DATE: November 21, 2013

SUBJECT: Reduced Parking Policy for Site Plan Office Buildings and Related Recommendations

C. M. RECOMMENDATIONS:


2. Adopt the Reduced Parking Policy for Site Plan Office Buildings as set forth in Attachment 2.

3. Direct the County Manager to develop a work plan and implementation schedule to address the following recommendations from the Commercial Parking Working Group:
   a. Evaluate managed parking and shared off-site parking and develop a policy defining the circumstances in which these techniques and other parking best practices should be used;
   b. Monitor and assess the costs and benefits of using a more rigorous and refined parking supply and demand estimation tool to establish parking ratios;
   c. Perform a technical review of the proposed policy every 5 years, with a full review every 10 years; and
   d. Consider revising the office parking requirements in the Zoning Ordinance based on the results and analysis of the monitoring studies, actual performance in the field, community comment and staff’s technical review.

ISSUES: This report and the proposed Reduced Parking Policy for Site Plan Office Buildings fulfills a need articulated by the County Board, the development community, staff and others to create a transparent and consistent process for evaluating and mitigating the impacts of reductions in parking for site plan office projects. A Commercial Parking Working Group (CPWG) composed of residents, commission representatives, developers, business leaders,
employers and staff met eleven times and conducted six outreach sessions to discuss the subject, resulting in the attached report and proposed policy.

**SUMMARY:** In response to the increased number of developer requests (with frequent support by County staff) to build fewer parking spaces in commercial site plan buildings, or the office portion of mixed-use buildings, than permitted in the Zoning Ordinance, on January 21, 2012 the County Board directed the County Manager to develop a methodology to “fully assess and mitigate the impacts attributable to a reduction of parking on a particular site plan (office) project.” This direction was in accordance with Policy 6 of the Parking and Curb Space Management Element of the Master Transportation Plan, “Ensure that minimum parking needs are met and excessive parking is not built. Divert resources saved by reducing excess off-street parking to other community benefits.”

The County Manager appointed the CPWG to address the task. They met 11 times and conducted six public meetings, which resulted in the attached report and recommendations. Underscoring the County Board’s directive was the understanding that if a developer was to build less parking than the standard amount, then the developer should mitigate the impacts of this action. The mitigation could take place in three ways: 1) by supporting Transportation Demand Management programs which encourage employees to commute in ways other than driving alone, 2) by contributing to transit operating costs and 3) by contributing to transportation capital costs such as those related to transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities either through direct compensation to the County or through infrastructure supplied by the developer. The CPWG also developed a series of recommendations for implementation of its proposed policy.

The proposed policy, Reduced Parking Policy for Site Plan Office Buildings (“Policy”), (Attachment 2) has two principal elements: the starting point for compensation to mitigate the impacts of reduced parking, and the compensation amount. The Policy uses three parking ratios as starting points for mitigation based on location. In the areas of Rosslyn and Crystal City that are eligible for rezoning to “C-O-Rosslyn” and “C-O-Crystal City,” mitigation would begin at a parking ratio of one space per 1,000 sq. ft. Gross Floor Area (1:1,000). In Pentagon City, mitigation would begin at 1:975. Mitigation for all other site plan areas in the County would begin at a parking ratio of 1:630.

The contribution toward mitigation is calculated using the amount of parking reduction below the defined starting points. The Policy proposes that, in order to ameliorate the effect of reduced parking, the amount of contribution be based on the difficulty of getting commuters to switch modes. The amount of difficulty and the associated mitigation amount per reduced parking space was divided into three tiers: $7,250 for the 1st tier, $12,500 for the 2nd tier, and $40,000 for the 3rd tier (in 2013 dollars adjusted annually for inflation by the US Department of Labor CPI Inflation Calculator). If a parking ratio at or above the starting point is proposed, the developer is responsible for providing the standard contribution toward Transportation Demand Management and transportation infrastructure and services as described in the project’s approved conditions (Attachment 3). To ensure that the project works from a transportation and parking perspective, all projects are expected to implement a consistent base level of TDM measures and infrastructure improvements, whether or not they have “reduced” parking.
The Policy provides a methodology whereby a developer of site plan office buildings can devise a parking proposal for a building that is responsive to both market and site conditions while contributing to mitigating increased transportation costs and encouraging increased use of other modes of transportation resulting from reduced SOV trips. The Policy serves to implement Policy 6 of the Parking and Curb Space Management Element of the Master Transportation Plan, “Ensure that minimum parking needs are met and excessive parking is not built. Divert resources saved by reducing excess off-street parking to other community benefits.”

