**Bellingham's former TIF Zone System**
- Original 10 zones; grew to 18 by 2006 via annexation, rezones, land use change.
- Some zones large, some small
- Some zones with major capital projects; Some with few or no capital projects
- Labor and data intensive & inefficient;
- Very inequitable across zones
- Presumed that cost of capital projects in each zone should bear only by new development in that zone, despite other traffic changes outside zones
- SF in Zone B paid $185/trip
- SF in Zone A paid $4.00/trip
- Transportation mobility is NOT limited to artificial "zones";
- New development generates new trips across entire transportation network

**Bellingham TIF Base Rates 2007-2013**
- Rates increased from $1.875 to $4.935 over 7 years
- New Citywide TIF effective Jan 1, 2007

**Part 1: Brief History of TIF in Bellingham**
- 1990: Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) adopted
  - RCW 82.02 authorizes local impact fees for traffic, parks, schools, fire
- 1995: Bellingham adopts first GMA-compliant Comprehensive Plan
- 1995: Bellingham adopts BMC 19.06 Transportation Impact Fees (TIF)
  - SF TIF zones established, grew to 18 TIF zones by 2006
- 2006: Bellingham Comprehensive Plan update and re-adoption
  - Infill land use strategies and multimodal transportation emphasis
- 2006: David Evans & Associates hired to overhaul/revise BMC 19.06 TIF
- 2007: TIF zone system eliminated, replaced by city-wide TIF system
  - Modeled after Olympia TIF system upheld by WA Supreme Court in “Drebick v Olympia”
- 2010-2011: Urban Village TIF Reduction Program created for infill development
  - Based on ITE methodology in Trip Gen Manual, Trip Gen Handbook, Trip gen research
  - Designed to account for presence/influence of sidewalks, bike lanes, transit, CTR, and TDM
  - Internal capture = less vehicle trips in mixed-use high-density Urban Village Master Plans
  - Implied that land use strategy and multimodal transportation emphasis of Comp Plan
  - Economic incentives/reward for development consistent with Comp Plan
  - Up to 25% automatic trip reduction; additional 20% trip reduction possible for TDM measures

**Bellingham’s Current Citywide TIF System**
- 2006 David Evans & Associates helps Bellingham create new city-wide TIF system
  - Based on Olympia TIF system upheld by WA Supreme Court
- Over time, all traffic (new & old residents, etc.) will be impacted by city-wide transportation network
- City-wide TIF system is more equitable and more predictable for developers
- One TIF base rate instead of 18
- Based on actual capital investment of local funds (receipts) plus programmed local funds in annual 6-Year TIF
- New Citywide TIF effective Jan 1, 2007

**Urban Village Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Reduction Program**
**Part 1 - Bellingham’s Experience with TIFs**
**Part 2 - Debunking Myths About TIFS**
**Part 3 - Integrating TIFs with Land Use Context**
**Part 4 - Development of New TIF Methodology**
**Part 5 - Success of the TIF Reduction Program**
Part 2. Debunking Myths About TIFs
Negative Perspectives Are Not Supported By Facts

“Well no wonder businesses are leaving Bellingham for Ferndale!”
General unhappy attitude expressed by uninsured applicants when they discover they are required to pay a Transportation Impact Fee for the peak hour vehicle trips produced by their project

“City fees seen as barrier to downtown Bellingham growth”
July 5, 2012 - Bellingham Business Journal

“Fighting to limit economic consequences of transportation impact fees”
The Bellingham/Whatcom Chamber of Commerce & Industry currently (2013) has the following listed as a "Core Competency" of the Chamber on its website: http://bellingham.com/about-the-chamber

“I think that’s phenomenal, I didn’t expect something so logical to come from the city.” Government Affairs Director, Whatcom County Association of REALTORS after learning about Bellingham’s Urban Village TIF Reduction Program October 21, 2010 - Bellingham Herald

Bellingham = Lowest 2013 TIF Rate in Whatcom County

Bellingham Annual TIF Revenue 2004 through 2012

How Bellingham TIFs Compare in Western WA

- 2012 Study of 60 cities = 5 counties in Western WA that charge TIF
  - Bellingham = $1,880/trip
  - Lynden = $2,880/trip
  - Ferndale = $2,466/trip

