PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
July 6, 2017
6:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL
Chair Bill Judd, Vice Chair Chele Dimmett, Jennifer Gilbert-Smith, Jonathan Ingram, Jim Langehough, Paul Max, & Alex White

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

C1. Minutes from June 15, 2017

CITIZEN COMMENTS - Note: The Citizen Comment period is to provide the opportunity for members of the audience to address the Commission on items either not on the agenda or not listed as a Public Hearing. The Chair will open this portion of the meeting and ask for a show of hands of those persons wishing to address the Commission. When recognized, please approach the podium, give your name and city of residence, and state the matter of your interest. If your interest is an Agenda Item, the Chair may suggest that your comments wait until that time. Citizen comments will be limited to four minutes for Citizen Comments and four minutes for Unfinished Business. If you require more than the allotted time, your item will be placed on the next agenda. If you anticipate your comments taking longer than the allotted time, you are encouraged to contact the Planning Department ten days in advance of the meeting so your item may be placed on the next available agenda.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – No action Required

1. Discussion of Sign Code

PUBLIC HEARING – Action Required

2. Fire Impact Fee Ordinance Amendments

NEW BUSINESS – No Action Required

3. Discussion of Park Impact Fees

ATTENDANCE VOTE

PUBLIC COMMENT: (Same rules apply as stated in the 1st CITIZEN COMMENTS)

COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS OF STAFF AND COMMISSIONERS

ADJOURN

Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City at least 24 hours in advance.
For TDD relay service please use the state’s toll-free relay service (800) 833-6384 and ask the operator to dial (253) 480-2400
Web Page: www.covingtonwa.gov
CITY OF COVINGTON
Planning Commission Minutes

June 15, 2017 City Hall Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER
The special meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Chair Judd.

MEMBERS PRESENT
Chele Dimmett, Jennifer Gilbert-Smith, Jonathan Ingram, Bill Judd, Paul Max and Alex White

MEMBERS ABSENT – Jim Langehough

STAFF PRESENT
Brian Bykonen, Associate Planner and Code Enforcement Officer
Kathy Hardy, City Attorney
Richard Hart, Community Development Director
Salina Lyons, Principal Planner
Kelly Thompson, Planning Commission Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

C1. Commissioner Ingram moved and Commissioner Gilbert-Smith seconded to approve the June 1, 2017 minutes and meeting agenda for June 15, 2017. Motion carried 6-0.

CITIZEN COMMENTS - None

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS
1. Open House and Discussion on Proposed Sign Code Amendments

The meeting recording was paused to conduct the “open house.” The meeting resumed at 7:25 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING - None

NEW BUSINESS - None

ATTENDANCE VOTE

C1. Commissioner Gilbert Smith moved and Commissioner Max seconded to approve the absence of Commissioner Langehough. The motion carried 6-0.
PUBLIC COMMENTS

Leroy Stevenson, Covington resident, shared that he is concerned about signs being limited on private property and free expression of political thoughts. He is concerned that the size limitation of 6 square feet to express a political point of view, may be too small. He is also concerned about the placement limitations for a political candidate vs. a private citizen. Only allowing “garage sale” type signs on private property would be too limiting.

Sonia Foss – Covington business owner, shared that the political signs placed closely to sidewalks and round-a-bouts create a visibility issue for drivers. She would like to see these placed where they do not block visibility. She is concerned for the safety of pedestrians.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2. Discussion of Public Comments and Questions from Open House on Sign Code

Chair Judd asked Mr. Bykonen if staff removed illegally placed signs. Mr. Bykonen responded that if temporary signs are placed illegally, the city’s maintenance crew may remove them or he would remove them. The signs are retained for 14 days at the city’s maintenance facility to allow the owners the opportunity to pick them up.

Commissioner Gilbert-Smith asked about open house signs for real estate that is for sale. Mr. Bykonen responded they are commercial signs which fall under the temporary commercial sign regulations and are not allowed in the public right-of-way. For a commercial property, the temporary sign must be placed on the property.

Commission Ingram asked when a residence already has a temporary “for sale” sign, would an additional temporary sign for an open house be in violation because it is a commercial sign. Mr. Bykonen responded that they would be in violation of the proposed temporary sign code. If the city allows more than one temporary commercial sign to be placed in the public right-of-way, the city would have to allow more than one for all types of temporary commercial signs.

Garage sale signs have not yet been defined as commercial or non-commercial, so this regulation in our proposed code is still in question.

Mr. Hart shared that real estate signs and garage sale signs are turning out to be the most difficult for cities to address. Staff wrote the code with the goal of being 100% defensible in any type of legal challenge in court. There are only
four other cities that have adopted permanent sign regulations since the
Supreme Court decision. We are reviewing those cities’ codes to figure out the
best way to deal with garage sale and real estate signs.

Mr. Hart reminded the Planning Commission that time, place, and manner are
the only aspects of a sign that can be regulated, and signs are either commercial
or non-commercial.

Commissioner Dimmett asked how signage for an event like Covington Days
would be handled as these are typically placed in the right-of-way. Mr. Bykonen
responded that these are considered non-commercial signs and are allowed in
the right-of-way. Commercial signs are not allowed in the right-of-way.

Chair Judd asked about the exposure of litigation risk and asked that the needs
of the community be taken into consideration. Mr. Hart responded that the
purpose was to balance public and private interests, to maintain the City
Council’s vision for the community, provide for economic well-being, and
maintain a balance of sign aesthetics. The City Council does not want commercial
signs in the right-of-way, they want them placed on private property, and that
message is conveyed in the interim code that was adopted.

Commissioner Gilbert-Smith is concerned that by not allowing open house signs
in the right-of-way, realtors are faced with either following the code, or risk
consequences of not following the code.

Mr. Hart reiterated that realtors are required to follow the same requirements as
all other commercial messages.

Mr. Bykonen added that the terms “real estate sign,” “political sign,” etc. cannot
be used anymore. The signs are either commercial or non-commercial. If a
residential property is actively for sale or for lease, they are allowed one
commercial sign.

Mr. Hart said that the City Council could change the number of commercial signs
allowed. Or, they could change the code to allow all commercial signs in the
public right-of-way.

Chair Judd attended the City Council Public Hearing for the interim sign code and
understands that the Councilmembers indicated which signs they liked and didn’t
like. Just because someone does not like a sign, it does not mean that is
representing what the citizens desire. He believes part of the role the Planning
Commission plays is to take into consideration the impact of their
recommendations on the citizens of Covington.
Mr. Hart responded that after the City Council indicated the types of signs they liked or disliked, they then considered how the regulations would effect the community.

Commissioner Ingram added that the Planning Commission may want to consider the impact the signs play in citizens selling their homes.

Vice Chair Dimmett shared that she is struggling because she feels the Planning Commission should consider the impacts on the “little guy”. She also asked that they clarify what “commercial” means. It is Fred Meyer, Walmart and McDonalds. Commercial is also a daycare center, a realtor, and a small business.

Mr. Hart responded that he has spent considerable time with the City Council over the past two years discussing the interim code. The Planning Commission can disagree with their policy decision, but the City Council has considered the impact on realtors and small business. The Planning Commission has the right to make a recommendation to the City Council that they believe that the prohibition of commercial signs in the right-of-way is the wrong way to go.

Vice Chair Dimmett asked about the requirement that a sign not exceed 50% of window area in residential property. Mr. Hart responded that windows are to allow light, air, and egress. If you cover up the window, it defeats the purpose of having a window.

Commissioner Ingram asked if they could define commercial based on whether it is a business or an individual. Mr. Hart responded no. A commercial message is defined by the law and the supreme court.

Commissioner Ingram responded that based on that answer, it should settle the issue of a garage sale. Whether a person is selling a t-shirt or a home, it would be considered commercial. Mr. Hart confirmed that is correct.

Commissioner Ingram asked whether a mural would be considered a sign. Mr. Bykonen said anything that conveys a message and is visible from public right-of-way is considered a sign. Mr. Hart reminded the Planning Commission that there is no limitation to the number of signs placed on residential (private) properties.

Mr. Hart reminded the Planning Commission to consider whether a sign is a commercial message or a non-commercial message and each type follows the same rules.

There will be a Public Hearing in August, and the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council in September or October.
Commissioner Gilbert-Smith asked for a summary of the regulations adopted by other cities.

Ms. Lyons offered the perspective that Covington is one of the first few cities to adopt their sign ordinance following the Supreme Court decision. There could be challenges to the Supreme Court, and we could be revisiting this in a few years.

COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM STAFF AND COMMISSIONERS

Ms. Lyons shared that the new Covington Elementary School broke ground on Monday, June 12, 2017.

Commissioner White asked about the status of Chick-Fil-A. Ms. Lyons responded that staff is just waiting on the signed and recorded joint access easement from Arco, which is now owned by British Petroleum. The city has approved their permits. This easement is what is holding them up.

ADJOURN

The June 15, 2017, Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

______________________________
Kelly Thompson, Planning Commission Secretary
To: Planning Commission

From: Richard Hart, Community Development Director
      Brian Bykonen, Associate Planner

CC: Salina Lyons, Principal Planner

Date: July 6, 2017

Re: Discussion of Sign Code Strategies

At the June 15, 2017 planning commission meeting and open house, the planning commission had a robust discussion of issues relating to how the interim sign code addresses temporary commercial message signs in the public right-of-way. Specifically, the major issue raised was how the code regulates signs for residential properties actively for sale or lease.

The interim sign code, adopted by the council in November 2016, prohibits all commercial message signs from being in the public right-of-way, except one commercial sign is allowed in the planter strip/public ROW directly adjacent to a residential property listed for sale or lease. This provision includes real estate signs, signs advertising a restaurant, retail, or professional services such as attorneys, accountants, or hair salons.

On the other hand, the interim code allows all noncommercial message signs, such as signs by political candidates and organizations, religious institutions, philosophical viewpoints, public events, or non-profit agencies to be placed in the public right-of-way, subject to limited sign requirements and safety standards.

The interim sign code was written with the intention to be highly defensible based on the US Supreme Court’s ruling in Reed v. Gilbert and provides the greatest assurance that it would not be subject to a valid legal challenge. The more content neutral the sign code is, the less risk the city has of being challenged.

Further, the interim code is based upon the council’s policy direction discussed in detail during various city council meetings in 2015 and 2016. The council had a unified desire to reduce sign clutter by removing commercial signs from public right-of-way.

At the June 15, 2017 planning commission meeting, the staff indicated they would provide information on what cities have adopted a new sign code post Reed v. Gilbert, and how those cities address
commercial signs in the right of way. The Commission indicated that would be very helpful. Staff obtained information from Municipal Research Service Center (MRSC) and other cities that have adopted new sign regulations as follows.

Five cities have adopted new sign regulations in response to Reed v. Gilbert. They are Bremerton, Edmonds, Kirkland, Rainier, and Sammamish. Three of the five have developed code language to allow off-premise commercial message signs in the right-of-way. These cities specifically mention real estate open house signs as permitted for a property actively for sale or lease. Two cities prohibit any signs within the public right-of-way including commercial real estate signs. One allows them off premise but on private property. One city also exempts other portable temporary signs posted under seven (7) days from any regulation. Most cities place qualifying restrictions relating to time, place, and manner when allowing such commercial message signs in the right-of-way. These types of code provisions may make a sign code less defensible, and potentially more likely to receive a legal challenge. However, the risk is only assumed until challenged, but often a city can be held liable for monetary damages.

As the planning commission continues discussing a permanent sign code, they certainly have the ability to request staff to make changes in the proposed final sign code that allows, in some fashion, commercial message signs in the public right-of-way and off premise, which would include signs for properties actively listed for sale or lease. This could be achieved in a variety of ways, with or without certain restrictions on the number, size, and duration of placement of the sign. One example of an approach might be to allow such commercial message signs to be placed one or two hours before the event and removed one or two hours after the event. Further, there might be a limit of three such signs, one placed on the property for sale or lease and two placed off the premises but within ½ mile of the property for sale.

Staff would appreciate further guidance on this issue so we can make changes in the draft permanent sign code and prepare for a public hearing currently scheduled for August.
To:        City of Covington Planning Commission  
From:     Salina Lyons, Principal Planner  
CC:        Richard Hart, Community Development Director  
          Ann Mueller, Senior Planner  
          Krista Bates, Permit/Planning Technician  
          Captain Larry Rabel, Puget Sound RFA  

Date:    July 6, 2017  
Re:     Proposed Fire Impact Fees - Public Hearing  

At the June 1, 2017, Planning Commission Meeting, city staff provided an overview of RCW 82.02. regarding the collection and authority of cities to collect Impact Fees. Battalion Chief, Greg Markley gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Puget Sound (formally Kent) Regional Fire Authority (RFA) Master Capital Plan and Fire Service Concurrency (Attachment 1).

**Fire Impact Fees**  
The RFA submitted the draft 6-year Capital Improvement Program 2016-2021, which was adopted by the RFA Governance Board on October 19, 2016, that outlines their capital program (Attachment 2). The costs associated with implementing their program are used to determine the impact fee.

Fire Impact Fees would be based on the cost of new equipment and stations and related asset preservation costs required to meet the adopted Level of Service (LOS) as Covington continues to grow. The adopted LOS is contained in the RFA’s Standard of Cover, which is adopted by reference in the City’s Comprehensive Plan and identifies that even though response performance time has improved, the RFA is still not meeting their LOS standard. *(2015-2035 Covington Comprehensive Plan, page CF-4)*

Based on the RFA’s Capital program, the maximum 2017 impact fees are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>6% Capital Improvement Program 2016-2021</th>
<th>Impact &amp; LOS Contribution Fee Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Res/Comm.</td>
<td>$1,702.12 / Unit</td>
<td>$1,702.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family Res/Comm.</td>
<td>$1,664.46 / Unit</td>
<td>$1,664.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Single Family Residential: $1,702.12 / Unit (A single family house is one living unit)  
Multi Family: $1,664.46 / Unit (Per unit in a multifamily development)  
Commercial developments are based on a fee-per-square-foot calculation.
If the Fire Impact Fee (which charges just for the new growth) was collected in Covington, it could pay for up to 7.00% of the identified needs discussed in the RFA Capital Facilities Plan. The city of Kent collects impact fees which are anticipated to cover 23.00% of the project costs identified in the RFA Capital Facilities Plan. The remaining capital costs are to be paid by existing and future residents and businesses located within the RFA service area through existing taxes and fees that fund the RFA’s annual operations.

**Zoning Code Amendments (Attachments 3 & 4)**

This is a city-initiated code amendment consistent with CMC 14.27 Development Regulations and Zoning Map Amendments. Tonight, the Planning Commission is holding the required public hearing on the attached amendments, to consider the amendments and any public comments, and to forward a recommendation to the City Council as to whether each proposed amendment meets the criteria in CMC 14.27.040.

**CMC 14.27.040 Decision criteria.**

The City Council’s approval, modification, deferral, or denial of an amendment proposal shall be based on the following criteria:

1. **The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the comprehensive plan;**

   **Staff Finding:** The purpose of these amendments to our code is to comply with the Growth Management Act (GMA) and authority provided under State law that permits cities to collect impact fees against new development project to help pay for new or expanded public facilities that will directly address the increased demand created by that development.

2. **The proposed amendment is consistent with the scope and purpose of the City’s zoning ordinances and the description and purpose of the zone classification applied for;**

   **Staff Finding:** The collection of fire impact fees will apply to new development, residential and commercial, constructed within the City of Covington.