BACKGROUND: The purpose of minimum parking requirements is to assure that the on-site supply of parking meets the demand of the particular building’s users. The Arlington County Zoning Ordinance establishes two types of zoning standards, by-right and special exception. Under by-right zoning, uses and development standards are determined in advance and specifically authorized by the Zoning Ordinance. Special exceptions, including site plan projects, are provided for in the Zoning Ordinance and require specific case-by-case approval.

The site plan process began in 1962. Since then over 400 site plan projects have been approved and built, primarily in the two transit corridors. Since the early ‘80s, the specified parking ratios for office developments varied from one parking space per 530 sq. ft. Gross Floor Area (1:530) (“C-O”) to 1:580 (“C-O-A” and “R-C”), during which time the commonly used parking standard has been 1:580. More recently 1:1,000 has been approved for most of Rosslyn and Crystal City.

Since the 1980s, the amount of office parking approved and built has decreased. Arlington adopted a policy in the 1990s requiring TDM and additional transportation infrastructure with new site plan projects to ensure that building employees and guests travelling to and from the building would use alternate modes of transportation.

Since 2005, 14 office buildings were built with less parking than the minimum site plan ratio set forth in the Zoning Ordinance. The reasons varied for why the developers proposed to build less parking and why the County approved their requests. In January 2012 two new office buildings came before the County Board, 3001 Washington Blvd. (SP #418) and the Arlington Funeral Home Site/3901 Fairfax Drive (SP #386). The developers of both properties requested to build less parking than the Zoning Ordinance minimum standard, which requests the County Board approved with conditions that the developers also contribute to additional transportation infrastructure and additional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs beyond the standard measures to incentivize employees to travel to work by means other than driving alone. Understanding that developers will continue to request reduced amounts of parking to address market changes and that the County needs to assure that those not able to park in the building’s garage are using transit or some other non-SOV mode of travel, the County Board acknowledged that there was a need for a process by which they, the developers, the public and staff would evaluate these types of requests. The County Board directed the County Manager to create a consistent and transparent methodology that could be used to examine the consequences of reduced parking and mitigate the impact on the transportation network of the reduced parking.
DISCUSSION:
The Starting Point for Mitigation
The CPWG began its task by discussing the parking ratio that would be the threshold below which mitigation would be necessary. The CPWG considered three options: 1) the Zoning Ordinance’s standard minimum parking requirements for special exception site plans; 2) an ideal future parking requirement; and 3) the average ratio of approved and built parking for commercial site plan projects. The group discussed each option in detail. Some of the factors that weighed into the group’s discounting of the first option included the following: The current Zoning Ordinance minimum standard is thirty years old and in reviewing office site plans approved from 2005-2013 found that most buildings constructed since then are no longer parking at the Z.O.’s minimum standard. The group also was informed of a 2011 County study of 14 office buildings in the Rosslyn Ballston corridor that had 90 percent or greater building occupancy. Although the buildings were at full occupancy, or close to it, their garages had many empty spaces. The average weekday garage occupancy was 69 percent, and the average observed peak occupancy was 78 percent. These percentages indicate that more parking than needed has been built for past projects.

The ideal future parking requirement was difficult to determine due to myriad of factors, which can change over time, and the quantity of data that would have to be collected and analyzed for such an effort. These factors include, among others, the changing character of office building tenancy; the unpredictability of commuting patterns of future employees; and the lack of data for parking ratios and occupancy to accurately reflect a trend for the future.

The CPWG recognized that analysis of these types of factors and the need for parking has been done for projects approved by the County Board through site plan approval over the years. Therefore, the CPWG relied on analysis done of prior projects; it decided that the best starting point for mitigation in the areas of Rosslyn and Crystal City eligible for rezoning to “C-O-Rosslyn” and “C-O-Crystal City” would be a parking ratio of 1 space per 1,000 sq. ft. (1:1,000) since those ratios had been vetted recently for appropriateness for those two transit-rich districts and included in Zoning regulations. For the other areas of the County the CPWG decided that the best starting point for mitigation would be the approximate average ratio of approved and built parking approved in the last ten years for which no additional TDM or mitigation was clearly identified. Mitigation for projects in Pentagon City would begin at 1:750. Mitigation for all other site plan areas in the County would begin at a parking ratio of 1:630, which was the average of the twelve properties approved since 2005 in the other parts of the County.