- 2013 Median TIF = $2,466/trip

- 2013 Bellingham TIF = $1,925/trip
  - TIF Base Rate = 66% of Western WA avg
  - TIF Base Rate = bottom 30% of all jurisdictions in Western WA
  - Urban Village TIF Rate = bottom 25% of all jurisdictions in Western WA

- Locally, Bellingham invests more in multimodal transportation infrastructure, but charges less TIF per trip than both:
  - Ferndale ($2,698) and
  - Lynden ($1,997)


Percent of Actual and Planned Transportation Investments (2000 - 2016) Compared to Projected TIF Revenue (2010 - 2032) in Urban Villages
Transportation Improvements Constructed in Downtown Bellingham Since 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Local Share</th>
<th>Park Cost</th>
<th>Total Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who Should Pay the Costs of Growth?

Q. New development and businesses or the City tax-payers?
A. BOTH because transportation benefits accrue to both

Part 3.
TIF Adjustments for Local Realities

Integration of:
- Land Use & Transportation Policy;
- Economic Development; and
- Local Politics

Bellingham, WA
"City of Subdued Excitement"

- City limits = 81,000 residents
- Urban Growth Area = 11,000 pop.
- 45% Whatcom County 201,140 pop.
- Seat of Whatcom County government
- 18 of Top 25 employers in County
- Bellingham International Airport
- 3 universities (WWU, WCC, BTC)
- Major regional hospital (St Joseph)
- Restaurants, Pubs, Social Places
- Theaters & performing arts centers
- Parks and Recreational Facilities

Washington’s Regulatory Tools for Transportation

- Multimodal Concurrence:
  - sidewalks, bike lanes, transit service, and arterial improvements;
- TIA (Traffic Studies): Traffic signals, both lanes, safety, connectivity of non-motorized facilities;
- Street Frontage Standards:
  - sidewalks, bike lanes, street trees, ADA-ramps;
- Transportation Impact Fee:
  - Recoup portion of City’s capital investment in citywide multimodal transportation network.
Traditional HCM "Level of Service" (LOS) is Auto-centric

RM. Peak Traffic Volumes (The Local Evening Rush Hour)

LOS B
LOS C
LOS E
LOS F
LOS G
LOS H
Accommodated
Unsaturated
Capacity

Ease of Walking
Residents Currently (2010) Living Within 1/4 mile (5-min) Walk of Urban Villages

Bellingham’s Multimodal Transportation Mode Shift Goals

Land Use Goals
Several compact mixed use "Urban Villages" adopted in Comp Plan Land Use Element
- Downtown Bellingham
- Fairhaven District
- Barlby Village
- Old Town Village
- Samish Way Village
- Fountain District
- Future waterfront District
All of Bellingham’s Urban Villages are well-connected with
- High-frequency (15 min) transit
- ADA Pedestrian Sidewalks
- Marked Arterial Bike Lanes
- Multi-use "Greenways" Trails
- Multimodal Arterial Streets

Non-Motorized Facilities
Pedestrian Master Plan
- Approved August 2012
- Defines 266-mile "primary pedestrian network"
- 170 miles (64%) complete
- Identifies pedestrian needs
- Prioritizes improvements
Bicycle Master Plan
- Planning effort 2013-2014
- 63 miles existing bike lanes
- 62 miles of planned bike lanes
- Will further define 125-mile (+) bicycle network
- Will identify bicycle needs
- Will prioritize improvements
Multimodal Greenways Trails
- Extensive citywide trail system
- 65 existing trail miles

Bellingham’s "Complete Streets" Approach to Transportation Planning
Part 4
Development of New TIF Methodology

City of Bellingham - Sustainable Connections
2010 Urban Village TIF Reduction Proposal

Transportation Mode Shift Incentive – reduction in Transportation Impact Fees for location factors and performance measures that are proven to reduce on-site trip generation, such as Urban Village location on Whatcom Transportation Authority Go Lines.

Project Goals:
1.) Incentive infill development in Urban Villages surrounded by population centers where multimodal transportation infrastructure, transit service, and TDM performance measures can be proven to reduce vehicle trip generation, which justifies lower TIF charges.
2.) Create yet another “tool in the toolbox” for further implementation of the integrated multimodal transportation-land use planning emphasis in the 2006 Bellingham Comprehensive Plan.