3. **Circumstances have changed substantially since the establishment of the current zoning map or district to warrant the proposed amendment;**

   **Staff Finding:** Not Applicable. There is no proposed zoning map amendment proposed.

4. **The proposed zoning is consistent and compatible with the uses and zoning of surrounding property;**

   **Staff Finding:** Not Applicable. There is no proposed zoning map amendment proposed.

5. **The property that is the subject of the amendment is suited for the uses allowed in the proposed zoning classification;**

   **Staff Finding:** These proposed fire impact fee code amendments will apply city-wide.
(6) The amendment is in compliance with the three-year limitation rule as specified in CMC 14.27.030(3); and

**Staff Findings:** These proposed amendments have not been proposed or reviewed by the City in the last three years.

(7) Adequate public services could be made available to serve the full range of proposed uses in that zone.

**Staff Findings:** Not Applicable.

**Required Notice to Commerce.**
On May 25, 2017, pursuant to state law and CMC 14.27.050(4), the city has provided the Washington State Department of Commerce the proposed code amendment more than 60-days prior to the expected date of final City Council action.

**SEPA**
A SEPA determination of nonsignificance was issued on June 2, 2017, with a legal notice placed in the Covington Reporter, posted at city hall, and on the city’s website. Copies were also provided to the SEPA register, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, and Ecology.

**Planning Commission Hearing**
This is a legislative action, the public hearing before the Planning Commission is scheduled for June 6, 2017, for review and recommendation to the City Council. Consistent with CMC 14.30.060, the Planning Commission public hearing was published in the Covington Reporter on June 16, 2017, more than 14 days prior to the public hearing. Notice was also posted on the city’s website and at city hall.

**Action**
**Recommended motion:** Move to recommend to the City Council to adopt a new section, Chapter 19.50 Fire Impact Fees and other associated amendments to Titles 18 & 19 related to the implementation of a fire impact fee collection program.

**Alternative motion:** Move to continue the Planning Commission’s discussion and final recommendation to a future meeting date to allow staff to make recommended modifications for Planning Commission review.

**Attachments:**
1. June 1, 2017- Puget Sound RFA PowerPoint Presentation
2. RFA – Capital Facilities Plan 2016 -2021
3. Draft Impact Fee Code (Title 19)
4. Associated Code Updates (Title 18)
Sustaining Levels of Service With Community Growth Through Impact Fees

Presented to:
Covington Planning Commission
June 1, 2017
Growth Impacts on Fire Service

- People living, working and moving in a community create demand for fire services
- Changes is service demand (growth of EMS)
- Services Provided
  - Emergency Medical
  - Community healthcare (CARES)
  - Rescue
  - Fire suppression
  - Hazardous Material response
  - Natural disaster response
  - Other
## Historic Growth Rates: Puget Sound Fire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Kent</td>
<td>16596</td>
<td>21850</td>
<td>37440</td>
<td>76228</td>
<td>92411</td>
<td>122900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop District 37 &amp; Covington</td>
<td>21410</td>
<td>27616</td>
<td>26313</td>
<td>41145</td>
<td>48477</td>
<td>24847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>27650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>38006</td>
<td>49466</td>
<td>63753</td>
<td>117373</td>
<td>140888</td>
<td>175397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Stations Kent/SeaTac</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Stations District 37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fire Stations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emergency Incidents</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>4250</td>
<td>9400</td>
<td>13294</td>
<td>15626</td>
<td>25356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents per 1000 pop</td>
<td>36.70473</td>
<td>85.9176</td>
<td>147.444</td>
<td>113.2628</td>
<td>110.9108</td>
<td>144.5635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Population growth rate = 10% per year 1970 - 2016 (461%)
- Incident growth rate = 11.82% per year 1970 - 2016 (1800%)
- Stations reduced from 12 in 1970 to 2 in 2016
Impacts of Past Growth - Reliability

- 6 of 8 Legacy Fire Stations Experience Resource Exhaustion Daily
  - Station 77 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. 14 hours
  - Station 71 11:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. 10 hours
  - Station 73 11:00 a.m. to Midnight 13 hours
  - Station 76 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. 7 hours
  - Station 75 12:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. 8 hours
  - Station 74 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. 8 hours

From 9:00 am till 9:00 pm, responses are delayed because of resource exhaustion in the Kent Valley, West Hill and western East Hill.
Level of Service

Time Based to Reduce Life & Property Loss
Level of Service

Time Based to Reduce Life Loss

- Time based to reduce life and property loss
- Flashover
- Brain death
- 7:34 is KFDRFA “Deadline”
  - No patient survival recorded after 7:34 arrival

![Response Time / Intervention vs. Survival graph]

- **Unmanageable Time**
- **Time Varies**
- **Some Manageable Time**

**9-1-1 Dispatch Units Respond to Scene**

**BLS/ALS Intervention**
Current Level of Service Conditions
City of Covington Adopted LOS

• Old Covington Comprehensive Plan
  • Based upon 2009 KFDRFA Standard of Cover
    • EMS and Fire
      • First unit: – 7 minutes or less
      • Full first alarm: – 10 minutes or less

• 2015 Covington Comprehensive Plan
  • Based upon 2014 KFDRFA Standard of Cover
    • EMS
      • Suburban first unit: = 7 minutes 30 seconds
      • Suburban first alarm = 7 minutes 50 seconds
    • Fire
      • Suburban first unit = 7 minutes 40 seconds
      • Suburban first alarm = 12 minutes 00 seconds
Summary of Current Situation

- Level of Service below adopted standards
- Resource exhaustion is occurring daily
- No capacity for growth, now or the future
  - Every new development further reduces LOS
Puget Sound Fire
Actions & Plans

What is the Puget Sound RFA doing to resolve these LOS issues?
Capital Planning – Need Identified

- New RFA adopted initial Capital Plan 2014
  - $87 million needed
    - $4.35 million per year
    - 2014 – 2016 Only half, $2.2 million funded

- 6-Year update adopted November 2016
  - Revised and reduced need to $86 million
    - 4.3 million per year
    - 2016 – with grants, Kent Impact fees, Covington LOS fees, $3.4 million funded
Moving Forward

A Look At The Future
Future Impacts of Growth in Covington 2015 - 2035

- **Housing Units**
  - Current April 2014 = 6,368
  - Projected 2035 = 8,857-9,858
    
    2,489 - 3,490 additional homes

- **Commercial Space**
  - Projected 2035 = 1.8 to 3.9 million square feet

- **Estimated Covington Impact fees:**
  - Approximately $5 million by 2035
    - Assists in sustaining levels of service
Future Growth in Covington

- Impacts of Future Growth in Covington (over the next 20 years)
  - Estimated 800 additional emergency responses annually
    - Housing = 545
    - Commercial = 191
    - Increased traffic 64
  - Traffic Congestion will increase response time.

- Need minimum of 1 additional fire station and 1 ladder truck for impacts. South Covington Station & Ladder = $6.1 million
  - Does not resolve eastern Covington issues – MVFLS plans to close Station 83
  - Does not include resources needed in Kent to provide effective response forces
Closing the Gap

• Kent Fire Department RFA Capital Facilities and Equipment Plan
  • Identifies the gap between current situation and future resource needs to attain LOS - $87.8 million

• Two realities:
  • Impacts of past growth
    • Has eroded LOS below standards
  • Impacts of future growth
    • Will erode LOS even further unless mitigated
Direction Based on 14-Year Question

- How should the Kent Fire Department RFA address the impacts of growth?
  - Surveys conducted in:
    - 2000
    - 2006
    - 2010
    - 2014
  - 80% of respondents want development to pay for their impacts.
Questions
THANK YOU
6 Year Capital Improvement Update

Kent Regional Fire Authority

2016-2021 KRFA 6 Year Capital Plan
Six-Year Capital Facilities & Equipment Plan
2016-2021
Kent Regional Fire Authority
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1 Executive Summary

This Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan (the "Plan") is an update and extension of the Kent Regional Fire Authority (KRFA) 2014 – 2033 Master Capital Facilities and Equipment Plan (CFEP) in compliance with the requirements of Washington's Growth Management Act Chapter 36.70A RCW, City of Kent Code 12.15.060, and Covington’s proposed City Code Chapter 19.50 “Fire Impact Fees”.

This Plan update uses data available through the first quarter of 2016 to evaluate level of service performance, and the progress toward implementation of the 2014 - 2033 CFEP. The goal of this Plan is to identify the next six years of community growth, determine the need for additional facilities and their cost and prioritize those resource into a 6-year funding plan (2016 – 2021) to ensure adequate service delivery prior to, or concurrently with the impacts of development within the service area.

The underlying premise of this document is that as the community continues to grow, additional resources will be required to adequately serve the growing demand for fire & life safety services. It is assumed that a direct relationship exists between populations within a community and demand for service, which, directly links to a need for resources.

Since adoption and publication of the Master CFEP in 2014, the post-recession economy has continued to recover and community growth is returning to near pre-recession rates. The City of Kent has published an updated Comprehensive Plan that continues a similar land use and community growth pattern. The City of Covington also completed a Comprehensive Plan update in 2015 and has increased their projected growth targets to more closely reflect past market rates but, the combined rate of growth for Covington, Kent, and unincorporated areas of the KRFA response area remain consistent with the projections of the 2014 CFEP. As a result, only minor changes have been made to baseline impact fees in Table 2, which are based upon the updated costs associated with funding the capital resources required to maintain fire service concurrency.

The GMA requires a six-year funding plan and the plan in Table 3 has been balanced through 2021 with a $702,000 surplus using projected revenue. However, the timing of resources funded in this plan have been pushed back in time from the Master 2014 CFEP because of the limits on available capital funding.

Table 1 2017 Fire Impact Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>System wide C&amp;E</th>
<th>Res/Com Split</th>
<th>Usage Factor</th>
<th>ERF Factor</th>
<th>New Dev Share</th>
<th>Projected New Units 2011 - 2030</th>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Impact &amp; LOS Contribution Fee Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$86,252,690</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>19,068</td>
<td>Living unit</td>
<td>$1,702.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>$86,252,690</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>19,068</td>
<td>Living unit</td>
<td>$1,664.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM/IND</td>
<td>$86,252,690</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSP/MED/SCH/CHUR</td>
<td>$86,252,690</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td>$0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTED CARE</td>
<td>$86,252,690</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 Six-Year Funding Plan

#### 6-Year Cost/Funding Sources for Capital Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost/Funding Source</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expense Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Construction &amp; Land Purchase</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$98</td>
<td>$1,486</td>
<td>$3,103</td>
<td>$5,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparatus</td>
<td>$714</td>
<td>$1,331</td>
<td>$1,174</td>
<td>$1,518</td>
<td>$1,645</td>
<td>$1,609</td>
<td>$7,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$118</td>
<td>$1,046</td>
<td>$827</td>
<td>$431</td>
<td>$377</td>
<td>$397</td>
<td>$3,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Preservation</td>
<td>$77</td>
<td>$1,003</td>
<td>$488</td>
<td>$312</td>
<td>$142</td>
<td>$183</td>
<td>$2,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.T. Capital</td>
<td>$153</td>
<td>$792</td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$195</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72nd Ave S Extension</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Tax Revenue to Capital</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$10,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxpayer Bond Funds</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$98</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Surplus Property</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$252</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$1,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington Impact/LOS Fees</td>
<td>$630</td>
<td>$610</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$4,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Impact/Los Fees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$767</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilmatic Bonds</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Radio Program</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$767</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in Kent ILA for IT</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>$306</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparatus Grant</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn Prop Grant</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$10,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac ILA Capital</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>$485</td>
<td>$493</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$510</td>
<td>$529</td>
<td>$2,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary of Revenues less Expenses

| Expense                          | $1,232| $4,347| $3,915| $2,594| $3,965| $5,613| $21,667  |
| Revenue                          | $2,458| $4,044| $4,633| $3,707| $3,783| $3,745| $22,369  |
| Balance                          | $1,226| $922  | $1,640| $2,752| $2,570| $702  | $702     |
2 Background and Demographics

The KRFA is an independent special purpose district legally formed under Chapter 52 of the Revised Code of Washington providing fire and rescue services to more than 60 square miles of urban, suburban and rural area. Services provided are delivered 24 hours per day, 365 days per year through career firefighters and support staff. Services delivered by the KRFA include; fire suppression, fire prevention and code enforcement, fire investigations, emergency medical services (EMS), non-emergent medical services, hazardous materials response, specialized rescue services, emergency management services, and public education in fire prevention and life safety.

The current service area includes all of the cities of Covington, Kent, and SeaTae, as well as unincorporated areas of King County within King County Fire District 37. Generally, the KRFA’s service area borders Renton and Tukwila to the north, Maple Valley to the east, Auburn to the south and Burien, Des Moines and Federal Way to the west. Current 2016 population of KRFA service area is 177,390.1

For purposes of this plan, capital improvements are defined as real estate, structures or collective equipment purchases anticipated to have a cost of $5,000 or more and an expected useful life of at least 3 years.

This update re-establishes the service level standards adopted by the KRFA in its 2014 Standard of Cover (SOC) and evaluates existing and future service capacity. Fire service capacity is evaluated upon the ability of current deployed resources to meet established levels of service. Fire stations and their apparatus are evaluated to determine capacity. A fire station with three apparatus bays and the infrastructure required to support three or more emergency response units, has reserve capacity when only one unit and crew is deployed from that station. Also, a fire resource that meets its level of service objectives and is reliably available for service at least as often as it is expected to meet its level of service objective has reserve capacity. The KRFA’s goal is to deliver service at the adopted level of service (LOS) 9 times out of 10 or a service expectation that meets adopted standards 90% of the time.

Fire service capacity is also measured with consideration of future growth and the fire service capacity that future growth will erode when built. The following pages describe:

- The current demographics of the KRFA
- The inventory of existing capital resources
- The capital needs that have been implemented since adoption of the CFEP in 2014
- The recent historical performance to the adopted standards
- The need for additional resources over the next six years
- The funding plan to implement the needed resources through 2021.

---

1 Washington State Office of Financial Management April 2015 with estimates of fire district 37’s unincorporated area based upon housing counts and 3 persons per dwelling
2.1 SeaTac Service Area

The KRFA provides fire based services to the City of SeaTac through a contract for service that began January 1, 2014. SeaTac’s area covers approximately 10 square miles surrounding the Port of Seattle Airport and has a 2016 population of 27,810.

Three fire stations owned by SeaTac are leased and operated by the KRFA under the service contract. All other capital resources previously owned by SeaTac prior to 2014, have been transferred to the ownership of the KRFA. As a condition of the service contract, SeaTac provides an annual capital payment to the KRFA for funding the equipment that was transferred but has retained responsibility for the capital costs of fire stations. Consequently, this plan does not address capital fire station needs in the SeaTac service area.
Community Growth and Impacts of Growth 2016 – 2021

In the post-Great Recession years from 2010 to 2016, the KRFA’s population grew at its slowest 6-year rate in more than 30 years. Growth from new development during 2010 through 2015 averaged less than ¾ of 1 percent per year. Now in 2016, the Office of Financial Management reports the greatest year over year population growth since 2007 in Washington State resulting in a 1.14% population increase within the KRFA service area.

While growth seemed to be limited during the post-Great Recession years, the rate of emergency service demand over the same 6-year period grew from 15,626 service requests in 2010 to 19,765 (not including the City of SeaTac) in 2015. This is an annual incident growth rate of 3.5%. The total 6-year increase in service demand was 21% with overall population growth of just 4.45%. The cause of this anomalous incident growth is unknown but likely caused from an aging population, increase in work force populations post-recession, and a higher rate of occupancy in existing dwelling units, many of which were foreclosed and vacant for an extended period of time during the recession.

Table 3 Population and Housing Growth Projections without SeaTac

The Puget Sound Regional Council’s regional plan “Vision 2040,” identifies Kent as both a residential and commercial/industrial growth center. This makes it unlikely that the limited commercial growth of less than one-half of one percent between 2013 and 2015 will continue. While the Amazon fulfillment center built in the Kent Valley was new growth of more than 1 million square feet, the selloff and demolition of buildings previously part of the Boeing Space Center netted almost neutral growth.