The CPWG was aware that the proposed PenPlace development was about to come before the County Board for approval. They recommended that if that development was approved below 1:750, then the recommended starting point for mitigation for Pentagon City should be the average of the PenPlace approved minimum parking and 1:750. The PenPlace project was approved on Sept 21, 2013 with a minimum parking ratio for its office use segment of 1:1,200 due to the high level of transit in the area and the anticipated amount of employees who would be walking or biking from the surrounding area to their worksite. It is therefore recommended that, in reliance on the analysis done for the PenPlace proposal and the transit available in the area, the starting point for mitigation for Pentagon City be 1:975, the average between 1:750 and 1:1,200.
The Standard TDM and infrastructure amount
With every new site plan office building, the County Board and developers have negotiated conditions that include TDM services and transportation infrastructure to ensure that the building “works” and that the additional density is appropriately mitigated. The amount of TDM and transportation infrastructure has varied over time, but recently has become standardized, both to provide a consistent and understandable relationship between TDM and parking, and also to establish a base from which to calculate reduced parking mitigation. (See Attachment 3 for the “base” amount that is required of new site plan buildings, including office.) When parking is reduced below the standard amount, an additional contribution for TDM and transportation capital and operating expenses that support non-SOV modes of travel would be required to mitigate the impacts of the reduced parking. In particular cases, portions of the additional contribution may be provided “in kind” by the developer.

The CPWG recognized that reduced parking requires a shift from single-occupant vehicle usage by the building occupants to teleworking or a different mode of travel. They recognized that the purpose of the mitigating contribution is to fund one or more of the following:

- Building-specific transportation demand management (TDM) services provided by the County or by property management to encourage different modes of travel by the tenants
- Transportation infrastructure such as bus stops, sidewalks or bicycle facilities used by the building tenants
- Transportation operating costs of transit serving the building

Cost of Mitigation for Reduced Parking
The next step was to determine the cost of shifting the commuters away from single occupant vehicles and the most appropriate quantities of mitigation for parking reduction. The group discussed whether the mitigation amount should be based on a single cost per space reduced, a continuously escalating amount per space or tiers of mitigation amounts. Staff had explained to the group that some people were more difficult to convince to switch modes than others and depending on their home distance from transit or other circumstances may need additional financial encouragement to switch modes. With a small reduction in parking spaces, it would not be very costly to convince the most interested people to switch their modes of transportation while, as the number of parking spaces decreased, the employees would need additional incentives to switch modes. Based on that input, it was agreed that some type of escalating amount was important.

In deciding on the methodology for mitigating reduced parking rates, the CPWG considered; input from developers, programs in other locations as described below, recent site plan approvals and usage rates of parking in the County. As a result, the CPWG decided on a tiered approach for establishing this escalation rate for mitigation, as being reasonable, and easy to apply, calculate and understand. Once the CPWG agreed on a tiered system, the group agreed that