Project Framework
Public Works staff specifically worked within the following framework:
1.) TIF reduction must be legally defensible;
2.) Consistent with ITE Trip Generation Methodology; (ITE Trip Generation is a prominent guidepost)
3.) Survey of trip reduction practices of other Washington and U.S. cities (Best Practices Within Transportation Industry);
4.) Consistent with GMA and Bellingham Comprehensive Plan; and
5.) Proposed Urban Village TIF Reduction is Limited to 50%.

BMC 19.06 Urban Village Vehicle Trip Reduction Credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: URBAN VILLAGE VEHICLE TRIP REDUCTION CREDITS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle trip reduction credit for development in close proximity to transit is based on distance from - and frequency of - the transit service available, as follows:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% for fronting on a WTA high-frequency transit corridor;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% within ¼ mile of a WTA high-frequency transit corridor;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% for fronting on a standard service (20-60 minutes) WTA transit corridor; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% within ¼ mile of a standard service (30-60 minutes) WTA transit corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Only one transit proximity credit above may be applied to lower TIF charges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> May not be used in addition to CTR provision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Downtown Urban Village Profile

WTA Transit Proximity Provision

- Vehicle trip reduction credit for development in close proximity to transit is based on distance from - and frequency of - the transit service available, as follows:
  - 10% for fronting on a WTA high-frequency transit corridor;
  - 7% within ¼ mile of a WTA high-frequency transit corridor;
  - 5% for fronting on a standard service (30-60 minutes) WTA transit corridor; and
  - 2% within ¼ mile of a standard service (30-60 minutes) WTA transit corridor.
- **Note:** Only one transit proximity credit above may be applied to lower TIF charges.
- **Note:** May not be used in addition to CTR provision.
Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) [Large Employers Only]  
Washington State’s Clean Air Act (RCW 70.94) and CTR Requirements (RCW 70.94.127)

- Washington State’s Clean Air Act (RCW 70.94) requires cities to adopt Commute Trip Reduction plans (RCW 70.94.127) - mandatory requirements for all employers with 100+ employees to reduce employee single occupant vehicle (SOV) trips 8% below the standard vehicle trip generation baseline.

- Commute Trip Reduction Proposed: Public Works is proposing a 10% CTR vehicle trip reduction credit for employers located in Urban Villages with 100+ employees, required to comply with RCW 70.94.127 (CTR law).

- Employer required to sign a CTR contract with the City with a specific time commitment (2-3 years) to reach the 10% SOV reduction goal, demonstration of good faith efforts to comply, and the consequence of failing to minimize the City for CTR equivalent funds minus the cost of CTR measures implemented within the contractual time period.

Voluntary WTA Bus Pass Provision  
[All Non-CTR Employers and Residential Projects]

- 1% reduction of overall site vehicle trip generation for each Urban Village residential unit or employee provided with 2-years worth of free WTA transit passes.

- A contract would be required with the City to ensure compliance with verification of bus pass purchases provided by WTA. Failure to comply would be a breach of contract requiring full TIF payment, minus the cost of any purchased bus passes.

- Letter of Endorsement from WTA included in City Council agenda

Voluntary Car Share Accommodation Provision  
[All Non-CTR Employers and Residential Projects]

- 2% reduction of overall site vehicle trip generation for each Urban Village residential unit or employee provided with 2-years worth of free car share organization memberships and/or

- 2% for each car share vehicle parked on an Urban Village residential or employment site.

- A contract would be required with the City to ensure compliance with verification of memberships provided by the car share organization. Failure to comply would be a breach of contract requiring full TIF payment, minus the cost of any purchased bus passes.

Urban Village TIF Reduction Financial Gain Price Points

2012 Enhancements

- 25% Discount for WTA Transit Passes Purchased through Urban Village TIF Reduction Program

- City “Depository Accounts” for Bus Passes  
  - No Hassles for Developers

- Bike Rack Installation Incentive/Reward  
  – @$500 Cost translates to @$1,400 TIF savings

Voluntary TIF Reduction for Bike Rack Installation

- Developer purchases and installs City-approved U-shaped bike racks

  - Location
    - Convenient (within 50 feet of entry)
    - Easily accessible (not too cramped)
    - Preferably covered, but not required

  - Rack capacity for at least 4 bikes

  - Typical Rack Cost = @$500
  - Typical TIF Benefit = @$1,400
Part 5. Success of the Urban Village TIF Reduction Program