The table below provides both a low and high range estimate of commercial growth. Continued growth at the 2013 to 2016 rate is the “Low” estimate for 2021 and 2035, and the “High” estimate more closely relates to market growth prior to the Great Recession. Both of these estimates are dependent upon buildable lands and future market rates.

Table 4 Commercial Growth Rates 2013 & 2016 with estimates for 2021 & 2035

---

2 Figures for 2000 to 2016 are actual counts from the Office of Financial Management, 2021 and 2035 are based upon OFM and Comprehensive Plan estimates of Covington and Kent.
3.1 Impacts of Future Growth

Two methods of growth projections have been used in Table 4 to determine the impacts of projected growth through 2035, the first utilizes the projected new units of the Covington and Kent Comprehensive Plans and the second utilizes the incident growth rates from 2010 through 2015 of 3.5% per year. The average of these two methods has been used to predict the future service demand as a result of growth. This method predicts service demand from the 2015 total incident count (excluding the SeaTac area) of 19,226, to an estimated growth of 22% or 23,464 incidents in 2021 and a 64% incident growth rate to 31,532 by 2035.

3.1.1 Growth Remains Consistent with the 2014 – 2033 Master CFEP

The pattern of growth and estimates of future impacts on service demand are consistent with the 2014 Master plan and the resource needs projected in that plan.

Table 5 Incident Growth Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2015 Total Incidents</th>
<th>2015 Incident Rate Per Unit</th>
<th>2021 Low Housing Unit Count</th>
<th>2021 High Housing Unit Count</th>
<th>Average Projected Incident Count 2021</th>
<th>2035 Low Housing Unit Count</th>
<th>2035 High Housing Unit Count</th>
<th>Average Projected Incident Count 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>55,579</td>
<td>14,420</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>58,440</td>
<td>72,686</td>
<td>90,993,003</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Space</td>
<td>64,995,002</td>
<td>4,807</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>66,794,918</td>
<td>72,794,724</td>
<td>90,993,003</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Incidents</td>
<td>19,227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Incidents -3.5% Growth Factor</td>
<td>19,227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of Both Methods</td>
<td>19,227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Current Capital Resources

Capital resources for KRFA consist of fire stations, fire apparatus (vehicles used for fire and rescue work), staff vehicles and the related equipment, tools and personal protection equipment needed to safely and legally provide fire and rescue services.

4.1 Influence of Public Protection Class Rating (PPC)

In the early 1900s, major U.S. cities suffered disastrous fires that destroyed billions of dollars' worth of property. In the aftermath, insurance companies realized that they needed advance information on the fire-loss characteristics of individual communities.

Since 1909, the Municipal Inspection and Grading System and its successors have been an important part of the underwriting and rating process for insurers writing personal and commercial fire policies. Washington State’s Survey and Rating Bureau (WSRB) service is a direct descendent of the earlier grading systems and is derived from the Insurance Services Office (ISO) rating system. The PPC program gives insurers credible data to help them develop premiums that fairly reflect the risk of loss in a particular location.

WSRB collects information on fire-protection efforts in communities throughout Washington. In each community, WSRB analyzes the relevant data using their rating schedule and then assigns a Public Protection Classification from 1 to 10. Class 1 represents exemplary public protection, and Class 10 indicates that the area's fire-suppression program does not meet WSRB’s minimum criteria.
The PPC rating program recognizes the efforts of communities to provide fire-protection services for citizens and property owners. A community's investment in fire mitigation is a proven and reliable predictor of future fire losses. Insurance companies use PPC information to help establish fair premiums for fire insurance, generally offering lower premiums in communities with better protection. It is estimated that property owners in the KRFA service area, save more than $28 million each year in reduced premiums compared to not meeting the ISO/WSRB's minimum criteria.

A community's PPC rating depends on:

- **Emergency Communications Systems**
  A review of the fire alarm/911 system accounts for 10% of the total classification. The review focuses on the community's facilities and support for handling and dispatching fire alarms.

- **Fire operations & deployment**
  A review of the fire department accounts for 40% of the total classification. The focus is on a fire agencies first-alarm response and initial attack to minimize potential loss. Here, WSRB reviews such items as engine companies, ladder or service companies, distribution of fire stations and fire companies, equipment carried on apparatus, pumping capacity, reserve apparatus, department personnel, and training.

- **Fire Safety Control**
  A review of the community having jurisdiction (Covington, Kent, King County SeaTac) ability to adopt and enforce effective building codes makes up 10% of the total PPC scoring. This is based upon the jurisdictions practices to adopt codes, train and staff personnel to enforce these codes and public awareness programs to their adopted building codes. Further evaluation looks at the process in place to review plans of new buildings to ensure structures are code compliant and ongoing inspections of existing buildings for code compliance.

- **Jurisdictional water supply**
  The jurisdictions water-supply system accounts for 40% of the total classification. WSRB reviews the water supply a community uses to determine the adequacy for fire-suppression purposes. They also consider hydrant size, type, and installation, as well as the inspection frequency and condition of fire hydrants.

### 4.1.1 Limitations of Deployed Resources to Preserve PPC

Because one of the PPC rating criteria is the deployment of resource for fire protection, the KRFA must maintain the fire protection equipment staffing and deployment that supports its current PPC rating. This is why emergency medical services are often provided through firefighters arriving on a fire engine or ladder truck instead of an aid car. The KRFA maintain its fire protection system first, and only then can it expand to deliver emergency medical services (EMS) from less costly aid cars or other service delivery platforms.

The KRFA recognizes the cost savings that could be realized by deploying lighter, cheaper, more maneuverable response vehicles to respond to EMS emergencies but must first maintain the fire equipment that supports the PPC rating which provides more than $28 million annually in decreased insurance costs to the service area. To deploy both types of vehicles, additional staffing is required and currently, the KRFA does not have the funding to accomplish this type of deployment and will continue to maintain its firefighting resources first to preserve or improve PPC ratings.
4.2 Fixed Facilities

4.2.1 Fire Stations
Emergency services originate from eight fire stations located throughout the service area (not including SeaTac) as identified in the Table and map shown below. The average fire station is 27 years old with ages ranging from 8 to 52 years old with the capacity for three emergency response apparatus and is 14,675 square feet in size. Individual stations range in size from just under 8,000 to more than 26,000 square feet where training facilities are included. Currently only stations 71, and 74, maintain more than one front line response apparatus with minimum staffing levels. All stations have some reserve capacity in the form of apparatus bays and dorm rooms. However, to utilize this capacity, additional climate controlled space is required to house reserve apparatus, alternative response vehicles, and equipment that is stored in these spaces now.

4.2.2 Support Facilities
Support facilities include spaces for emergency management functions, a fire-training tower with computerized fire simulators, a training facility, apparatus & vehicle maintenance facilities, a logistics warehouse, and a roadway. An inventory of these facilities is found in Table 4 below.

4.2.3 Roadways - 72nd Ave South
72nd Ave S in the Kent valley is currently under construction and is a support facility to the KRFA because previous analysis determined only two ways to resolve level of service deficiencies in the northeast Kent valley. Either build and staff a fire station in that area, or construct a missing link of 72nd Ave S. north of Station 76. Completion of the missing link of 72nd Ave allows responses from station 76 to access the eastbound rail overpass of S. 196th St. and connect with the East Valley Highway. This new route opening in early 2017, will bypass chronic response delays caused by traffic congestion associated with S 212th Street and SR 167 traffic at the East Valley Highway. KRFA’s part in completing this section of roadway is the provision of funding $1.2 million of the project’s cost through an inter-local agreement with the City of Kent. This one-time cost is less than a single year’s cost of wages and benefits for personnel to staff a new fire station. Building the missing link of 72nd Ave S is the most cost effective way to solve the level of service deficiency that growth and increased traffic congestion has created and continues to erode in the northern Kent valley.

Table 6: Fire Station & Support Facility Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Station/Facility Location</th>
<th>Size in Srvc Acquired</th>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Cond.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station 71 504 West Crow Street</td>
<td>10,858</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.5 bays Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 72 25620 140th Ave SE</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3 bays Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 73 26512 Military Road South</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3 bays Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 74 14611 116th Ave SE</td>
<td>26,653</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Lease 2010</td>
<td>3 bays Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 75 15605 SE 272nd Street</td>
<td>12,425</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Lease 2010</td>
<td>3 bays Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 76 20676 72nd Ave S</td>
<td>11,104</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3 bays Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 77 20727 122nd Ave SE</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3 bays Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 78 17820 SE 266th Street</td>
<td>17,485</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4 bays Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 117,397</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Future Fire Station Sites Owned by KDFRFA | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Benson Station 21509 108th Ave SE | 0 | 1 | 2015 | Land | 0.20 |
| App Storage 116th St & SE 248th | 0 | 2 | 2016 | Land | 2.03 |
| Totals 0.29 |

| Accessory Structures Owned, Maintained or Funded by KDFRFA | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| EM 24425 116th Ave SE | 2,860 | 2014 | Good | 0.23 |
| Training Tower 24523 116th Ave SE | 4,655 | Lease 2014 | Good | N/A |
| Training Annex 24524 116th Ave SE | 3,152 | 2009 | Poor | N/A |
| Apparatus Shop 20078 20th Ave S | 10,880 | 2015 | Good | N/A |
| Logistics Center 8320 S 208th Street | 20,000 | 2015 | Good | N/A |
| Sub-Total Totals 39,529 | 122 | 0.29 |
| Total 156,926 | 27.37 |
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4.3 **Mobile Resources**

Specific inventories of mobile resources are found in the Appendices of this Plan.

4.3.1 **Apparatus Life Cycle Policy**

KRFA keeps response vehicles well maintained but historic delays in funding life cycle replacement has allowed the fleet to age past industry standards. Agencies with workload similar to the KRFA utilize a life cycle for heavy apparatus of 10 years front line and 5 or 10 years in reserve status for a total in-service life of 15 or 20 years.

Recent studies have shown that the maintenance cost and decreased residual value of 20 year old fire engines is less cost effective than shorter life cycles of 15 years. Because of this, the KRFA’s long-term goal will be to continue with a 10 year front line life cycle but shorten the reserve life cycle to 5 years and recapturing significantly higher surplus values when these apparatus are sold. Studies show this will also reduce overall maintenance costs, downtime, and provide greater savings than longer life cycles.
4.3.2 Fire Engines
KRFA fire engines are specialized apparatus equipped with pumps capable of 1,500 gallons per minute or more of fire flow, with onboard water supplies of 500 gallons or more and a compliment of hoses, nozzles and firefighting equipment necessary to the extinguishment of fires. The inventory of 19 fire engines has an average age of 14 years and average miles of 87,843. The six reserve engines have an average age of 26 years with average miles of 137,100.

4.3.3 Quints
A Quint is a multi-purpose apparatus or cross between a fire engine and a ladder truck. They are capable of pumping fire flows like a fire engine and are equipped with shorter ladders of 55 to 75 in length compared to the typical ladder trucks reach of 100 feet or greater. Ladder trucks do not carry or pump water. The KRFA has two Quint units with 65 foot ladders, one located at Station 76 in the industrial north end of the Kent Valley, and one at Station 75 near Covington. These two units are capable of delivering elevated master streams of water like a ladder truck and cost effectively augment KRFA’s ladder trucks located at Stations 46 and 74.

4.3.4 Ladder Trucks
Both front line ladder trucks are tillered, meaning they are built on a tractor-trailer platform. The trailer portion has steerable wheels that allow these units to maneuver into very tight locations with their more than 100 foot ladders. One is located at Station 74 and the other at Station 46. Apparatus 713, (Ladder 74) is 10 years old with over 60,000 miles, and 800 ladder hours. Apparatus 768 (Ladder 46) is two years old making the average age of the two front line ladders 6 years old with average mileage of 35,000. Reserve apparatus 715 is 20 years old with over 84,000 miles and 1,100 ladder hours.

4.3.5 Aid Cars
Aid Cars are licensed ambulances with extra equipment necessary to support the two-person staffing with basic tools and protective equipment for firefighting. These vehicles primarily respond to medical emergencies and augment fire apparatus that are required to maintain the KRFA’s Public Protection Class rating.

4.3.6 Command and Staff Vehicles
Command and staff vehicles are utilized to support both emergency and non-emergency operations of the KFRFA. Command vehicles are specially outfitted with equipment and communications equipment necessary to providing coordinated command over emergency incidents.

4.4 Equipment
A full complement of special equipment is necessary for the delivery of fire and rescue services. Special equipment includes all of the equipment within fire stations or carried on fire engines and other apparatus that allow firefighters to safely and effectively deliver services. Table 4 provides a listing of the equipment maintained by KRFA.
5 Standards of Service

5.1 Time and Origin of Standards
Time to arrival at the scene of an emergency is critical in the survival of a non-breathing patient and the control of fire growth. The longer it takes trained fire personnel to arrive at the scene of an emergency, the greater the chance of poor outcomes regarding fire and life loss. As a result, the standards identified herein adopted by the KRFA and are based upon industry best practices. Industry standards have been cooperatively established by the International City/County Managers Association (ICMA) National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and the Center for Public Safety Excellence (CPSE) in the 8th edition Fire and Emergency Service Self-Assessment Manual (FESSAM) published through the CPSE. KRFA’s standards exceed the expectations established by these groups largely because of limited funding to deliver service. Compared to the NFPA, the KRFA’s level of service exceeds those of the NFPA in some cases by 1 minute and 40 seconds.

5.2 Emergency response
Achievement of drive time standards are influenced by the location of fire service resources. If a service area is located too far from a fire station (poor distribution), it is unlikely that travel time objectives will be met. If distributed resources are over-used because of high demand, they become “unreliable” to meet additional demand. Because of units becoming unreliable, units from farther away must respond in the place of the busy home area unit, causing increases in arrival times. If too few resources exist, and fire resources from other fire departments are needed to backfill for busy units, the consequence is extended drive times, resulting in increased total response times and higher levels of risk for life and property loss.

5.3 Benchmark / Baseline Gap Performance and Relation to Staffing
KRFA uses adopted Benchmark performance levels as those levels of service to be achieved as capital facilities and resources are funded, deployed, and staffed. Baseline levels of service represent the actual performance achieved over the previous 5-years. The goal of capital planning in the KRFA is to close the gap between Baseline and Benchmark performance. The CPSE annually reviews the KRFA’s Baseline performance to assure progress toward achieving Benchmark expectations. Failure to progressively improve toward benchmark expectations can lead to loss of accredited agency status.

The gap between the two performance standards (Benchmark and Baseline) should close as funding becomes available to implement the capital needs identified in the 2014 – 2033 KRFA Master Capital Plan and this 2016 – 2021 six-year update of that Plan. Operational funding is also required to close the resource gap. Where additional response stations and apparatus are required, the KRFA must also fund the annual operational cost of additional firefighters and support staff.

5.4 Components of Response Performance
There are three components in the measurement of “Total Response Time”, Alarm Handling, Turnout and Drive time.

---

3 See section 5 and of the Kent Regional Fire Authority Mitigation and Level of Service Policy for additional detail and consequences of long response times.
5.4.1 Alarm Handling Time
Alarm handling is completed at Valley Communications Center, the dispatch agency available to KRFA. Alarm handling is the total time elapsed from the pick-up of a 911 call until enough information is collected to dispatch appropriate resources.

5.4.2 Turnout Time
Turnout refers to the total time it takes firefighters to discontinue their current task, assess dispatch information, don appropriate personal protective gear and become safely seat-belted and ready to begin their response. Turnout time ends and drive time begins when the response vehicle begins to move.

5.4.3 Drive Time
Drive time begins when the response vehicle’s wheels begin to roll and ends once the response vehicle arrives at the curbside address of the dispatched incident. When added together, alarm handling plus turnout plus drive time equals total response time.