---

1 TDM programs may be managed by the property owner, by the tenant or through the Arlington County Commuter Services (ACCS). The details of such management would be specified in the final TDM plan which the developer is required to submit and obtain approval from the County prior to building occupancy.
approximately a 20-25% difference in parking reductions for the first tier provided the amount of parking reduction that was suitable at a lower level of mitigation. The extent of the top tier should be based on the point at which replacement parking would be necessary. The resulting tier levels can be seen in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio Starting Point</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:630</td>
<td>1:630 - 1:780</td>
<td>1:781 - 1:1,000</td>
<td>less than 1:1,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:975</td>
<td>1:975 – 1:1,100</td>
<td>1:1,101 – 1:1,800</td>
<td>Less than 1:1,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1,000</td>
<td>1:1,000 - 1:1,200</td>
<td>1:1,201 - 1:1,900</td>
<td>less than 1:1,901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To better understand the costs associated with shifting one person from an SOV to a non-SOV mode of transportation, the CPWG reviewed the County’s annual budget associated with transit (operations and capital), and bicycle and pedestrian enhancements. The budget includes such costs as the County’s contribution to Metrorail and MetroBus, ART operating costs, Metrorail and MetroBus capital subsidies, Virginia Rail Express (VRE), bike and walk operating and capital. Additionally, the CPWG requested information from Arlington County Commuter Services (ACCS) about the general cost per person required to incentivize a shift in transportation mode. Based on this information, the CPWG determined that the cost to accommodate a person shifting from an SOV to alternate transportation modes is approximately $250 per year per person. With the reduction of vehicular traffic on Arlington’s road network, the CPWG evaluated the budgeted amounts for paving and maintenance of roads and estimated cost savings of approximately $10 per vehicle reduction in road related expenses due to the reduced number of vehicles. This savings subtracted from the estimated cost resulted in a net cost of $240 annual cost of reducing one parking space (one SOV commuter), or $7,250 over a period of 30 years.

The CPWG based the second tier of contribution, at $12,500 per space reduced, on the cost of additional TDM subsidies that would be required to make switching from driving alone sufficiently attractive for an additional increment of commuters who are less interested in switching modes. This next tier of people are harder to shift away from driving, and therefore a higher incentive will be required than for those in the first tier. The CPWG based the amount on varying programs implemented throughout the country. In particular, the Georgia Commute Options program has an incentive program of $3 per day ($60 per month) for 3 months which resulted in a mode switch by commuters who applied to the program from an 84% SOV to approximately half of that.

Similarly, in Arlington, the mitigation contribution could be used for monthly subsidies to non-SOV commuters and a retention rewards program. A retention rewards program involves a variety of promotions and rewards, such as monthly drawings for commuters not driving alone, which have proven successful in other cities. For example, the $12,500 ($417 per year for 30 years) contribution could be allocated to a transit subsidy or carpool/vanpool subsidy of $104 per person per month ($5.20 per day) for three months for the number of people that will need to switch modes with a 25 percent reserve for administrative costs and for a retention rewards program. Although the second tier mitigation amount was calculated using methods associated
with a more robust TDM program, the CPWG supported that the contribution could be used toward all three components that encourage commuters to change from an SOV to a non-SOV mode of transportation.

The CPWG based the third tier of contribution, $40,000, on the average construction price of an underground parking space in Arlington County. This mitigation amount would be required for projects requesting less parking than 1:1,901 in Crystal City (C-O-Crystal City) and Rosslyn (C-O-Rosslyn); less than 1:1,801 in Pentagon City, and less than 1:1,001 in the other areas of the County. Based on the large numbers of employees who might occupy the building that live far from accessible transit (given the current mix of employed workers in Arlington who live outside the county), it is not expected that TDM services and an increase in transit operating and capital costs will be able to convince enough commuters to switch modes to accommodate the building occupants in the garage. Therefore, if for some reason a developer would need to build such a small amount of parking, then their contribution in that case may be used by the County to provide replacement parking.

**Timing of Contribution**

As mentioned previously, the contribution towards mitigating the impacts of reduced parking would be allocated to transportation infrastructure, transit services or TDM programs and services. It is understood that the transit and TDM services would be paid for over 30 years, which is the life of an office building prior to major capital investments, which is when the services would be needed. On the other hand, it is likely that transportation infrastructure would need to be built at the same time as the new building so that the building users can take advantage of the infrastructure (whether that is in the form of bus stops, bike and pedestrian infrastructure or other type) from the time the building is occupied. The timing of the payments for infrastructure would be part of the negotiation between developers and staff at the time of site plan approval.

The mitigation amount has been calculated to reflect a thirty year contribution. Because many buildings last over 30 years, others have suggested that the developer’s contribution should extend for the life of the building, not 30 years. Because the operating life of an office building before considerable capital improvements (and possible need for a site plan amendment) is considered to be 30 years, because it is likely that commuter patterns will change over time, and because other TDM conditions are for 30 years, the proposed policy is remaining with the 30 year time frame.

**Implementation**

Frequently Asked Questions related to implementation are in Attachment 5.