March 1, 2011 to August 1, 2013, the Bellingham Urban Village TIF Reduction Program has saved developers over $300,000 in TIF savings (Table 4.), as follows:

- Year 1 = $117,976;
- Year 2 = $100,178;
- Year 3 (5 mos) = $87,878; and
- TIF savings (to date) = $306,032

Details of Success

- 30 Projects in 30 months
  - 433 residential apartments in compact mixed use areas
  - 115,249 SF commercial space
  - 31,897 SF office space
  - $246,175 in automatic (22% - 25%) TIF savings

- 3 Major Developers (274 apartments) have voluntarily purchased WTA bus passes for 2 years at a 25% discount
  - $47,737 in TIF savings for voluntary performance measures

- 6 Businesses have purchased and installed bike racks
  - $11,524 in TIF savings for voluntary performance measures

Case Study Example – Barkley Urban Village

Bellingham = Lowest 2013 TIF Rate of Any City in Whatcom County
Urban Village TIF = 46% of Ferndale’s “Mainstreet” TIF

(Averages per peak hour vehicle trip)

Who Should Pay the Costs of Growth?

Q. New development and businesses OR the City tax payers?
A. BOTH because transportation benefits accrue to both

Awards & Recognition

- 2012 APA-PAW Award for Transportation Planning in Washington State
- 2013 ITE Transportation Planning Council Best Program Award – Runner Up (International)
- Program featured in many State and National APA and ITE Publications
[Example copy available here]
**What’s Next?**

- In all of our work, there is always room for improvement ...
- 2014 research to support trip reduction credits for:
  - TDM applications for small business employers & “employment centers”
  - Possible application for Urban Village parking reductions/reward
- Better educational efforts by planners and engineers regarding vehicle trip generation rates and the value that transportation impact fees provide for planners/engineers, the public, developers, and politicians
  - City transportation improvements are extremely expensive
  - TIFs = private development proportional share of infrastructure cost
  - TIFs are beneficial to help leverage outside State & Federal grant funding
  - Capital projects funded with grants help to keep local TIF rates low

---

**Conclusions & Recommendations**

- Regarding TIFs:
  - Private developers don’t like TIFs and never will; Cities need to be ‘okay’ with that
  - Fiscal Reality = There is no such thing as a “free lunch”
  - Fiscal Choice: Costs can be shared (TIFs) or completely subsidized by public (no TIFs)
    - (In Bellingham, TIF revenue covers less than 20% of actual transportation costs)
- ITE Trip Generation Manual is an important resource, but trip generation rates may not reflect local land use and transportation realities; especially mixed use and the influence of sidewalks, bike lanes, and transit
- Best Practice = Comprehensively register vehicle trip generation rates to actual land use context and availability of other modes of transportation
- Outcome-based methodology. Create financial incentives that reward the type of development that the community wants while promoting infill land use, multimodal transportation goals, and economic development.

---

**….. but wait ….. there’s more!**

For more information about Bellingham’s Multimodal Transportation Concurrency Program and Urban Village TIF Reduction Program visit the City of Bellingham web site at:

http://www.cob.org/services/planning/transportation/index.aspx

or contact:  

Chris Comeau, AICP, Transportation Planner  
City of Bellingham Public Works Department  
(360) 778-7946; or ccomeau@cob.org
Spokane Transportation Impact Fee Program Update

WA APA Conference 2013
Louis Meuler, City Planner
Planning and Development Services

October 2013
American Planning Association – Washington Chapter
2013 Annual Conference – Bellevue, Washington

Why am I here?
1. Close to Shameless Self Promotion

Live Music!
APA Conference Reception
Bellevue Art Museum
Monday, October 27th, 2013
5:30 – 7:30 PM

The Nordman’s
Washington State’s Only All-Planner Band!

2. Wicked Problems
3. Smart Solutions

Background and History

• What are we doing to ourselves?
• Past crisis to current crisis
  – Don’t let a good crisis go to waste.
• Maintenance Backlog and Needs vs. Wants
• Current Program
• Where to from here?

Spo·kane
A city of eastern Washington near the Idaho border on the falls of the Spokane River, about 193 km (120 mi) long. Settled on the site of a trading fort established in 1810, Spokane is a trade and processing center in an agricultural, lumbering, and mining region.