5.5 Deployment and Measures of Response Resources
The performance measure directly in the KRFA’s control is the “Dispatch to Arrival Interval” and consists of turnout + drive time. This measure assesses response time performance against two deployment practices, distribution and concentration.

5.5.1 Distribution
Distribution refers to how fire stations and resources are distributed around a service area to achieve defined response levels of service (LOS) goals for first units to arrive. Distribution can be referred to as the “speed of attack” or the first unit to arrive. Achievements of first unit arrival time objectives indicate that fire stations are properly distributed throughout the service area.

5.5.1.1 Distribution / First unit to arrive - Service Capabilities:
The first unit arriving at the scene of an emergency staffed with a minimum of 2 firefighters on an Aid Car, or 3 firefighters on an Engine, shall be capable of; establishing command; calling for additional resource; extending appropriate hose line(s); and/or beginning delivery of basic life support and/or rescue services. These operations are done in accordance with Department standard operating procedures while providing for the safety of the general public and responders.

5.5.2 Concentration
Concentration refers to the number of resources that can be assembled or “concentrated” at the scene of an emergency. Concentration can be referred to as the “force of attack” or full first alarm assignment. Concentration resources need to provide the force or quantity of resources necessary to stop the escalation of an emergency. If an agency cannot distribute and concentrate adequate resources, fire and life loss will be higher when compared to the timely arrival of adequate resources.
5.5.2.1 Concentration / Minimum Effective Response Force
The minimum effective response force (MERF) consists of at least 3 firefighting units with a minimum of 8 firefighters. The MERF is capable of: establishing command; providing an uninterrupted water supply; advancing an attack line and a backup line for fire control; complying with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements of two-in and two-out; completing forcible entry; and searching and rescuing at-risk victims. These operations shall be done in accordance with the Department’s standard operating procedures while providing for the safety of responders and the general public.

5.5.2.2 Concentration / Full first alarm – Service Capabilities:
The full first alarm resources arriving at the scene of an emergency staffed with between 5 to 17 firefighters depending upon the incident type. These resources shall be capable of; establishing command, providing an uninterrupted water supply, deploying hose lines for fire control and suppression, complying with the two-in-two out law for firefighter rescue, completing forcible entry, controlling utilities and/or rescuing and treating sick, injured, or at-risk victims. These operations are done in accordance with departmental standard operating procedures while providing for the safety of the general public and responders.

5.6 Benchmark and Baseline Level of Service Objectives:
Table 7 establishes the service level objectives for; Alarm Handling, Firefighter Turnout, and drive times expectations of distribution (first unit) and concentration (MERF and ERF) performance. Benchmark levels of service are targeted for achievement as additional resources identified in this Plan and the CFEP are funded, implemented and staffed. Baseline performance objectives are the minimum levels of service KRFA is currently capable of achieving and must be maintained or improved to retain status as an Accredited Agency through the Center for Public Safety Excellence.

5.6.1 Community Risk Types
Performance expectations have been established for three community risk types, urban, suburban, and rural,4 with both benchmark and baseline objectives as shown in Table 5.

5.6.2 Performance Measured
Washington State’s Chapter 52.33 RCW requires performance measures meaningful to flashover and brain death to be established, performed, and reported at the 90th percentile. If response times of 100 incidents were stacked from quickest to slowest, the time of the 90th incident is the time used to measure service delivery at 90%.

5.6.3 Performance Expectations
The following two tables outline the standards adopted by the KRFA for the two main categories of emergency incidents; those requiring donning of full firefighting personal protective gear shown in Table 7 below, and those emergency medical incidents that do not require full firefighting gear shown in Table 8 below. Donning firefighting gear is time consuming, and consequently longer turnout times are applied to Table 7.

4 See section 4.2.1.7 of the 2014-2033 KRFA Capital Facilities and Equipment Plan.
### Table 7: Benchmark & Baseline Level of Service Objectives – Non-Medical Related

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Unit</th>
<th>2nd Unit</th>
<th>3rd Unit</th>
<th>MERF</th>
<th>Balance of 1st Alarm</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Call Processing</strong></td>
<td>1 min 10 sec</td>
<td>1 min 10 sec</td>
<td>1 min 10 sec</td>
<td>1 min 10 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Call Processing</strong></td>
<td>1 min 25 sec</td>
<td>1 min 25 sec</td>
<td>1 min 25 sec</td>
<td>1 min 25 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Benchmark Turnout</strong></td>
<td>1 min 55 sec</td>
<td>1 min 55 sec</td>
<td>1 min 55 sec</td>
<td>1 min 55 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Drive Time</strong></td>
<td>4 min 15 sec</td>
<td>5 min 55 sec</td>
<td>6 min 30 sec</td>
<td>8 min 55 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Drive Time</strong></td>
<td>6 min 08 sec</td>
<td>6 min 54 sec</td>
<td>7 min 44 sec</td>
<td>10 min 21 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Benchmark Reflex</strong></td>
<td>7 min 20 sec</td>
<td>9 min 00 sec</td>
<td>9 min 35 sec</td>
<td>12 min 00 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Baseline Reflex</strong></td>
<td>9 min 03 sec</td>
<td>9 min 49 sec</td>
<td>11 min 39 sec</td>
<td>20 min 16 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Benchmark & Baseline Level of Service Objectives – Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Related

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Unit</th>
<th>2nd Unit</th>
<th>3rd Unit</th>
<th>MERF</th>
<th>Balance of 1st Alarm</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Call Processing</strong></td>
<td>1 min 10 sec</td>
<td>1 min 10 sec</td>
<td>1 min 10 sec</td>
<td>1 min 10 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Call Processing</strong></td>
<td>1 min 25 sec</td>
<td>1 min 25 sec</td>
<td>1 min 25 sec</td>
<td>1 min 25 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Benchmark Turnout</strong></td>
<td>1 min 55 sec</td>
<td>1 min 55 sec</td>
<td>1 min 55 sec</td>
<td>1 min 55 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark Drive Time</strong></td>
<td>4 min 35 sec</td>
<td>6 min 10 sec</td>
<td>7 min 00 sec</td>
<td>9 min 55 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Drive Time</strong></td>
<td>5 min 04 sec</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Benchmark Reflex</strong></td>
<td>8 min 35 sec</td>
<td>9 min 15 sec</td>
<td>10 min 05 sec</td>
<td>13 min 00 sec</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Baseline Reflex</strong></td>
<td>8 min 59 sec</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response Standards - No EMS**

**Urban** – an incorporated or un-incorporated area with a population of over 30,000 people and/or a population density of 2,000 people per square mile

**Suburban** – an incorporated or un-incorporated area with a population of 10,000-29,999 and/or any area with a population density of 2,000 people per square mile

**Rural** – an incorporated or un-incorporated area with a population less than 10,000 people, or with a population density of less than 2,000 people per square mile

**Response Standards - EMS**

**Urban** – an incorporated or un-incorporated area with a population of over 30,000

**Suburban** – an incorporated or un-incorporated area with a population of 10,000-29,999

**Rural** – an incorporated or un-incorporated area with a population less than 10,000
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5.6.4 Resource Capacity

Finally, resource capacity is evaluated. The fire service refers to this measure as “reliability” sometimes referred to “unit hour utilization,” referring to the availability of specific response units. If an emergency response unit was in its assigned location 24 hours a day and never called upon for service, it would have a reliability of 100%. But, if an emergency response unit is expected to provide a level of service performance at 90% or 9 times out of every ten requests, that unit must be available or “reliable” for providing service when called upon at least 90% of the time or it will likely fail in its performance expectation. Unit reliability is often the best predictor of service capacity of deployed units. As workload increases, reliability decreases.

Table 9: Response Unit Reliability Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum RELIABILITY Objectives</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Peak Hour Unit Reliability</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 KRFA Service Level Performance

6.1 Response Performance Findings

Analysis of KRFA’s historical response data reveals sub-standard performance compared to benchmark expectations. See Tables 7 & 8 Base Drive Time compared to Benchmark Drive Time. Several factors contribute to this current sub-standard performance. First, performance cannot be met during peak hours where workload is high and unit reliability is low. Second, some areas of KRFA simply cannot be reached within the adopted time standards because of excess distance from a fire station. Finally, latencies in current communications and alerting systems extend firefighter turnout times beyond benchmark standards.

6.1.1 Reliability Performance

Reliability performance is typically used as an indicator to monitor the need for additional resources. Reliability at or above 95% is considered to be reliable with reserve capacity. This is shown in Table 10 below as “Green.” As reliability falls below 95% (displayed as yellow) it is time to begin planning for the deployment of additional resources to handle the workload. Reliability below 90% (displayed as red) prevents reliable achievement of response standards. Those units with reliability displayed in red are considered in resource exhaustion and begin to impact surrounding fire station reliability by drawing in other resources to cover for the deficient capacity or resource exhaustion occurring during peak demand hours. This ripple effect of deficient reliability spreads outward with the consequences of longer response times because units must travel out of their home area to cover the deficient area. This ripple continues to spread during peak demand hours moving out to other fire stations and often to other jurisdictions.

6.1.2 Reliability & Mutual Aid

The measure to which reliability impacts other jurisdictions is seen in automatic mutual aid balances. Currently the KRFA maintains a deficit in mutual aid with all but one of its surrounding neighbors because of the need to use more outside resources than can be repaid through services given back to these mutual aid neighbors.
Table 10 Hourly Unit Reliability for the Year 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>2016-2021 KRFA Year Capital Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station 71</td>
<td>2015 Reliability of Existing Stations &amp; Resources with Minimum Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour of Day</td>
<td>Station 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>No Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Conclusion of Need for Capital Resources 2016 – 2021

The most concerning evidence of the need for capital resources is the overall reliability of all emergency response units displayed in Table 11 above. The only hour where the KRFA has unit reliability above 95% occurs at 5:00 am. All other hours of the day are yellow and red. From noon until 9:00 pm each day, resource exhaustion occurs with reliability below 90 percent. It is expected that in the current year 2016, reliability will further erode increasing resource exhaustion three additional hours each day with units unable to meet level of service expectations from 10:00 am until 10:00 pm, all of the peak demand hours for emergency response.

Nearly 1,000 new apartment units and 300 single family homes are currently permitted and under construction in 2016. Growth within the KRFA service area is expected to continue at or close to the rates experienced prior to the Great Recession resulting in further declines in unit reliability and erosion of service capacity. This in turn, will lead to steady increasing total response times unless additional resources and the staffing they require can be funded and deployed.

7.1 Planned Capital Funding 2014 – 2033

The 2014 – 2033 KRFA Capital Facilities and Equipment Master Plan identified the need for more than $87 million in capital investments to maintain fire service concurrency through 2033. This 6 year plan explores two options to reduce the near term cost of capital. First, less expensive alternatives to some resources identified in the Master Plan have been chosen, next, modified life cycles of fire apparatus are expected to provide additional value to surplus equipment that can assist in funding new capital. In total, this reduces the cost of some resources needed in the next 6 years.
The additional cost associated with the KRFA’s portion of funding construction of 72nd Ave South, and the cost of maintaining the apparatus and equipment transferred from SeaTac has been added into the total capital costs established in the Master Plan. Combined with the cost saving measures associated with the new apparatus life cycle plan the current cost of the total 2014 Master Plan has decreased from $87.14 million to $86.25 million.

7.1.1 Planned Capital Purchases 2016 - 2021
The table below identifies the capital expenses to be incurred between 2016 and 2021 based upon the current known priorities and levels of service. Each year this table will be updated to reflect current known priorities and levels of service.

Table 11: Six Year (2016-2021) Capital Costing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost/Funding Source</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station Construction &amp; Land Purchase</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$98</td>
<td>$1,485</td>
<td>$3,103</td>
<td>$5,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparatus</td>
<td>$714</td>
<td>$1,331</td>
<td>$1,174</td>
<td>$1,518</td>
<td>$1,645</td>
<td>$1,609</td>
<td>$7,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$118</td>
<td>$1,046</td>
<td>$827</td>
<td>$431</td>
<td>$377</td>
<td>$397</td>
<td>$3,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Preservation</td>
<td>$77</td>
<td>$1,003</td>
<td>$488</td>
<td>$312</td>
<td>$142</td>
<td>$183</td>
<td>$2,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.T. Capital</td>
<td>$153</td>
<td>$792</td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$195</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72nd Ave S Extension</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expense Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,232</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,347</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,915</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,594</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,965</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,613</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,667</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,458</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,044</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,633</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,707</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,783</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,745</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,369</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Revenues less Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,226</strong></td>
<td><strong>$922</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,640</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,570</strong></td>
<td><strong>$702</strong></td>
<td><strong>$702</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 Progress toward Planned Capital Purchases

As a result of the Great Recession and the uncertainty of the economy during that time, the KRFA delayed some planned equipment purchases between 2014 and 2016 and placed funding toward the new Valley Station and the Benson Station on hold. The Valley Station is now scheduled to be completed in 2022 with the Benson Station scheduled for opening in 2026. All asset preservation projects, equipment needs and apparatus are now scheduled for funding and replacement through 2021.

The 2014 – 2033 Master Capital Plan is funded through 2033 with the following assumptions:

- Annual tax revenue to capital between 2022 – 2033 averages $2.43 million per year
- Impact fees revenue between 2022 – 2033 averages $1.7 million per year

8 2016 – 2021 Capital Plan Effects on Impact Fees

Impact fees are established in the KRFA Mitigation and Level of Service Policy in Appendix A, using a formula based upon the cost of capital needs and service demand by property type. The policy requires updating along with the costs of annual capital plan updates. Total funding needs have decreased because of this update, resulting in a slight decrease in impact fees displayed in Table 12 below.

Table 12: 2015 Impact Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>System wide C&amp;E</th>
<th>Use Factor</th>
<th>ERF Factor</th>
<th>New Dev Share</th>
<th>Projected New Units 2011 - 2030</th>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Impact &amp; LOS Contribution Fee Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$86,252,690</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>19,068</td>
<td>Living unit $1,702.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>$86,252,690</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>19,068</td>
<td>Living unit $1,664.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM/IND</td>
<td>$86,252,690</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>Sq Feet $1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSP/MED/SOC/CHIR</td>
<td>$86,252,690</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>Sq Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTED CARE</td>
<td>$86,252,690</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>Sq Feet $1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 C&E costs adjusted down in 2015 reflecting reduced size of proposed Station 80
9 Capital Cost Summaries

9.1 Equipment Inventory, Life Cycle and Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hose</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>$208</td>
<td>20-Yrs</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Hose Nozzles</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>15-Yrs</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
<td>$73,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue Tools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>12-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>$4,106</td>
<td>10-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$123,188</td>
<td>$439,369</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$562,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBA Air Bottles</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>$979</td>
<td>10-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$285,998</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$285,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBA Misc - Masks, SABA Fill Stations</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$290,421</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$290,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballistic Vests</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$525</td>
<td>5-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Radios</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>10-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Radios</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>10-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>$157,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Protective Gear - Fire</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>10-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Protective Gear - Haz-Mat</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td>8-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
<td>$13,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haz-Mat Equipment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>6-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defibrillators</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>10-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Pumps</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>25-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Ground Fuel Tanks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>25-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forklifts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>20-Years</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam Cleaner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>8-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Shop Compressor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>10-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal Imaging Cameras</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$9,837</td>
<td>10-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrant Retrofit (storz connections)</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>40-yrs</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2 Asset Preservation Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$53</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emer Mgmt</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App Shop</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$422</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$77</td>
<td>$1,003</td>
<td>$488</td>
<td>$312</td>
<td>$142</td>
<td>$183</td>
<td>$2,205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.3 IT Capital Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Data Computers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>5-Yrs</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop PC's</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>5-Yrs</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptops/Tablets</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>4-Yrs</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO Field Tablets</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>4-Yrs</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPads for Tablet Command</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>3-Yrs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wensoft-Sales Pad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command Unit Mods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Cycle Capital</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td>$107</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td>$819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Independence Project</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$596</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Year Total: $1,196,575
### 9.4 Fixed Facility Construction Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Project</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64th Ave</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$1,088</td>
<td>$86</td>
<td>$1,473</td>
<td>$2,876</td>
<td>$5,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$227</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Move</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yearly Totals</strong></td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$98</td>
<td>$1,485</td>
<td>$3,103</td>
<td>$5,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.5 Apparatus Funding Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid Car/Ambulances</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$261</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Engines</td>
<td>$672</td>
<td>$868</td>
<td>$838</td>
<td>$996</td>
<td>$824</td>
<td>$1,030</td>
<td>$5,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has-Mat Vehicles</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood / Water Rescue</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder Trucks</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$319</td>
<td>$319</td>
<td>$319</td>
<td>$957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Trucks</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Test/Generator</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command/Staff Cars</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$146</td>
<td>$576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Support Cars</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$114</td>
<td>$445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Trailers</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ops Support Units</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyboom - Quint</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Year (2016 - 2021) Apparatus Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$714</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,331</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,174</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,518</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,645</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,991</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10.1 Apparatus Inventory & Funding Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Apparatus</th>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0002</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0003</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0004</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0005</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0006</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0014</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0015</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0016</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0017</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0018</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0019</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0020</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0021</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0022</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0023</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0024</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0025</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0026</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0027</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0028</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total Annual Cost: $7,071*
Amendments to Title 19 - Associated with the adoption of Fire Impact Fees
New Chapter 19.50 – Fire Impact Fees

Chapter 19.10
GENERAL PROVISIONS

19.10.030 Definitions.
New definition:

(f) “RFA” means the Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority, a Washington State municipal corporation established and operating pursuant to Chapter 52.26 RCW.