This new policy is significant in that it allows a developer to propose an amount of parking based on market and site conditions. With this new policy there is no minimum parking requirement. The recommended strategy provides a simple formula to ensure that any impacts of reduced parking are mitigated. County staff will perform an analysis of each proposal for the adequacy of the proposed parking. Each site is different depending on its location, neighboring uses, and expected building occupants. A site plan condition will be developed to capture the ratio and the programs that will be supported by the mitigation contribution. If the contribution is needed for
TDM or transit operating costs, it will be paid over a 30 year period. If the contribution is used for transportation infrastructure, the monies may be paid up front or over time, depending on the situation. The County Board has the authority to reject the amount of parking proposed, but it is assumed that with most site plan projects the developer will be approved to build the amount that is initially proposed. In certain cases, such as conflicts with other County policies or goals or because of unusual site or project characteristics, certain proposed ratios may not be appropriate. The mitigation strategies to be implemented will be documented in the Transportation Management Plan approved by the County at the Shell and Core Certificate of Occupancy.

Table 2 demonstrates how the contribution amount is calculated.

**Table 2**
Sample calculation for a development requesting reduced parking using 2 tiers

| Proposed Building Size: 300,000 sq. ft. | Location: Courthouse Area | Amount of Parking required based on the Courthouse starting point of 1:630: 476 spaces | Requested Amount of Parking: 330 spaces (ratio of 1:909) – 146 spaces less |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Tiers</th>
<th>Number of reduced spaces in each mitigation tier</th>
<th>Mitigation amount per parking space</th>
<th>Contribution amt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>more parking than 1:630</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>reduction from 1:630 to 1:780</td>
<td>476 - 385 = 91</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>reduction from 1:780-1:1,000</td>
<td>385 - 330 = 55</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>reduction below 1:1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicability of this policy to other parking policies

It has been asked whether this reduced parking policy has any impact on other County parking policies notably, the parking requirement for by-right office development, Columbia Pike FBC requirements, and non-office site plan parking requirements. This policy has no impact on the by-right minimum parking requirements for office buildings per Section 14.3.7 of the County’s Zoning Ordinance. A developer may not build less parking than the minimum stated.

The Columbia Pike Form Based Code (FBC) requires, for office use, a minimum of 1 space per 1,000 sq. ft. of Gross Floor Area (GFA) as “shared parking,” and a maximum of 1 space per 1,000 sq. ft. for “reserved parking.” The FBC also has a provision that in lieu of the minimum parking requirement, “the County may accept a one-time payment per each space of Shared Parking. The County Manager shall establish the amount of payment annually based on the approximate cost to build structured parking.” This provision differs from this Policy in that the contribution is presumed to go toward building parking as opposed towards TDM, transit or transportation infrastructure.
The Policy has no bearing on non-office site plan buildings. The parking demands of different land uses such as residential, retail and hotel vary based on different factors. Additional studies would be required to determine if a similar mitigation strategy should be used if less parking than the current minimum standards is requested by developers for these other uses.

Additional CPWG Recommendations
The CPWG made seven recommendations that supported the Policy. Three of them are already taking place or included in this report. They include: integrating the proposed methodology as soon as possible, updating the mitigation amounts annually according to the CPI, and requiring developers to provide monitoring studies at two, five and subsequent five-year intervals, which is currently already provided for in site plan conditions.

A work plan should be developed to address the Working Group’s additional four recommendations for the following reasons:

- Evaluate managed parking and shared off-site parking and develop a policy defining the circumstances in which these techniques and other parking best practices should be used. Managed parking in the forms of valet parking, tandem parking and automated facilities is increasingly being used in parking facilities. Criteria for evaluation of these systems need to be established. Shared off-site parking is supported in the Master Transportation Plan, and needs to be encouraged.
- Monitor and assess the costs and benefits of using a more rigorous and refined parking management tool such as the residential parking calculator used in King County, Washington to establish parking ratios. The King County Right Size Parking Calculator (www.rightsizeparking.org) is based on a powerful model developed from current local data of actual parking use. Arlington could create a similar model that would be accepted by the public, County officials and developers in estimating the appropriate amount of parking for office buildings.
- Perform a technical review of the proposed policy every 5 years, with a full review every 10 years. This task should be included in a subsequent County budget and work plan.
- Consider revising the office parking requirements in the Zoning Ordinance based on the results and analysis of the monitoring studies, actual performance in the field, community comment and staff’s technical review. A Zoning Ordinance amendment should be considered after the appropriate data is collected.