Source: http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Spokane

Spo·kani·stan
Another nickname for the city of Spokane in Washington State USA. This nickname began growing in popularity when some Spokane residents began to notice similarities between their surroundings and the pictures of dusty towns in Afghanistan being shown on TV news.

Source: http://www.urbandictionary.com
Spokane Demographics

- 1,700,000 people within Spokane Trade Area – Very Spread Out – 150 mile radius
- 471,000 people within Spokane County
  - Spokane County “Urban” = 387,847
  - Spokane / Coeur d’Alene CSA = 674,600
- 210,000 people within the City of Spokane
  - About 1,000 a year growth – slow growth?
  - As of 2012 – Just under 70 Square Miles
- City’s median household income $41,466
  - Region’s poverty issues
- Spokane County’s median household income $49,257

Source: http://wellpinit.wednet.edu
Trolley Era to Current Transit

1883 – First Rail Transit Service
1922 – Spokane United Railway
   Regional light & trolley service
1938 – Trolley to Bus transition
   (motorized coaches)
2010 – Private U-District Bus
1908 Olmsted Brothers Plan

The railroad-jammed downtown riverfront, above the falls, was not part of the Olmsted plan, but only because, as the Olmsted's dryly noted, it had

"already been partially 'improved,' as one might ironically say, but it is questionable whether any considerable proportion of the community is proud of most of those improvements" (Olmsted).

Yet they predicted that the city would someday come to its senses and reclaim the area.
TIF 1.0: A five-year mission (15?) To boldly go?

• Attempted to integrate with land use plan vision
  - Centers and Corridors
  - Multi-modal

Level of Service

• LOS currently based solely on intersection LOS and auto capacity.
• Adjusted this LOS based on Land Use desires – Generally perceived as not achieving desire results.

Impact Fee Programs

Are these controversial?

Our 1st “Voluntary” System Created

• Mid 2005 – Traffic mitigation process still not working.
• Through 2006 – Staff effort not inclusive enough.
• December 2006 – Mayor appointed TIF Work Group – Let us make this official!
• October 2007 TIF Rate Study - Only 10 Months!
  • Council says “Not adequate” - Sticker shock?
• November 2008 – Council adopts TIF “shell” ordinance. Required more process (reduce price tag, better data & model) before going into effect.
• TIF 2.0: Program finally adopted in January, 2011

• Still not satisfied with SEPA Mitigation process
• March 2005 – City-Wide Voluntary Impact Fee System Developed – It worked before?
### TIF Reductions for Good Behavior

- Downtown Zone lowest rate
- **Credits**
  - Reduced rate for Center or Corridor – 10%
  - Mixed use for “active” first floor – 10%
  - “Complete Street” upgrades – 10%
  - Maximum of 20% Credit
- Parking garage pays zero – no use that generates trips 😊

### TIF Rates

- **Downtown** = $90 a Peak Hour Trip
  - MF DU = $68
- **Outside Downtown** = $587 to $860
  - SF DU = $750 to $1,004
- **TIF collected** $1.3m since Jan. 2011.
  - Downtown = $11,500 😊

### The Sky is Falling – Crisis?

- **& the streets are falling apart**
- Recession – Spokane 1.5 to 2 Years Behind
- City administration change
  - Different Philosophy – Familiar?
- Infrastructure O&M and Life Cycle Cost
  - Bills for infrastructure replacement coming
  - [www.StrongTowns.org](http://www.StrongTowns.org)

### Pavement Maintenance Funding

- Deferred Maintenance vs. Investment

### Combined Sewer Overflow Water & Sewer

- Build our way out with huge tanks - $500 to $600 per household.
- Is there another way?
- TIF 3.0 System to support integrated approach?

### Infrastructure Integration

- Make sure our Level of Service definition fits what we want and can afford.
  - Transportation
  - Land Use
  - Storm-water / CSO
  - Water / Sewer Maintence
- Great opportunity to look at everything differently and be SMART about how we look at our future needs within the right of way
- HELP - “Right of Way Infrastructure Chapter”?
Performance Measures

• Are we measuring the right things?
• Are we happy?
• Are we achieving desired results?
• Do we really have a congestion problem?
• What can we afford?

What are we doing?

• Public health partnership
• Trying to include next generation
  – Is Facebook already dead?
  – Is there a conference session?
• What can we afford rather than what we think we would like?
  – What can we maintain?
  – What do we want to maintain?

