direct cost of developing parking is just one element of the total cost of on-site parking. Other costs could include the lost profits of the business that could have occupied the space taken by the on-site parking. Local governments also lose revenue related to sales, property, B&O, and utility taxes that could have been generated by the business activity that didn't occur in that space.

The developer's onsite parking cost may be offset somewhat by the value to the business of onsite parking. This will vary greatly by business, related to the proximity and convenience of off-site parking and the availability of transit service.

#### The cost of off-site parking

The cost of on-site parking must be weighed against the cost of offsite parking.

A simplified formula:

*Developer's offsite parking cost = the FILOP cost – the saved onsite parking cost + the potential gain or loss of business profitability related to parking convenience or inconvenience.*

As noted before, readily available off-site parking tends to diminish the value to the developer of on-site parking. Shared parking facilities typically do not require as many total spaces as distributed private lots, due to variability of peak parking demand among different types of uses

The City's increased tax revenues from not requiring on-site parking would be partially offset by the reduction in tax revenue from development of off-site city parking facilities. However, because these shared facilities should operate more efficiently than distributed private lots, the City should experience overall increased tax generation from development.

## Appendix C: Fee-in-Lieu of Parking Programs

City	Year <sup>1</sup>	Fee Basis <sup>2</sup>	Req/Opt <sup>3</sup>	Subsidy <sup>4</sup>	Fee Amt	Pmt <sup>5</sup>	Guar Park <sup>6</sup>	FILOP Use <sup>7</sup>	Overall Success <sup>8</sup>
Davis, CA	2009I	U	O	PNA	\$4,000	F	N	NS	4
Coconut Grove (Miami) FL	2009I	U	O	PNA	\$12,000 <sup>9</sup>	M <sup>10</sup>	N	S, G	4
Lake Forest IL	2009I	C	S	N	Varies \$25,000	F	N	G	4
Jackson WY	2009I	U <sup>11</sup>	O	PNA	\$8,500 <sup>12</sup>	F/M	N	S, T	4
Kirkland WA	2009I	U	O/R <sup>13</sup>	PNA	\$6,000 \$20,000	F	N	S, G, ST	2
Bend OR	2009I	U	O	PNA	\$510 \$20,650	F	N	S	4
Skokie IL	2009I	U	O	PNA	\$3,500 \$5,000	F/M	N	S	2
Chapel Hill NC	2009I	U	O	PNA	\$12,000	F	N	NS	1
Vancouver WA	2004D	U	O	PNA	\$5,200	F	N	NS	1
Corvallis OR	2009I	U	O	50%	\$4,000 <sup>14</sup> \$5,189	S <sup>15</sup>	N	S	3

<sup>1</sup> XXXXI=Year of Information; XXXXD=Year of Discontinuation

<sup>2</sup> C=Case-by-Case; U=Uniform per Space Fee

<sup>3</sup> R=Required; O=Optional; S=Special Use Permit

<sup>4</sup> Percent subsidy by City if available; N=No subsidy; PNA=Partial Subsidy / Amount Not Available

<sup>5</sup> F=Full Payment; S=Twice Yearly Payment; M=Monthly Installment

<sup>6</sup> Y=Parking is guaranteed in exchange for payment; N=Parking is not guaranteed

<sup>7</sup> S=Surface Parking; G=Parking Structure; P=Pedestrian Facilities; T=Transit Subsidy or Facilities; ST=Studies; NS=Non-specific

<sup>8</sup> 1=Unused, 2=Seldom Used, 3=Used Occasionally / Success Limited, 4= Well Used and Successful, 5=Very Well-Used and Successful

<sup>9</sup> Varies by district. Updated each 5 years based on change in CPI-U. Rate established in 2006. Next updated 2011.

<sup>10</sup> Amortized over 15 years. Interest at 1 percent below prime rate.

<sup>11</sup> Varies by number of stalls opted out.

<sup>12</sup> Price goes up to \$17,000 per parking space after first 5 parking spaces.

<sup>13</sup> Required for change in use that increases parking requirement. For example: retail to restaurant.

<sup>14</sup> Established in Dec 2002 at \$4,000 and indexed to the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index (ENRCCI). At that time the ENRCCI was 6578.03. Feb 2009 ENRCCI is 8532.73. Second number is adjusted for inflation

<sup>15</sup> Up to 20 semi-annual payments at 10% annual interest. Also places lien against property until balance is paid in full.

## Appendix D: Downtown Burien Parking Supply and Demand

In downtown Burien, the parking supply was determined in 2006 to be 4,675 spaces, of which 85 percent was off-street parking provided by private developments, and 15 percent was on-street parking designated by the City.

The actual parking supply varies at different times of the day and days of the week. On-street parking supply is limited during weekday peak travel times to open lanes for vehicular traffic. Conversely during non-peak times, more on-street parking spaces are available for general use. Some private parking lots that serve restricted uses during daytime business hours are available in the evening for use by the general public.

Off-street parking supply can be broken into two categories: 1) parking provided for the general public by larger retail establishments 2) residential and commercial parking that is restricted to tenants and customers.

### 1. Off-Street Demand

The 2006 parking study indicated that peak parking demand occurs during the mid-afternoon on weekdays and early afternoon on Saturdays. Weekday, 3 p.m. parking demand ranged across the downtown Burien subareas from 17 percent in Subarea C to 64 percent in Subarea D. The average weekday 3 p.m. demand across all subareas was 37 percent. Only Subarea I showed an increase in weekday evening (7 p.m.) parking demand at 43 percent, compared to its 3 p.m. demand of 33 percent. Saturday, 1 p.m. parking demand varied from a low of 8 percent in Subarea D to 40 percent in Subarea K, with an average demand of 20 percent over all subareas. Saturday evening demand tends to be similar to slightly lower overall, with the exception of Subareas H and K, which increased to 42 percent and 50 percent respectively.

### 2. On-Street Demand

While there are nearly 6 times as many off-street parking spaces (3,994) than on-street parking spaces (681) in downtown Burien, utilization of on-street parking is higher overall than off-street parking, although the reverse is true in certain subareas.