FISCAL IMPACT: The contributions collected will be used to mitigate the impact of the reduced parking. The revenues will be used for additional TDM and transit services and transportation infrastructure. Additional County staff and consultant resources will be needed to conduct the studies mentioned in the recommendations.

CONCLUSION: It is recommended that the County Board accept the “Report and Recommendations of the Commercial Parking Working Group” dated September 23, 2013, adopt the Reduced Parking Policy for Site Plan Office Buildings, and direct the County Manager
to develop a work plan and implementation schedule addressing the recommendations from the Commercial Parking Working Group. The Policy provides the County’s site plan process with a flexible and consistent methodology for assessing requests by developers of office buildings to build less parking than called for in the County’s standard and to provide a plan for mitigating the impacts of reduced parking through the support of transportation demand management, transit operations and transit, bike and walk infrastructure.
REPORT and RECOMMENDATIONS
of the COMMERCIAL PARKING WORKING GROUP

September 23, 2013

Summary

The Commercial Parking Working Group (CPWG) was tasked with devising a transparent and predictable methodology to mitigate the impacts of reduced office parking. Early on, the Working Group recognized that their charge was not to change fundamental County policy but to have it be implemented more effectively. Many felt that the policy should point to the future, and move the County where it wants to be from both a transportation and environmental perspective.

To build a base of knowledge on the subject of office parking, the Working Group learned about relevant County land use and transportation policies; consulted with experts in various aspects of the parking issue; reviewed the current data on transit and TDM costs; and reviewed the best available data on parking costs, parking utilization, mode split and the factors that affect it, and approved office parking ratios. The Working Group also conducted seven outreach sessions with the public, Commissions and business organizations. All of this information was extremely important to the work of the CPWG but ultimately was insufficient as a basis for developing a methodology responsive to the charge.

The longstanding parking policy of one parking space per 580 square feet of site plan office space (1:580) dates back to the early days of transit-oriented development in Arlington. Since the 1980’s, many office projects have been approved with less parking than the 1:580 standard; in the last decade site plan approvals resulted in an average ratio of 1:630 in the Rosslyn–Ballston Corridor (outside of C-O-Rosslyn areas), and lower in the Jefferson Davis Corridor and “C-O-Rosslyn” areas. In the 1990’s, Arlington adopted policy requiring transportation demand management (TDM) with new site plan projects to ensure that surrounding transportation infrastructure could accommodate building employees and guests traveling to and from the building using alternate travel modes. Increased developer support to transportation infrastructure and transit operations has been required in recent years, largely achieved through the Commercial Real Estate Tax which generates approximately $24 million in transportation funding annually. The County TDM program has become more consistent and robust, with increased staffing to enforce requirements and review monitoring reports.

Proposed Methodology

The Working Group proposes that the County adopt a policy change regarding parking in site plan approved office buildings. The CPWG proposes that the County shift the focus of negotiation from the “appropriate” level of parking for each site plan to mitigation of the transportation impacts of the ratio proposed by the developer. This would allow the developer to devise a parking proposal for the building that is responsive to market conditions, site conditions, and prospective tenant preferences while paying the County to offset increased transportation costs that result from reduced SOV trips and increased use of other modes of transportation (and, in many cases, augmenting the developer’s own investments in accommodating tenants’ use of other modes). Even though the developer will propose an amount of parking to build, the County retains responsibility to ensure that adequate measures are taken by the
developer to mitigate community impacts and achieve the mode split that justifies the proposed parking.

The methodology proposed by the Working Group will enable the County to recoup at least their share of the cost of additional commuters who choose alternate modes of travel to and from work. This recognizes that a shift from SOV trips shifts the costs from commuters and the developer/building owner who provides parking to the government which provides and operates transportation infrastructure. Based on actual annual capital and operating costs for transit in Arlington, staff estimates that the County’s per employee costs of TDM, transit and related programs to cover transit costs and encourage employees to move out of their cars to alternate modes of travel is approximately $245 per year, or approximately $7,250 over 30 years. Developers who build less parking than the current “standard” must contribute to the mitigation of these additional public costs.