Chapter 19.20
IMPOSITION OF IMPACT FEES

19.20.030 Service area.
New Section: (2) Define Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority Service area. Reorder following sections.

(2) Fire Impact Fees. For purposes of the fire impact fees established in Chapter 19.50 CMS, all land within the boundaries of the Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority shall be considered a single service area and the City shall impose impact fees within that portion of the Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority lying within the City corporate limits.

19.20.080 Low-income housing exemption.
New Section: (3) Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority Service Low Income Exemption language. Reorder following sections.

(2) Any claim or request for a waiver under this section shall be made no later than the time of issuance of a building permit. If a building permit is not required for the development activity, the claim shall be made when the impact fees are tendered. Any claim not made when required by this section shall be deemed waived.

(3) The Low-income housing exemption shall not apply to Fire Impact Fees.

19.20.090 Credits.
New Section: (1) General statement about impact fee credits. Reorder following sections:
(1) Unless otherwise defined in the respective impact fee chapter or associated Interlocal Agreements, the provisions for requesting and receiving credits toward impact fees shall follow the provisions of this section.
Chapter 19.50
FIRE IMPACT FEE

Sections:
19.50.XXX Purpose – Authority.
19.50.XXX Interlocal agreement required.
19.50.XXX Submission of RFA capital facilities plan and data.
19.50.XXX Annual Council review.
19.50.XXX Exclusions.
19.50.XXX Fee calculations.
19.50.XXX Assessment of fees.
19.50.XXX Use of funds.
19.50.XXX Impact fee accounts – Payment.

19.50.XXX Purpose – Authority.
The City Council of the City of Covington hereby finds and determines that continuing growth and development in the City of Covington will create additional demands and need for fire protection facilities. The Council further finds that the Washington State Growth Management Act requires that new growth and development should pay a proportionate share of the cost of new facilities needed to serve the new growth and development.

Therefore, pursuant to Chapter 82.02 RCW, the Council adopts this chapter to assess fire impact fees. The provisions of this chapter shall be liberally construed in order to carry out the purposes of the Council in establishing the fire impact fee program.

19.50.XXX Interlocal agreement required.
As a condition of the City’s authorization and adoption of a fire impact fee ordinance, the City and RFA shall enter into an interlocal agreement governing the operation of the fire impact fee program, and describing the relationship and liabilities of the parties thereunder.

19.50.XXX Submission of RFA capital facilities and equipment plan and data.
(1) On an annual basis, the RFA shall submit the following materials to the City Council:

(a) The RFA’s capital facilities and equipment plan as adopted by the RFA’s governing board. The capital facilities and equipment plan shall contain a six-year financing component as set forth in RCW 82.02.060.

(b) The RFA’s growth projections over the next six years;

(c) The RFA’s standard of service;
(d) The RFA’s overall capacity to meet levels of service over the next six years, the expected service improvements from fire protection facilities planned by the RFA but not yet built or implemented.

(e) An inventory of the RFA’s existing facilities.

19.50.XXX Annual Council review.
The City Council shall review on an annual basis the materials received from the RFA and required under this chapter. The City Council may make adjustments to the fire impact fee schedule as necessitated by its review or applicable law, and, if the City Council deems appropriate, shall adopt the fire impact fee schedule by resolution. The review and fee schedule adoption decision may occur in conjunction with the annual update of the capital facilities plan element of the City’s comprehensive plan.

19.50.XXX Exclusions.
(1) In addition to the exclusions in CMC 19.20.060, the following development activities do not create an additional fire impact and are exempt from the requirements of this chapter:

   (a) Projects in which existing dwelling units are converted into condominium ownership and where no new dwelling units are created.

   (b) Any development activity for which fire impacts have been mitigated pursuant to a voluntary agreement entered into with the RFA to pay fees, dedicate land or construct or improve fire protection facilities; provided, that the agreement predates the effective date of fee imposition.

   (c) Any development of 200 square feet or less that does not use or store hazardous materials that would create a life safety risk.

   (d) Two thirds of the normal residential impact fee is exempted for the construction of accessory dwelling units constructed on a property with an existing single-family dwelling unit.

   (e) Pursuant to RCW 82.02.100(2), where automatic fire sprinklers are installed in single family residential occupancies, a reduced fee equal to 70% of the impact or level of service fee shall serve to mitigate the costs of needed EMS and rescue resources.

(2) The Director shall be authorized to determine whether a particular development activity falls within an exclusion identified in this section or under other applicable law. Determinations of the Director shall be in writing and shall be subject to the appeals procedures set forth in Chapter 14.45 CMC.
19.50.XXX Fee calculations.
(1) The fee shall be calculated based on a RFA-wide basis using the appropriate factors and data to be supplied by the RFA as indicated in Appendix A of the RFA’s Mitigation and Level of Service Policy using the capacity analysis formula set out in Appendix B, as amended and incorporated herein by reference. The city council shall adopt the Fire Impact Fee schedule by resolution.

(2) Separate fees shall be calculated for single-family, multifamily, commercial/industrial, assisted care and hospital and medical facilities and others identified in Attachment A. For purposes of this chapter, manufactured homes shall be treated as single-family dwelling units and duplexes shall be treated as multifamily dwelling units.

(3) The capacity analysis formula in Appendix B provides for a credit where creditable mitigations are implemented or where voluntary agreements between the RFA and developer provide for fire protection facilities, fire protection facility sites or other related developer contributions that the RFA finds acceptable.

19.50.XXX Assessment of fees.
The impact fee shall be based on the capital facilities and equipment plan developed by the RFA and approved by the RFA governing board, and adopted by reference by the City as part of the City’s Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan as amended.

19.50.XXX Use of funds.
Impact fees for the RFA’s system improvements shall be expended by the RFA only in conformance with the RFA’s adopted Capital Facilities and Equipment Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

19.50.XXX Impact fee accounts – Payment.
(1) The RFA shall establish a fire impact fee account. The account shall be an interest-bearing account, and the fire impact fees received shall be prudently invested in a manner consistent with the investment policies of the RFA.

(2) For administrative convenience while processing the fee payments, fire impact fees may be temporarily deposited in a City account. On a monthly basis, the City shall deposit the fire impact fees collected for the district in the district’s fire impact fee account or pursuant to the accounting procedures established by the City’s Finance Department.
Amendments to CMC 18.20- Associated with the adoption of Fire Impact Fees

CMC 18.20
TECHNICAL TERMS AND LAND USE DEFINITIONS

“Fire Capital Facilities and Equipment Plan” means the Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority’s (RFA’s) capital improvement plan adopted by the RFA’s governing board consisting of:

(1) An inventory of existing capital facilities and equipment owned by the RFA, their locations, and capacities.

(2) An identification of demands expected to be placed on existing fire protection facilities and equipment by the impacts of projected new development over a 20-year period.

(3) A forecast of future capital facilities and equipment necessary to meet the RFA’s adopted level of service with the increased service demand of future growth within the RFA.

(4) The proposed locations of expanded or new capital facilities and equipment and the associated timeline for construction or expansion.

(5) At least a six-year financing component, updated as necessary to maintain at least a six-year forecast period, for financing needed fire protection facilities within projected funding levels, and identifying sources of financing for such purposes, including bond issues.

(6) Any other long range projects planned by the RFA.

New definition: 18.20.469 Fire protection facilities.
“Fire protection facilities” means fully equipped fire stations, administrative offices, training grounds and structures, maintenance facilities and other specialized facilities required for the RFA to locate, house or expedite the timely arrival of firefighting and emergency medical equipment, necessary to deliver emergency response services within the RFA’s service area.

Amendment: 18.20.621 Impact fee.
“Impact fee” means a payment of money authorized by State law and this code to be imposed upon development as a condition of development approval to pay for public facilities needed to serve new growth and development. Impact fees include, but are not limited to, transportation impact fees, park mitigation payment fees (fee-in-lieu of), fire impact fees, and school impact fees. “Impact fees” do not include fees imposed to cover the costs of processing applications, inspecting and reviewing plans or other information required to be submitted for purpose of evaluation of an application, or inspecting or monitoring development activity.
**New definition: CMC 18.20.621.1 Impact fee schedule.**

“Impact fee schedule” means the table of impact fees to be charged per unit of development, computed by the formulas adopted under Title 19, indicating the standard fee amount per dwelling unit or per commercial development that shall be paid as a condition of development within the City.

**Amendment: 18.20.641 Interlocal agreement.**

“Interlocal agreement,” for purposes of Chapter 18.75 CMC, means any agreement between the City and the County or any municipal utility district, fire district, regional fire authority, or school district or any other City or governmental agency.

**New definition: 18.20.684 Level of service (LOS), fire.**

“Level of service (LOS), fire” means the standards adopted by the RFA for the delivery of fire and emergency medical response services, as set forth in the RFA’s adopted Standard of Cover and reflected in the capital facilities and equipment plan.
In 2016 the City Council directed Community Development to adopt a Park Impact Fee program to replace the current fee-in-lieu sections in CMC 18.35 and to repeal the outdated Park Impact Fee in Chapter 18.122.

**Parks and Recreation Department**

Department of Parks and Recreation adopted the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) plan through Resolution No. 2016-03 on March 8, 2016. Elements in this documents were then integrated into the City of Covington’s current Comprehensive Plan. This Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan is a six-year guide and strategic plan for managing and enhancing park, trail and recreation services in Covington. It establishes a path forward for providing high quality, community-driven parks, trails, greenspaces and recreational opportunities. This Plan provides a vision for the city’s park and recreation system, proposes updates to city service standards for park and facility classifications and addresses departmental goals, objectives and other management considerations toward the continuation of high-quality recreation opportunities to benefit residents of Covington.

This Plan was guided with input and direction of city residents and the Parks and Recreation Commission. The Plan inventories and evaluates existing park and recreation areas, assesses the needs for acquisition, site development and operations and offers policies and recommendations to achieve the community’s goals. A copy of the PROS plan is available on the city’s Parks and Recreation Department’s website.

The City of Covington currently provides over 166 acres of public parkland and recreation facilities distributed among 25 parks, special facilities and natural areas. This system of parks supports a range of active and passive recreation experiences and is supplemented by over 12 acres of private parks and open spaces managed by several homeowner’s associations. In addition, the city provides a skate park and access to approximately 7 miles of trails within its
parks and greenways. Recreation services are available to Covington residents through a wide range of public and private recreation, health and fitness providers and facilities. The Covington Aquatic Center is the backbone of the city’s recreation programming, and it provides a venue for specialized aquatics programming, activities and events.

Covington is a maturing young city with many families with children. New investments in parks and recreation will be necessary to meet the needs of the community, support youth development, provide options for residents to lead healthy, active lives and foster greater social and community connections.

**Impact Fees Overview - State Law Requirements**

State law requires that cities plan for projected growth and have infrastructure in place (within 6 years) to support the growth (RCW 36.70A.070(3)). This requires a long range financial plan that shows how the city will pay for the needed public infrastructure.

To offset the cost of the demands of growth, counties, cities, and towns planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) are authorized under RCW 82.02.050 -.100 to impose impact fees on development. The collection of impact fees is permitted for: Public streets and roads, publicly owned parks, open space, and recreation facilities, school facilities and fire protection facilities.

Impact fees are one-time charges assessed by local governments against a new development project to help pay for new or expanded public facilities that will directly address the increased demand created by that development. Impact fees may only be imposed for “system improvements.” Public capital facilities in a local government’s capital facilities plan are designed to provide service to the community at large (not private facilities), are reasonably related to the new development, and will benefit the new development. These fees are calculated to pay for new capacity which is solely attributable to new development, and cannot be used to ‘fix’ existing problems.

Further State law does not allow cities to charge 100% of the total cost of the capital as an impact fee. It is important to remember that each one of us has added to the growth of our community and contributes to the need for streets, parks, open space schools and fire protection. There is a public share of the costs for infrastructure and facilities and that everyone will benefit from them, not just the new residents.

The city currently collects the following impact fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Fee Type</th>
<th>Single Family Rate</th>
<th>Multifamily Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$4,461 per unit</td>
<td>Range $2,676 - $3,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>$5,100 per unit</td>
<td>$2,210 per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Park Impact Fees- Fee Study & Code Amendments

The PROS plan identified a capital facilities plan and asset inventory which was the foundational data used to develop the Park Impact Fee Study completed October 29, 2015. (Attachment 1). The costs associated with implementing the capital facilities are used to determine the impact fee.

Park Impact Fees would be based on the cost of new land and related costs required to meet the adopted Level of Service (LOS) as Covington continues to grow. The adopted LOS is contained in the PROS plan, incorporated in the Rate Study for Park Land Impact Fee, and adopted by reference in the city’s Comprehensive Plan.

Based on the PROS 2015-2020 Capital Facilities Plan in the Rate Study for Park Land Impact Fee, the Park Impact Fee per Dwelling Unit fee is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Net Cost per Person</th>
<th>Average Persons per Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Impact Fee per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling Units</td>
<td>$1,453</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$3,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of the adoption of the Park Impact Fee process the city will be develop an Ordinance to:

- **Repeal CMC 18.122** – CMC 18.122, Recreation Facilities and Open Space Impact Fee provision (“Park Impact Fee”), was intended to collect impact fees from all development and expended on identified park capital facilities that are generally not located within the site of the specific development project, but which are necessitated by the development project.

Although CMC 18.122 has included the provision for collecting an impact fee since 2006, the impact fee was not collected at the time based on our then-city attorney’s opinion that we need to conduct a rate study to justify such impact fees. The Parks and Recreation department completed the required fee study in October 2015.