Back to a Transportation Vision

• Pedestrian First?
• Reduce Demand?
• Viable Public Transit?
• Reduce Sprawl / Continue to Encourage Infill? Who pays?
• Use Fiscal Resources Efficiently?

Trade-offs in Cities

Conventional Approach

Balanced Approach

• More Lanes
• More Roads
• More Parking
• More Efficiency
• More Cars

• Transit
• Bicycling
• Walking
• HOV/HOT Lanes

• Vehicular Service
• Livability

• Large Gain

• User View and Comfort
• Context-Sensitive Design
• Traffic Calming
• Personal Security

• More Lanes
• More Parking
• More Efficiency
• More Cars

• Nature of Uses
• Road Network
• Pedestrian-Oriented Environment
• Compact Development

• Manage, Not "Solve"
**What I’ve Heard**

- Reduce integrated costs
  - Re-evaluate what is really needed
    - Reduced lane widths?
    - Rebuild existing streets to narrower / lower cost?
  - Stormwater Integration? Green?!
  - Multi-modal is important? Economy?
- Integrate Capital and O&M with Vision?
City of Vancouver
Traffic Impact Fee Program

TIF Program – A Complete Overhaul

Ryan Lopossa, P.E.
Transportation Development Review Services

October 2, 2013
American Planning Association – Washington Chapter
2013 Annual Conference – Bellevue, Washington

Agenda
- Background
- Existing Program Structure
- Historical TIF Collections
- Role of TIF in City’s Transportation Budget
- Goals & Objectives for New TIF Program
- Scope of Program Overhaul
- Schedule
- Questions & Discussion

Background
- City Size – 46 Square Miles
- Population – 165,000 (4th largest in WA)
- Over 1,800 Lane Miles of City Streets
- Over 3,800 Acres of City Owned ROW
- 234 Traffic Signals
- 17,300 (+/-) Street Lights
- Thousands of Traffic Control Signs
- Hundreds of miles of pavement striping
- >$16 Million in Annual Street O&M
- >$430 Million in Future Street Upgrades

Historical TIF Collections

Existing TIF Program

Current TIF Program adopted in 2001 with origins going back to County’s 1991 program
TIF collected pursuant to RCW 82.02
TIF assessed based on “trips” from development site
TIF must be related to “new growth” (impacts) on transportation system
Significant Case Law guides program design and policy framework
Most Cities in WA state and other states implement “impact fee”
Historical TIF Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchards</td>
<td>$22,782</td>
<td>$25,440</td>
<td>$17,055</td>
<td>$32,881</td>
<td>$26,741</td>
<td>$3,325,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Orchards</td>
<td>$20,666</td>
<td>$18,751</td>
<td>$45,486</td>
<td>$25,183</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,778,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittgrass</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant City</td>
<td>$27,954</td>
<td>$27,455</td>
<td>$22,457</td>
<td>$24,123</td>
<td>$20,705</td>
<td>$3,309,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Overlay</td>
<td>$19,810</td>
<td>$20,460</td>
<td>$24,123</td>
<td>$20,069</td>
<td>$2,813</td>
<td>$2,366,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum by Year</td>
<td>$1,255,277</td>
<td>$1,172,638</td>
<td>$384,315</td>
<td>$485,582</td>
<td>$361,720</td>
<td>$21,666,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transportation Revenue

Goals & Objectives

- Continued emphasis on TIF’s role within the City’s transportation funding program
- Consideration of industry best practices
- Efficiency in the administration of the program
- Accountability for development impacts to the City’s transportation system
- Affordability for development community
- Application of trip reduction incentives

Scope of Program Overhaul

- Research Best Practices
- Public Involvement Process – Stakeholders
- TIF District Boundaries
- TIF Credit system
- TIF Reduction Incentives – BEF
- Financial Analysis
- City Code & Policy Updates
- Planning Commission/City Council
- Adoption

Scope / Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Scope</th>
<th>2013 (4th Qtr)</th>
<th>2014 (1st Qtr)</th>
<th>2014 (2nd Qtr)</th>
<th>2014 (3rd Qtr)</th>
<th>2014 (4th Qtr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Best Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF District Boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF Credit System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF Reduction Incentives</td>
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Questions & Discussion

Ryan Lopossa, P.E.
Manager - Transportation Development Review Services
ryan.lopossa@cityofvancouver.us; 360-487-7706