Form revised: February 26, 2014

FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

Department:	Contact Person/Phone:	CBO Analyst/Phone:
Seattle Department of	Angela Steel/684-5967	Doug Palmer/ 684-5266
Transportation		

Legislation Title:

AN ORDINANCE relating to land value determinations for shoreline street end and term permit fee methodologies; amending the current Seattle Department of Transportation Street Use Fee Schedule, Attachment A to Ordinance 123477, as amended by Ordinances 123600, 123611, 123659, 124159, and 123485 as amended by Ordinances 123585 and 123907 by amending the definition of land value.

Summary of the Legislation:

This legislation amends the Seattle Department of Transportation Street Use Fee Schedule by redefining how 'land value' is calculated for permitted encroachments that abut government-owned parcels and King County no longer assesses for tax purposes. Currently, the Street Use Fee Schedule details the fee methodology for Shoreline Street End and Term Permits. These fee calculations utilize a land value factor that is calculated based on the abutting tax assessed land value as determined by the King County Tax Assessor.

This legislation expands the definition of 'land value' to include how SDOT will assess the land value if the encroachment is abutting a government-owned parcel and the parcel is no longer tax assessed by King County. If a government-owned parcel abuts the permitted encroachment, the entire parcel shall be excluded when establishing the term or shoreline street end permit fee. All other privately-owned parcels that abut the permitted encroachment shall be averaged to determine the current per-square-foot-land value. If there are no privately-owned parcels that abut the permitted encroachment, the closest privately-owned parcels to the permitted encroachment with similar zoning or shoreline designation shall be averaged to determine the current per-square-foot-land value.

There are 16 existing term permits that are abutting government-owned parcels and will be subject to this expanded land value calculation method. Of these 16 term permits, seven term permits will have the same annual fee assessment as 2013, four term permits will have a lower annual fee, and five term permits will have an increased annual fee from 2013. The land value increases for these five term permits are due primarily to the 2014 King County tax assessed land value increases for the area. It is assumed that these five term permits would have had a similar annual fee increase for 2014 as proposed with this legislation, if the government-owned parcel had been tax assessed by King County.

Angela Steel SDOT Term Permit Fee Schedule Amendment FISC April 22, 2014 Version #2

For the 16 existing term permits, the modified term permit fee methodology will result in an estimated new annual total base fee of \$127,007 compared to the previous base of \$186,755, a reduction of 32%. This reduction is largely based on one term permit for a King County pump station that will have a new lowered 2014 annual fee of \$19,077 compared to the 2013 fee of \$84,387. If this one permit is removed from the fee impact analysis, the remaining 15 term permits assessed with the modified term permit fee methodology will result in an estimated new annual total base fee of \$107,930 compared to the previous base of \$102,368, a 5 percent increase.

There are two existing shoreline street end permits that are abutting government-owned parcels and will be subject to this modified land value calculation method. Of these two permits, one will have the same annual fee assessment as 2013 and one will have a lower fee.

For the two existing shoreline street end permits, the modified shoreline street end permit fee methodology will result in an estimated new annual total base fee of \$159,772 compared to the previous base of \$160,188, a reduction of 0.26 percent.

Background:

By Ordinance 123485, as amended by Ordinances 123585 and 123907, the City adopted a term permit schedule of fees and established a term permit fee methodology for several different term permit uses. By Ordinance 123611, the City adopted a shoreline street end schedule of fees and established a shoreline street end permit fee methodology for use of designated shoreline street ends.

In 2013, the State legislature amended RCW 84.40.045 and 84.40.175 to eliminate the revaluation of government-owned parcels for tax-assessment purposes. This action by the State legislature inadvertently affected the ability for the Street Use division of SDOT to determine land values and fully implement the shoreline street end and term permit fee methodologies for encroachments that abut government-owned parcels.

<u>x</u> This legislation has financial implications.

Appropriations: N/A

Anticipated Revenue/Reimbursement Resulting from this Legislation:

Fund Name and	Department	Revenue Source	2014	2015
Number			Revenue	Revenue
Transportation	Seattle Department	Annual Fee	Term Permit:	TBD
Operating Fund	of Transportation		\$127,007.02	
10310	•		Shoreline Street	
			End Permit:	
			\$159,772.46	
TOTAL			\$286,779.48	TBD

Revenue/Reimbursement Notes: N/A

Total Regular Positions Created, Modified, or Abrogated through this Legislation, Including FTE Impact: N/A

Do positions sunset in the future? No

Spending/Cash Flow: N/A

Other Implications:

- a) Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications? Yes, this permit fee methodology will be applied annually to all shoreline street end and term permits that have encroachments that abut government-owned parcels.
- b) What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation? If the legislation in not enacted by City Council, the Seattle Department of Transportation will not have the ability to assess annual permit fees for shoreline street end and term permits that abut government-owned parcels and will not receive the 2014 annual fees totaling \$286,779.48.
- c) Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department? No
- d) What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives? There are no possible alternatives that could achieve the same or similar objective without proposing some sort of legislative amendment.
- e) Is a public hearing required for this legislation?
- f) Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?
 No
- g) Does this legislation affect a piece of property?
- h) Other Issues: N/A

List attachments to the fiscal note below: None