- **Repeal & Replace CMC 18.35 (Attachment 2)** – CMC 18.35.140-190 & CMC 18.35.230-250. adopted the city’s the current standard for developments to provide park and recreation space and trails within a development and the method by which the applicant could provide a credit for the park space against the assessed recreation fee-in-lieu. The program outlined in this section was adopted from the King County code up on incorporation.
It has been staff experience, through the development process, that providing the required onsite recreation space is generally the last thought by developers, is squeezed into the minimum size required, and the developer is not typically interested in maintaining the infrastructure. If the park or recreation space is maintained by the HOA, then they want to make the park private and available only to their neighborhood residents. The

As part of the Park Impact Fee Rate Study, the parks department focused on the need to obtain land to provide more public neighborhood parks. The current regulations have been repealed and replace with regulations are intended to:

- Require all new development to pay a park impact fee.
- If a development provides a private park they are not subject to impact fees credits unless the park meets minimum standards for land dedication as outlined in the proposed code.
- Any private park or trail shall meet minimum design standards
- Multifamily project shall provide on-site rec facilities with their project, to meet the needs of their tenants and pay the multifamily park impact fee.
- If a site is identified to have a park or trail per the Comprehensive Plan, then the developer is required to provide at a minimum land dedication as determined by the parks director. Any dedication of real land or facility improvements would be subject to an impact fee credit per Title 19- Impact Fees.

- Amend Sections of CMC 18.20 (Attachment 2)- Update definitions to support the implementation of a Park Impact Fee Program

- Adopt New Chapter CMC 19.60 & Park Impact Fee Rate Study (Attachment 3)

And a Resolution (City Council Authority) to:

- Adopt Park Impact Fees as shown in Table 7 of the Park Impact Fee Rate Study.

All documents will be reviewed and approved by the City Council. Documents will be provided during Council review of this topic.

**Next Steps**
The Planning Commission is scheduled to hold a Public Hearing for a recommendation regarding the adoption of a Park Impact Fee program to the City Council on August 3, 2017.

**Action**

Planning Commission – Discussion Only

**Attachments:**
1. Rate Study for Park Land Impact Fee
2. Draft Impact Fee Code- Title 18 Amendments
3. Draft Impact Fee Code- Title 19 Amendments
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study is to establish the rates for impact fees for park land in the City of Covington, Washington as authorized by RCW\(^1\) 82.02.050 – 100. This study describes the methodology that is used to develop the fees, presents the formulas, variables and data that are the basis for the fees, and documents the calculation of the park land impact fee.

Impact Fee Rates

The rate for park land impact fees are $3,922 per single family dwelling unit, and $2,760 per multi-family dwelling unit.

Definition and Rationale of Impact Fees

Impact fees are charges paid by new development to reimburse local governments for the capital cost of public facilities that are needed to serve new development and the people who occupy the new development\(^2\). New development is synonymous with “growth.”

Local governments charge impact fees on either of two bases. First, as a matter of policy and legislative discretion, they may want new development to pay the cost of its share of new public facilities because that portion of the facilities would not be needed except to serve the new development. In this case, the new development is required to pay for the cost of its share of new public facilities\(^3\).

---

\(^1\) Revised Code of Washington (RCW) is the state law of the State of Washington.
\(^2\) Throughout this study the term “developer” is used as a shorthand expression to describe anyone who is obligated to pay impact fees, including builders, owners or developers.
\(^3\) RCW 82.02.050(2) prohibits impact fees that charge 100% of the cost, but does not specify how much less than 100%, leaving that determination to local governments.
On the other hand, local governments may use other sources of revenue to pay for the new public facilities that are needed to serve new development. If, however, such revenues are not sufficient to cover the entire costs of new facilities necessitated by new development, the new development may be required to pay an impact fee in an amount equal to the difference between the total cost and the other sources of revenue.

There are many kinds of "public facilities" that are needed by new development, including parks, recreation and open space; streets and roads; fire protection facilities; schools; and water and sewer facilities. This study is for park land in the City of Covington, Washington.

**Impact Fees are Different Than Other Types of Developer Contributions**

The impact fees that are described in this study do not include any other forms of developer contributions or exactions, such as mitigation or voluntary payments authorized by SEPA (the State Environmental Policy Act, RCW 43.21C); system development charges for water and sewer authorized for utilities (RCW 35.92 for municipalities, 56.16 for sewer districts, and 57.08 for water districts); local improvement districts or other special assessment districts; linkage fees; or land donations or fees in lieu of land.

There are several important differences between impact fees and SEPA mitigations. Three aspects of impact fees that are particularly noteworthy are: 1) the ability to charge for the cost of public facilities that are "system improvements" (i.e., that provide service to the community at large) as opposed to "project improvements" (which are "on-site" and provide service for a particular development); 2) the ability to charge small-scale development their proportionate share, whereas SEPA exempts small developments;
and 3) the predictability and simplicity of impact fee rate schedules compared to the cost, time and uncertain outcome of SEPA reviews conducted on a case-by-case basis.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY
This study contains two chapters and three appendices:

Chapter 1 summarizes the statutory requirements for developing impact fees, and describes how the study of Covington’s park land impact fee complies with the law.

Chapter 2 documents calculation of the park land impact fee, including descriptions of seven formulas, each variable used in the formulas, and the data used in each formula.

Appendix A presents the inventory of Covington’s existing park land and trails.

Appendix B contains the analysis of the need for park land.

Appendix C is a copy of the Capital Facilities Plan for future park acquisition and development.
1. STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS AND THIS STUDY

This chapter summarizes the significant statutory requirements pertaining to the calculation of impact fees in the State of Washington, and describes how this study of Covington’s park land impact fees complies with the statutory requirements. Each synopsis of a statutory requirement includes citations to the Revised Code of Washington as an aid to readers who wish to review the exact language of the statutes.

TYPES OF PUBLIC FACILITIES

RCW 82.02.050(2) and (4), and RCW 82.02.090(7)

Four types of public facilities can be the subject of impact fees: 1) public streets and roads; 2) publicly owned parks, open space and recreation facilities; 3) school facilities; and 4) fire protection facilities.

This Study

This study contains impact fees for land for parks and trails. In general, local governments that are authorized to charge impact fees are responsible for specific public facilities for which they may charge such fees. The City of Covington is legally and financially responsible for the park land it owns within its jurisdiction.

TYPES OF IMPROVEMENTS

RCW 82.02.050(3)(a) and RCW 82.02.090(5) and (9)

Impact fees can be spent on "system improvements" (which are typically outside the development and "designed to provide service to service areas within the community at large"). Impact fees cannot be used for "project improvements" (which are typically provided by the developer on-site within the development or adjacent to the
development, and "designed to provide service for a development project, and that are necessary for the use and convenience of the occupants or users of the project").

**This Study**

The park land impact fees in this study are calculated for system improvements that are listed in the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) (see Appendix C). No project improvements are included in this study.

**BENEFIT TO DEVELOPMENT**

*RCW 82.02.050(3)(a) and (c)*

Impact fees must be limited to system improvements that are reasonably related to, and which will benefit new development.

**This Study**

There are many ways to fulfill the requirement that impact fees be "reasonably related" to the development's need for public facilities, including personal use and use by others in the family or business enterprise (direct benefit), use by persons or organizations who provide goods or services to the fee-paying property (indirect benefit), and geographical proximity (presumed benefit).

Impact fees for parks are charged to properties which need (i.e., benefit from) new parks. Parks are provided by the City of Covington to all kinds of property throughout the City regardless of the type of use of the property. Impact fees for park land, however, are only charged to residential development in the City because the dominant stream of benefits redounds to the occupants and owners of dwelling units. As a matter of policy, the City of Covington has decided not to charge park impact fees to non-residential properties. Impact fees for park land are calculated for all new residential development within the City of Covington.
The need for additional park land for new development is determined by using standards for levels of service for each type of park to calculate the quantity of land that is required. The required quantity is then compared to the existing inventory to determine the need for additional land. The analysis of needed park land must comply with the statutory requirements of identifying existing deficiencies, reserve capacity and new capacity requirements for facilities. An analysis of the need for additional park land is presented in Appendix B and summarized in Chapter 2.

In addition, a provision of Covington’s city code further ensures compliance with the requirement that expenditures be “reasonably related” to and benefit the development that paid the impact fee. All park land impact fee revenue is deposited to a separate account that can be used only for the specific projects in the Capital Facilities Plan that are the basis of this park land impact fee because their benefit has been demonstrated in determining the need for the projects and the portion of the cost of needed projects that are eligible for impact fees as described in this study (see Chapter 2, and Appendices B and C).

**PROPORTIONATE SHARE**

*RCW 82.02.050(3)(b) RCW 82.02.060(1) and RCW 82.02.090(6)*

Impact fees cannot exceed the development's proportionate share of system improvements that are reasonably related to the new development. The impact fee amount shall be based on a formula (or other method of calculating the fee) that determines the proportionate share.
This Study

There are four ways that this study complies with the proportionate share requirement.

First, the "proportionate share" requirement means that impact fees can be charged only for the portion of the cost of public facilities that is "reasonably related" to new development (as described above). As a result, impact fees cannot be charged to pay for the cost of reducing or eliminating deficiencies in existing facilities. Some impact fee studies use standards for park land that may result in existing deficiencies between the standards and the existing parks. This study for park land impact fees for Covington ensures that impact fees are not for existing deficiencies by using the ratio of existing park land to the current population as the basis for determining the need for park land and the amount of the impact fee. Ratios of existing land to current populations have no deficiencies, nor do they have any excess capacity.

Second, using the ratio of existing land to current population ensures that new development’s share is proportionate. The ratio “is what it is” for all of the current population, and new development is required to match it with the same proportionate share in order to maintain the same ratio as exists before the new development.

The third way in which Covington’s park land impact fee complies with the proportionate share requirement is by providing adjustments and credits to impact fees, as explained in the next section. These actions ensure that the amount of the impact fee does not exceed the proportionate share.
Fourth, this study uses seven formulas to calculate the proportionate share impact fee for park land in Covington.

**ADJUSTMENTS AND/OR CREDITS REDUCING IMPACT FEE AMOUNTS**

*RCW 82.02.050(1)(c) and (2), RCW 82.02.060(1)(b), and RCW 82.02.060(4)*

Impact fees rates must be adjusted to account for other revenues that the development pays (if such payments are earmarked for or proratable to particular system improvements). Impact fees may be credited for the value of dedicated land, improvements or construction provided by the developer (if such facilities are in the adopted CFP and are required as a condition of development approval).

**This Study**

The "adjustments" requirement reduces the impact fee to account for past and future payments of other revenues (if such payments are earmarked for, or proratable to, the system improvements that are needed to serve new growth). The impact fees calculated in this study include an adjustment that accounts for other revenue that is used by the City to pay for a portion of growth’s proportionate share of costs. Chapter 4 includes an analysis of the other sources of revenue the City has to pay needed costs.

The "credit" requirement reduces impact fees of specific developers by the value of dedicated land, improvements or construction provided by the developer (if such facilities are in the adopted CFP and are required as a condition of development approval). This credit is in addition to the adjustment for other revenues described in the preceding paragraph.

The law does not prohibit a local government from establishing reasonable constraints on determining credits. For example, the location of dedicated land
and the quality and design of a donated public facility can be required to be acceptable to the local government, and meets local standards.

“Adjustments” are included in the calculation of the impact fee because the City can estimate the amount of other revenue it may receive for the same park projects that will be funded in part by impact fees. “Credits” are not included in the calculation of the impact fee rate in this study because it is not possible to predict which applicants will propose to contribute land. “Credits” are determined on a case-by-case basis when an applicant proposes to make such a contribution.

CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

RCW 82.02.050(4), RCW 82.02.060(8), and RCW 82.02.070(2)

Impact fees must be expended on public facilities in a capital facilities plan element (or used to reimburse the government for the unused capacity of existing facilities). The CFP must conform with the Growth Management Act of 1990, and must also identify existing deficiencies in facility capacity for current development, capacity of existing facilities available for new development, and additional facility capacity needed for new development, as required by RCW 82.02.050(4).

This Study

This study includes excerpts from the CFP for parks in Appendix C, and uses specific CFP projects to calculate the cost per acre (or mile of trail) that is one of the variables in the impact fee calculation.

Appendix B provides the required analysis that identifies existing deficiencies, capacity available for new development, and additional public facility capacity needed for new development. The analysis is based on levels of service ratios
for each type of public facility. The results of Appendix B are summarized in Chapter 3.

NEW VS. EXISTING FACILITIES

(RCW 82.02.060(1)(a)) and (RCW 82.02.060(8))

Impact fees can be charged for new public facilities and/or to reimburse the government for the unused capacity of existing public facilities (subject to the proportionate share limitation described above).

This Study

This study bases the park land impact fee on new park land acquisitions in the CFP. As noted earlier, using the ratio of existing land to current population as the basis for the impact fee ensures that there is no existing deficiency, nor any surplus capacity. Therefore the park land that will serve new development will be provided by future acquisitions.

SERVICE AREAS

RCW 82.02.060(7)

Local governments must establish reasonable service areas (one area, or more than one, as determined to be reasonable by the local government).

This Study

Impact fees in some jurisdictions are collected and expended within service areas that are smaller than the jurisdiction that is collecting the fees. Impact fees are not required to use multiple service areas unless such “zones” are necessary to establish the relationship between the fee and the development. Park land impact fees are collected and expended in a single service area throughout the
boundaries of the City of Covington because of the compact configuration of the City and the accessibility of its park system to all residences.

**OTHER STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTERING IMPACT FEES**

There are other statutory requirements that pertain to the administration of impact fees. Those requirements do not affect the calculation of the impact fee rate. The requirements are fulfilled in the City’s code, or administratively, as described below.

**EXEMPTIONS FROM IMPACT FEES**

*RCW 82.02.060(2) and (3)*

Local governments have the discretion to provide exemptions from impact fees for low-income housing and other "broad public purpose" development, but all such exemptions must be paid from public funds (other than impact fee accounts).

**This Study**

The City’s impact fee ordinance addresses the subject of exemptions. Exemptions do not affect the impact fee rates calculated in this study because of the statutory requirement that any exempted impact fee must be paid from other public funds. As a result, there is no increase in impact fee rates to make up for the exemption because there is no net loss to the impact fee account as a result of the exemption.

**DEVELOPER OPTIONS**

*RCW 82.02.060(6), RCW 82.02.070(4) and (5), and RCW 82.02.080*

Developers who are liable for impact fees can submit data and or/analysis to demonstrate that the impacts of the proposed development are less than the impacts...
calculated in this rate study. Developers can pay impact fees under protest and appeal impact fee calculations. The developer can obtain a refund of the impact fees if the local government fails to expend the impact fee payments within 10 years, or terminates the impact fee requirement, or the developer does not proceed with the development (and creates no impacts).

This Study
All of these provisions are addressed in the City’s impact fee code, and none of them affect the calculation of impact fee rates in this study.

ACCOUNTING REQUIREMENTS
RCW 82.02.070(1)-(3)
The local government must separate the impact fees from other monies, expend the money on CFP projects within 10 years, and prepare annual reports of collections and expenditures.

This Study
These requirements are addressed by Covington’s impact fee code, and are not factors in the impact fee calculations in this study.

DATA SOURCES AND CALCULATION
Data Sources
The data in this study of impact fees for park land in the City of Covington, Washington was provided by the City of Covington unless a different source is specifically cited.
Data Rounding

The data in this study was prepared using computer spreadsheet software. In some tables in this study, there will be very small variations from the results that would be obtained using a calculator to compute the same data. The reason for these insignificant differences is that the spreadsheet software was allowed to calculate results to more places after the decimal than is reported in the tables of these reports. The calculation to extra places after the decimal increases the accuracy of the end results, but causes occasional differences due to rounding of data that appears in this study.


2. **CALCULATION OF PARK LAND IMPACT FEE**

This chapter documents the calculation of the park land impact fee for the City of Covington. The calculations are produced using seven formulas. Each formula is described, each variable used in each formula is explained, and the data and calculations are presented in a separate table for each formula.

1. **Population**

Impact fees are meant to have “growth pay for growth” so the first step in developing an impact fee is to quantify future growth in the City of Covington. The future population is calculated by adding the current population to the population growth for the next 6 years.

\[
\]

There are two variables that require explanation: 1-a, current population and 1-b, population growth from 2015 through 2020.

*Variable 1-a: Current Population*

The current population is the number of people who reside in Covington in 2014. The source for this is the State of Washington’s Office of Financial Management.

*Variable 1-b: Population Growth 2015-2020*

The estimate of additional population from 2015 through 2020 is a linear projection based on the average annual population growth during the last ten years (2004 – 2014).

*Table 1 - Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Current Population</td>
<td>18,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Growth (2015-2020)</td>
<td>1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total as of 2020</td>
<td>19,689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Level of Service Ratio

Level of service ratios measure the average quantity of park land per 1,000 population. This is a common metric used in park planning and park impact fees. One of its uses is to estimate the quantity of park land that will be needed for future growth (which will be presented in formula 3, below).

The level of service ratio is calculated by dividing the existing acreage of each type of park by the current population.

\[
\text{Existing Acres of Parks} \div \text{Current Population} = \text{Current Level of Service Ratio}
\]

There is one new variable that requires explanation: 2-a, existing acres of parks.

**Variable 2-a: Existing Acres of Parks**

The acreage of each of Covington’s parks is listed in Appendix A – Inventory of Existing Parks. There are three categories of parks: community parks, neighborhood parks, and trails. Appendix A includes a total of the acreage for each category.

**Calculation of Level of Service Ratios**

The levels of service for park land for Covington’s impact fee are the ratios of existing park land per 1,000 current population for the year 2014. Table 2 lists each of the three types of parks, the existing acres from Appendix A, and the current population from Table 1.

The ratios are calculated in the final column of Table 2 by dividing the 2014 existing inventory by the 2014 current population, then multiplying the result times 1,000. The result is the current level of service ratio of each type of park for every 1,000 people in the Covington’s current population.

---

4 Covington’s park land acquisitions for community and neighborhood parks will be measured in acres. However, acquisitions for trails will be measured in lineal miles. For simplicity in this study, the term “acres” includes “miles” when referring to trails.
### Table 2 – Inventory and Level of Service Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Measurement Units</th>
<th>Existing Acres</th>
<th>Current Population</th>
<th>Level of Service Ratio per 1,000 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>92.52</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>lineal miles</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Park Land Needs for Growth

The park land needed for growth is calculated in order to ensure that Covington plans to acquire enough land to provide new growth with the same level of service ratio that benefits the current population. The acres of park land needed for growth are calculated by multiplying the level of service ratio times the population growth from 2015 through 2020 (divided by 1,000).

\[
\text{Current Level of Service Ratio} \times \frac{\text{Population Growth 2015 – 2020}}{1,000} = \text{Park Acres Needed for Growth}
\]

There are no new variables in formula 3.

**Calculation of Land Needs for Growth**

Table 3 shows the calculation of land needed for growth\(^5\). The current level of service ratios are from Table 2, and the population growth is from Table 1. The last two columns show the number of additional acres needed for growth, and the number of acres in Covington’s plans for future parks (the 2015-2020 Capital Facilities Plan).

The number of acres in the CFP must equal or exceed the number of acres needed for growth in order to provide at least the amount for which growth is paying impact fees. If

---

\(^5\) A different version of part of Table 3 is presented in Appendix B – Analysis of the Need for Park Land.
the CFP amounts are greater than the amount needed for growth, the City pays for the additional amounts, and growth pays only for the amount that it needs.

Table 3 – Park Land Needs for Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Level of Service Ratio per 1,000 Population</th>
<th>Additional Growth 2015-2020</th>
<th>Additional Acres Needed for Growth 2015-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>lineal miles</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Park Land Cost per Acre

The cost per acre of park land is the cost basis for the impact fee (in formula 5, below).

The cost per acre of park land is calculated by dividing the cost of proposed park acquisitions by the number of acres to be acquired.

\[
\text{Cost of Park Land Acquisitions} \div \text{Acres to be Acquired} = \text{Park Land Cost per Acre}
\]

There are two variables that require explanation: 4-a, cost of land acquisitions and 4-b, acres to be acquired.

**Variable 4-a: Cost of Park Land Acquisitions**

The park land impact fees are based on three different park types and each type has a different cost per acre. The costs are from the City’s plans for future parks listed in Appendix C. If more than one acquisition is planned for a type of park the total cost of all acquisitions is used in order to calculate the weighted average cost per acre.

**Variable 4-b: Acres to be Acquired**

The acres to be acquired are from the same projects listed in Appendix C. If more than one acquisition is planned for a type of park the total acres of all acquisitions is used in order to calculate the weighted average cost per acre.
Calculation of Park Land Cost per Acre

Calculations of park land costs per acre are presented in Table 4. The acquisition costs and acreage for each type of park are from Appendix C. The average cost per acre in the last column is the result of dividing the acquisition cost by the number of acres to be acquired. The variation among the costs per acre are consistent with real estate markets. Community parks are typically larger than neighborhood parks, and large parcels typically have lower costs per acre than smaller parcels. Trail costs are per mile, and cannot be compared to park costs per acre.

Table 4 – Park Land Cost per Acre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Measurement Units</th>
<th>Acquisition Cost</th>
<th>Acres to be Acquired</th>
<th>Average Cost per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>$ 2,010,000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$ 100,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>2,330,000</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>304,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>lineal miles</td>
<td>65,300</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>32,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Park Land Cost per Person

The cost of park land per person is needed for calculating the impact fee rate in formulas 6 and 7. The cost per person of future park land acquisition is calculated by multiplying the park land cost per acre times the level of service standard.

\[
\text{Park Land Cost per Acre} \times \text{Current Level of Service Ratio} = \text{Park Land Cost per Person}
\]

There are no new variables in formula 5.

Calculation of Park Land Cost per Person

Table 5 contains the calculations: each cost per acre (from Table 4) is multiplied by the corresponding level of service ratio from Table 2, with the result being the cost for 1,000 persons. That result is divided in the final column by 1,000 to establish the cost per person. The costs per person for the three types of park are then combined into a total.
dollar cost per person for all three types of parks in order to develop a total cost per person as the basis of the impact fee.

Table 5 – Park Land Cost per Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Total Cost per Acre or Mile</th>
<th>Level of Service Ratio per 1,000 Population</th>
<th>Cost per 1,000 Population</th>
<th>Cost per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,500</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>$273,360</td>
<td>$273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td></td>
<td>304,575</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1,525,922</td>
<td>1,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>lineal miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,650</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>6,857</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Net Cost Per Person

The net cost per person is calculated by adjusting the park land cost per person to subtract the adjustment for other revenue.

\[
\text{Park Land Cost per Person} - \text{Adjustment for Other Revenue} = \text{Net Cost per Person}
\]

There is one new variable that requires explanation: 6-a, adjustment for other revenue.

**Variable 6-a: Adjustment for Other Revenue**

The revenue adjustment is a reduction of the cost per person to account for other revenues used by the City for park projects. The City’s CFP for all projects lists grant revenues totaling $7.2 million. These are estimates of future grants for all park projects, so there may be some variation between these estimates and the amounts and specific projects for which the City will receive grants. The most conservative approach is to assume that the total amount of all the grants ($7.2 million) may be available in the same proportion for land acquisition as for all other park projects. Therefore, dividing $7.2 million of potential grants by the total $36.8 million cost of all projects indicates that 19.57% of all projects may be funded by grants.
Calculation of Net Cost per Person

Table 6 begins with the cost per person from Table 5, then calculates 19.57% of the total cost as the amount of the adjustment for other revenue for park projects. Subtracting the $353 adjustment from the total $1,806 leaves a net cost of $1,453 per person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost per Person</td>
<td>$1,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent From Other Funding Sources</td>
<td>19.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Person From Other Funding</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cost per Person</td>
<td>$1,453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Impact Fee Per Dwelling Unit

The impact fee per dwelling unit is calculated by multiplying the net cost per person times the number of persons per dwelling unit.

\[
\text{Net Cost per Person} \times \frac{\text{Persons per Dwelling Unit}}{\text{Net Cost per Person}} = \text{Impact Fee per Dwelling Unit}
\]

There is one new variable that requires explanation: 7-a, persons per dwelling unit.

Variable 7-a: Persons per Dwelling Unit.

The number of persons per dwelling unit is the factor used to convert the cost of park land per person into the impact fee per dwelling unit. Covington determined the persons per dwelling unit using census and buildable lands data as well as school district data and provided that data for Table 7.
Calculation of Impact Fee per Dwelling Unit

In Table 7 (on the next page) the net cost per person (from formula 6) is multiplied by the average number of persons per dwelling unit to calculate the park land impact fee per dwelling unit.

Table 7 – Impact Fee per Dwelling Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Net Cost per Person</th>
<th>Average Persons per Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Impact Fee per Dwelling Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling Units</td>
<td>$1,453</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$3,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A: INVENTORY OF EXISTING PARKS

The parks system in Covington presently consists of 50.20 acres of community parks, 107.64 acres of neighborhood parks, 110.48 acres of open space, and 3.84 miles of trails. The neighborhood parks inventory includes parks owned by Homeowners Associations (HOAs) because those parks serve the function of a neighborhood park for their association, therefore the City would not develop a City-owned neighborhood park in the same service area. Open space is not included in this park land impact fee because the City has a separate requirement for donation of critical areas that include natural areas. A complete inventory is listed in Table A.

Table A – Covington Parks and Trails (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and Name of Park</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins Creek Park</td>
<td>20.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington Community Park</td>
<td>29.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Owned and Maintained</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Park</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal View Park</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Park</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Owned, Maintained by HOA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abotsford Estates Park</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reserve</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamarack</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channing</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOA Owned and Maintained</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coho Creek HOA</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofton Heights HOA</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofton Hills HOA</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Jones HOA</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamarack HOA</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reserve HOA</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Hills HOA</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timberlane HOA</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterwood Estates HOA</td>
<td>43.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Vista at Pipe Lake HOA</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Type and Name of Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and Name of Park</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channing Park HOA</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornerstone HOA</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennwood HOA</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Creek HOA</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgans Creek</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Rainier Vista HOA</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Parke HOA</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parke Meadows HOA</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Jones HOA</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Ridge (High Point) HOA</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Rainier Vista HOA</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savana HOA</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Crest HOA</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>107.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trails</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covington Community Park</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Park</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Park</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins Creek Park</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins Creek Trail</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainier Vista Park</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingfield (Coho) Open Space</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MILES</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: ANALYSIS OF THE NEED FOR PARK LAND

RCW 82.02 requires impact fees to be based on the City's Capital Facilities Plan, and requires it to identify existing deficiencies in facility capacity for current development, capacity of existing facilities available for new development, and additional facility capacity needed for new development. The purpose of this appendix is to summarize existing deficiencies and reserves, and needs for additional capacity for new development (based on data provided in the City's comprehensive plan).

The need for parks is determined by multiplying the level of service ratio for each type of park times the population to calculate the quantity that is required. The population is from Table 1, and the level of service ratio of existing parks to current population is from Table 2.

The quantity required is then compared to the existing inventory to determine existing deficiencies, reserve capacity, and needed new park land. The inventory of existing parks is from Table A.

Table B shows the analysis of park land needs for the current population and for population growth from 2015 through 2020.

The data illustrate that the existing inventory of park land serves the current population, therefore there is no existing deficiency, and no reserve capacity of existing parks to serve future growth.

The increase in population during the next 6 years from 2015 through 2020 requires the addition of park land to accommodate the persons from dwelling units created by new development. Specifically, in the next 6 years the City of Covington will need an additional 3.28 acres of community parks, 7.04 acres of neighborhood parks, and 0.25
mile of trails. All of these needs are for population growth from new development from 2015 through 2020.

Table B – Analysis of Need for Park Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Level of Service Ratio</th>
<th>City Population</th>
<th>Quantity Required</th>
<th>Existing Inventory</th>
<th>Reserve or (Need)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Current</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Growth (2015-2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(3.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total as of 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,689</td>
<td>53.48</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>(3.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Current</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>92.52</td>
<td>92.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Growth (2015-2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(6.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total as of 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,689</td>
<td>98.57</td>
<td>92.52</td>
<td>(6.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trails</strong></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Current</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Growth (2015-2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total as of 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,689</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
Level of Service Ratio: Table 2
City Population: Table 1
Existing Inventory: Appendix A
APPENDIX C: CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN - 2015-2020

RCW 82.02 requires impact fees to be based on the City’s Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). Table C is an excerpt from Covington’s CFP for parks for the years 2015 – 2020. It lists projects for community parks, neighborhood parks and trails that involve acquisition of additional land. The list includes each project’s total cost and the land acquisition portion of each project (because that is the basis for the park land impact fee).

Table C – Capital Facilities Plan for Parks: 2015-2020 (Excerpt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>CFP #</th>
<th>CFP Budget</th>
<th>Land Acres</th>
<th>Land Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park #3</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>4,510,000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2,010,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,510,000</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2,010,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Covington (SoCo) Park</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>5,523,599</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>1,830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park #5</td>
<td>xxxx</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,023,599</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>2,330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Trail North</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>477,507</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins Creek Trail</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td>557,507</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>65,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,091,106</td>
<td>4,405,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New definition: 18.20.1XX Capital facilities plan, parks and recreation.
“Capital facilities, parks” means the facilities or improvements included in the most recent capital facilities plan element of a comprehensive plan adopted pursuant to Chapter 36.70A RCW, and such plan as subsequently amended and adopted by the City Council. Park and recreation facilities include those identified in the following documents, as amended:
(1) The Capital Facilities Element of the City of Covington Comprehensive Plan;
(2) The Parks and Recreation Element of the City of Covington Comprehensive Plan; and
(3) The Rate Study for Park Land Impact Fees.

Amend definition: 18.20.621 Impact fee.
“Impact fee” means a payment of money authorized by State law and this code to be imposed upon development as a condition of development approval to pay for public facilities needed to serve new growth and development. Impact fees include, but are not limited to, transportation impact fees, park mitigation payment fees (fee-in-lieu of), park impact fees, fire impact fees and school impact fees. “Impact fees” do not include fees imposed to cover the costs of processing applications, inspecting and reviewing plans or other information required to be submitted for purpose of evaluation of an application, or inspecting or monitoring development activity.

Amend definition: 18.20.819 Open space.
“Open space” means areas left predominately in a natural state to create urban separators and greenbelts, sustain native ecosystems, connect and increase protective buffers for environmentally sensitive areas, critical areas, provide a visual contrast to continuous development, reinforce community identity and aesthetics, or provide links between important environmental or recreational resources. Open space functions as protection of natural resources and biodiversity, recreations spaces, support for economic development opportunities, developing of neighborhood gathering spaces, promotion of public health benefits; and civic and cultural infrastructure.[A1]

Replace definition: 18.20.835 Park and recreation facilities.
“Park and recreation facilities” means a site designed or developed for recreational use by the public, including those dedicated parklands, developed parks and associated improvements so designated in the Parks and Recreation element of the City’s comprehensive plan. “Park” means a site designed or developed for recreational use by the public including, but not limited to:
(1) Indoor facilities, such as:
(a) Gymnasiums;
(b) Swimming pools; or
(c) Activity centers;
(2) Outdoor facilities, such as:
(a) Playfields;
(b) Fishing areas;
(c) Picnic and related outdoor activity areas; or
(d) Approved campgrounds;
(3) Areas and trails for:
(a) Hikers;
(b) Equestrians;
(c) Bicyclists; or
(d) Off-road recreational vehicle users;
(4) Recreation space areas required under CMC 18.35.150;
(5) Play areas required under CMC 18.35.170; and
(6) Facilities for on-site maintenance. (Ord. 42-02 § 2 (21A.06.835))

Amend definition: 18.20.840 Park service area.
“Park service area” means a geographic area in which a defined set of park facilities provide service to development within the area. The entire area within the city limits is the park service area. established by the Department, within which the dedications of land and fees received from new residential developments for the benefit of residents within such service area. (Ord. 42-02 § 2 (21A.06.840))

New definition: 18.20.9XX Proportionate share.
“Proportionate share” means that portion of the cost of public facility improvements and facilities that are reasonably related to the service demands and needs of new development.

New definition: 18.20.12XX System improvements.
“System improvements” means public facilities that are included in the City’s capital facilities plan and are designed to provide service to service areas within the City, in contrast to project improvements.
Repeal and Replace Sections 18.35.150, 160, 170, 180, 190, 240 & 250

Chapter 18.35
DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS – DESIGN REQUIREMENTS

New Sections
18.35.150 Residential - On-site recreation requirements
18.35.160 Multifamily - On-site recreation facilities required
18.35.170 Dedication of parks and trails - Required by capital facilities plan
18.35.180 Private on-site recreation facilities - Minimum design standards
18.35.190 Request for impact fee credits - Private park and trail facilities

18.35.150 Residential - On-site recreation requirements.
(1) Residential development that includes single family attached and detached dwelling units within the city’s service area shall mitigate for impacts the park and recreation service levels through payment of a park impact fee in accordance with CMC Title 19.

(2) If the applicant chooses to provide a park and recreation facility as part of the residential development the park and recreation facility shall meet the following minimum requirements:

   (a) Park and recreation facilities should be provided at a rate of 200 square feet per lot.

   (b) Park and recreation facilities shall meet minimum design standards pursuant to CMC 18.35.180.

   (c) The applicant will not receive credit for any park and recreation facilities or dedication of land for a future park and recreation facility unless the space meets the criteria in CMC 18.35.190.

(3) Developments within the Lakepointe Urban Village Subarea as designated in the Future Land Use Map shall provide fully accessible recreation facility for leisure, play and sport activities as follows, or as otherwise determined by the director in accordance with the adopted subarea plan (Ordinance 02-2017) and planned action (Ordinance 04-2017):

   (a) Residential subdivision at a density of four units an acre or more: 450 square feet per unit;

   (b) Townhouses developed at a density of eight units or less per acre: 450 square feet per unit;

   (c) Manufactured home park: 260 feet per unit;
(d) Multifamily dwelling units and townhouses developed at a density of greater than eight units per acre: 100 square feet per unit;

(e) Senior housing or other age-restricted facilities: 200 square feet per unit or as required by the funding agency, whichever is greater.

18.35.160 Multifamily - On-site recreation facility required.

(1) Multifamily development and mixed-use development with residential units, including senior housing or other age-restricted facilities, shall be require to provide private recreations facilities on-site pursuant to subsection (2) and mitigate for impacts to the city’s park and recreation service levels through payment of a park impact fee in accordance with CMC Title 19.

(2) Multifamily development shall provide 100 square feet per unit of private recreation facility. The private recreations facility shall meet the minimum design standards pursuant to CMC 18.35.180.

(3) Indoor recreation areas or rooftop areas may be credited toward the total recreation space requirement, if the director determines that the areas are located, designed and improved in a manner that provides recreational opportunities functionally equivalent to recreational activities provided outdoors or provides areas for social activities, multi-purpose entertainment and education areas.

18.35.170 Dedication of parks and trails - Required by capital facilities plan.

(1) Dedication of park and recreation facility and trails shall be provided by any development when such developments are located within an area identified by the capital facilities plan as a park site or trail corridor.

(2) The area of the park and recreation facility and trail dedication shall be counted as part of the site for purposes of density and floor area calculations, unless otherwise exempt from density calculations in accordance with CMC 18.30.080.

(3) The residents of the development shall be provided, at a minimum pedestrian access to the park and recreation facility and trail.

(4) Residential and multifamily developments that propose to provide public park and trail facilities pursuant to this section shall be subject to an impact fee credit in accordance with CMC Title 19. An easement granted for future park and recreation and trail facilities shall not be subject to impact fee credits, unless the easement includes required facility improvements.

18.35.180 Private on-site recreation facilities - Minimum design standards.
(1) Private park and recreation facilities shall meet the minimum design standards:

(a) Be on the site of the proposed development;

(b) Be adjacent to and visible from main pedestrian path, sidewalk or near building entrances;

(c) Be of a grade and surface suitable for recreation; 75% of the site cannot exceed 2% grade, unless the topography results in enhanced critical areas or environmental protection.

(d) Be fully accessible and convenient to all residents within the development and in compliance with 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design and the 2004 Architectural Barriers Act, as amended.

(e) Be designed with amenities that encourage residents to the facility such as benches, trash receptacles, and paths leading from the main pedestrian path and to an internal walking path.

(f) Trails and paths shall be constructed per the City of Covington’s Design and Construction Standards adopted in Title 12. Trails located within critical area buffers shall be designed in accordance with Chapter 18.65 CMC. Any modified private trail or path design shall be approved by the parks and recreation director prior to any preliminary land use approval.

(g) Private recreation facility, paths and trails shall be placed in a designated recreation facility tract. The tract shall be dedicated to the homeowner’s association or other organization. Maintenance of any recreation facility tract retained in private ownership should be audited regularly for safety and compliance with current standards. The homeowner’s association or other organization shall be responsible for all costs associated with the continued long-term maintenance of the recreation tract and facilities.

(h) Provide play equipment that meets, at a minimum, the Consumer Product Safety Standards for equipment, soft surfacing and comply with all applicable ADA accessibility standards, and incorporate play pieces that address ages 2-5 and 5-12. Prior to final approval of the development, the applicant will be required to provide the city a letter from a certified parks installer that the equipment was installed to industry standards.

(3) The city may require a financial guarantee for construction and maintenance of private recreation facilities and trails consistent with CMC Title 14.

**18.35.190 Request for impact fee credits - Private park and recreation and trail facilities.**

(1) Residential and multifamily developments that propose to provide private park and recreation and trail facilities shall not receive a credit against the park impact fee, unless otherwise determined by the Parks and Recreation Director, in accordance with this section,
and CMC Title 19[A3]. Any request for a credit shall be submitted in accordance with CMC Title 19.

(2) The applicant may request a credit be applied to the park impact fee based on the installation of a private park and recreation facility, construction of a private trail, or the dedication of land for future park and recreation and trail facilities. The applicant shall be responsible for all cost associated with preparing data and analysis to determine if the private park and recreation or trail facilities provided on private land satisfies the applicant’s requirement to mitigate for park and recreation level of service deficiencies.

(3) The Parks and Recreation Director is responsible for making a final decision pertaining to a request for park impact fee credits. The applicant shall submit the following information, in addition the minimum requirements in Chapter 19.20 CMC, to be considered.

(a) Supply and demand data that identifies proposed private park and recreation facility would better meet community needs for parks and recreation facilities than payment of park impact fees.

(b) The location and design of the park and recreation facilities is consistent with comprehensive plan and any applicable park and recreation plans, as amended.

(c) Site plan and supporting documents that shows the proposed private park and recreation facility meets the following minimum criteria:

   (i) The land and its development is an integral element of the comprehensive plan;

   (ii) The land is suitable for future active park and recreation facilities pursuant to the comprehensive plan;

   (iii) The land is a size and horizontal and vertical configuration necessary for the design of recreation facilities that meet the city’s park standards identified in the comprehensive plan;

   (iv) The land has public access via a public street;

   (v) The land is located near areas designated by the city for park, trail or recreation purposes;

   (vi) The land provides a link between city and/or other publicly owned recreation properties;
(d) The land shall be surveyed or adequately marked with survey monuments, or otherwise readily distinguishable from adjacent privately owned property;

(e) The land shall have no known physical problems associated with it, such as problems with drainage, erosion or flooding, or the presence of hazardous waste, which the director determines would cause inordinate demands on public resources for maintenance and operation;

(f) The land shall have no known on-site safety hazards. Substandard vehicular and pedestrian facilities shall be considered but shall not alone be used to disqualify a proposed site dedication;

(g) The director may require a developer to post financial guarantee consistent with Title 14 for the maintenance of any private park and recreation facility as a method of showing long term maintenance for a time as specified by the director.
Title 19 Amendments
Adopt new Chapter 19.60 – Park Impact Fees

Chapter 19.20
IMPOSITION OF IMPACT FEES

19.20.090 Credits.

New Section (5)(e) Renumber following sections:

(5)(e) Any impact fee credits, pursuant to this section shall be deducted from the calculated impact fee and a new impact fee shall be assessed for the development. If an impact fee is owed by the applicant the outstanding fee may be distributed evenly per building permit, unless otherwise determined by the city.
Chapter 19.60
PARK IMPACT FEE

Sections:
19.60.XXX Purpose.
19.60.XXX Application
19.60.XXX Administrative guidelines
19.60.XXX Exemptions.
19.60.XXX Assessment of fees.
19.60.XXX Use of funds.
19.60.XXX Credits.

19.60.XXX Purpose.

(1). The purposes of this chapter are to:
(a) Establish the City of Covington as a service area for parks and recreation facilities;
(b) Ensure that new growth and development pay a proportionate share of the cost of parks and recreation facilities needed to service and support new growth;
(c) Implement the policies of the Parks and Recreations Element of the City of Covington Comprehensive Plan; and,
(d) Provide funds, related to Parks and Recreation, as identified in the City of Covington Comprehensive Plan as necessary to meet additional growth.

19.60.XXX Application
Except as otherwise provided for under this title, development activity in the city’s service area shall be charged a park impact fee pursuant to this chapter.

19.60.XXX Administrative guidelines
The director shall be authorized to adopt internal guidelines for the administration of impact fees under this chapter.

19.60.XXX Exemptions.
(1) Public school districts, as fee payer, shall be exempt from the assessment and collection of park impact fees under this chapter, as authorized by exemptions for a broad public purpose under RCW 82.02.060(2).

19.60.XXX Assessment of fees.
(1) Impact fees shall be assessed based on the city’s fee schedule, as updated by the city council, through resolution. The park impact fee shall be generated from the formula for calculating park impact fees as set forth in the Rate Study for Park Land Impact Fee Henderson, Young and Company, dated November 19, 2014, as amended (“Park Rate Study”) as may be
amended from time to time and incorporates the rate study into this chapter by this reference. The rate study utilizes a methodology for calculating impact fees that fulfills all the requirements of RCW 82.02.060(1). A copy of the rate study shall be kept on file with the city clerk and is available for public review.

(2) Park Impact Fee Schedule:
   (a) Park impact fee schedule is generated from the formula for calculating impact fees set forth in the rate study adopted in subsection (1) of this section.
   (b) The park impact fee schedule is adopted by the city council through the fee resolution.

(3) Development activities that have received vesting rights, prior to the adoption of the impact fee rate by resolution of the city council, shall be required to mitigate for park impacts through a park fee-in-lieu, as assessed through an approved preliminary plat or by providing park space at the rate of 450 square feet per lot for single family residential for densities of four units per acre or more; or 100 square feet per dwelling unit for multifamily at a density of eight or more dwelling units per acre. A deficiency in adequate park facilities associated with development activities with vested rights shall be subject to payment of the park impact fee in place at the time of building permit issuance.

19.60.XXX Use of funds.
(1) The City shall base continued authorization to collect and expend impact fees on revising its Comprehensive Plan in compliance with RCW 36.70A.070, and on the capital facilities plan identifying:
   (a) Deficiencies in public facilities serving existing development and how existing deficiencies will be eliminated within a reasonable period of time;
   (b) Additional demands placed on existing public facilities by new development; and
   (c) Additional public facility improvements required to serve new development.

(2) Park impact fees collected for system improvements shall be used only in conformance with the most recent capital facilities plan element of the comprehensive plan adopted by the City Council.

(3) Park impact fees shall not be used to eliminate or reduce deficiencies in existing facilities serving existing development.

(4) Park impact fees shall not be used for maintenance or operation expenses.

(5) Park impact fees may be spent for public improvements for planned facilities, including, but not limited to planning, land acquisition, right-of-way acquisition, easement or access
acquisition, construction, permitting, financing, engineering, architectural design, project management and any other expenses which are consistent with the most recent capital facilities plan element adopted by the City Council.

(6) Park impact fees may be used to recoup public improvement costs previously incurred by the City to the extent that new growth and development activity will be served by the previous acquisition; provided, such fee shall not be imposed to make up for any system improvement deficiencies.

19.60.XXX Credits.
Requests for park impact fee credits shall be in accordance with CMC 18.35 and 19.20.090.
Proposed Park Impact Fee

Planning Commission
July 6, 2017
Should we Delete slides 10 – 14?
Seems it would be confusing

Potential Subjects for Code Revisions Related to Park Impact Fee

- Adoption of new park impact fee rates
- Modification of land dedication requirements and fee-in-lieu alternative
- Development design requirements pertaining to parks and open space (both public and private)
- Impact fee credits for land dedication
- HOA park standards
- Treatment of older vested projects

Definition of an Impact Fee

One time payment...
... by new development ...
... for capital costs of facilities ...
... needed by new development.
**Reasons Governments Charge Impact Fees**

- Revenue: for public facilities
- Policy: growth pays a portion of costs
- Quality of life: public facilities keep up with growth

**What Can Impact Fees Pay For?**

- CAN pay for “system improvements” in adopted CIP
- NOT pay for repair, replacement, renovation

**Rules for Impact Fees**

1. “Fair Share”
   = growth yes, deficiency no
2. “Reasonably needed” & “proportional share”
   = fee proportional to impacts
3. “Credits”
   = no double charging
4. “Not rely solely on impact fees”
   = must include some other funding
Guiding Principles

- Parks and trails land, not improvements
- Open space via dedication, not impact fee
- Residential development, not commercial
- Current LOS ratios, not "standards"
- Neighborhood parks include HOA parks

Calculation of Park Impact Fees

1. Growth Forecast
2. Cost per Person (5 steps)
3. Impact Fee Rates

1. Growth Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Current</td>
<td>18,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth 2015-2020</td>
<td>1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total as of 2020</td>
<td>19,689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Cost per Person

**Level of Service Ratios**

Table 2, page 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Existing Acres</th>
<th>Current Population</th>
<th>LOS Ratio/1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>92.52</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deficiency vs. Growth**

Park Levels of Service (Kirkland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>LOS Ratio/1,000</th>
<th>Growth 2015-2020</th>
<th>Units for Growth</th>
<th>Units in CFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Cost per Person

#### Park Land Cost per Acre

Table 4, page 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Cost per Unit</th>
<th>Cost per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>acres $2,010,000</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>$100,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>acres $2,330,000</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>$304,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>miles 65,300</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$32,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Net Cost per Person

Table 5, page 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Cost per Unit</th>
<th>LOS Ratio/1,000</th>
<th>Cost per 1,000</th>
<th>Cost per person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>acres $100,500</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>$273,360</td>
<td>$273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>acres $304,575</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1,525,922</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>miles 32,650</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>6,857</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Net Cost per Person

Table 6, page 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost per Person</td>
<td>$1,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent from Other</td>
<td>19.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Person from</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cost per Person</td>
<td>1,453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Impact Fee Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost per Person</th>
<th>Persons per Dwelling</th>
<th>Impact Fee per Dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$1,453</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$3,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential revenue from park impact fees in Covington

- Population growth 2015-2020 = 1,209
- 1,209 people @ $1,453/person = $1,756,677
  - Park CFP = $38.9 million
  - Park Impact Fee = 1.8 million
  - Growth = 5%, City = 95%

Impact Fee Options:

- Impact fee rate study provides sound basis for park impact fees, but Covington has options:
  1. Increase City share, decrease growth’s share
  2. Phase in rates over 2 or more years
  3. Exempt low-income housing
  4. Do not adopt park impact fees
Next Steps

- Public outreach to stakeholders and community (Completed)
- Briefing of Park Commission – July 6
- Development of code revisions
- SEPA review
- Department of Commerce review
- Planning Commission review, public hearing, recommendation to Council
- City Council review and decision – August 22
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