The Working Group also recommends that the threshold for additional mitigation begin at different parking ratios, depending on the location in the County. Starting at the level of current practice—1:630 for much of the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor, 1:750 for Pentagon City and 1:1,000 for areas in or eligible for “C-O-Rosslyn” and “C-O-Crystal City”—further reductions in parking provided would result in a defined dollar amount (per space) to be used for mitigation. The levels of reduction within the formula recognize the difficulty of achieving and mitigating additional SOV trips. Timing of payments and the allocation to TDM, capital and operating costs would be negotiated in the site plan process.

Recommendations

The CPWG recommends that the County Manager accept the proposed methodology and its components and present them to the County Board for endorsement. Further, the Working Group recommends that the methodology be integrated into the site plan review process as soon as staff can develop materials and procedures.

With regard to the methodology, the Working Group recommends that step $ amounts should be updated annually according to the CPI even though increases to the CPI are likely to be less than the increases in transit costs over time. As previously noted, payment timing and allocation should be negotiated at the time of site plan project approval.

In addition, the Working Group recommends:

- That staff evaluate managed parking and shared off-site parking and develop a policy defining the circumstances in which these techniques and other parking best practices should be used;
- That staff continue to monitor and assess the costs and benefits of using a more rigorous and refined parking management tool such as the residential parking calculator used in King County, Washington (http://www.rightsizeparking.org/) to establish parking ratios;
- That developers continue to provide monitoring studies at two, five and subsequent five-year intervals (as currently provided for by site plan condition);
- That the County perform a technical review of the proposed policy every 5 years, with a full review every 10 years; and that
- Based on the results and analysis of the monitoring studies, actual performance in the field, community comment, and staff’s technical review, a Zoning Ordinance amendment for revised office parking requirements should be considered.
Background and Context for the Working Group

Parking in commercial office buildings is a critical component of the overall County approach to a balanced transportation system that includes those who drive alone or share private vehicles with others, take public transportation, or walk or bicycle. On January 21, 2012, the County Board passed a directive requiring that a process be developed to mitigate the impacts of reduced parking in site plan office projects (Attachment 1, County Board Directive re Parking Reduction, January 21, 2012). This was an extension of Master Transportation Plan Policy 6 which states: “Ensure that minimum parking needs are met and that excessive parking is not built. Divert resources saved by reducing excess off-street parking to other community benefits.” (Master Transportation Plan Goals and Policies, pg. 13) Essentially, the directive recognized that reductions in on-site office parking could have impacts on the larger transportation system, and those impacts should be addressed in a predictable and transparent manner.

The directive noted that parking requirements established in the Zoning Ordinance must be met unless otherwise approved by the County Board as part of the site plan process and acknowledged that each request must be evaluated in the context of site conditions and other relevant factors, including the characteristics of the proposed project and the project’s achievement of County goals identified in County plans and policies (i.e. affordable housing, open space, historic preservation). Reflecting current practice, the 2012 directive recognized that Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures should be part of every site plan project, along with infrastructure improvements in the vicinity of the site. The Board requested a methodology that would “provide predictability about how mitigation measures and their costs are determined” and charged the County Manager to “examine the consequences of reducing parking below the required standard and the methodologies that can be used to fully assess and mitigate the impacts attributable to a reduction of parking on a particular site plan project.”

In December 2012, the County Manager appointed the Commercial Parking Working Group (CPWG). The Working Group members represent the Planning, Transportation, and Environment and Energy Conservation Commissions; the development industry; Civic Federation; National Association of Industrial and Office Parks (NAIOP); the Chamber of Commerce; a large employer; residents-at-large; and staff from the Departments of Environmental Services (DES), Economic Development (AED), and Community Planning, Housing and Development (CPHD) (Attachment 2, List of Members).

The Working Group endorsed the following statement as their Mission for the process:

To explore alternative methodologies, evaluate their possible ramifications, and propose a clear and consistent methodology to evaluate site-specific parking ratios and associated transportation strategies proposed in applications for site plan commercial buildings.

The Working Group Process

The Working Group met 11 times and conducted six outreach sessions between January and July 2013. A core group of staff, the facilitator and the chair met before and after each meeting to plan, debrief and follow-up on items from the CPWG meetings. All meeting materials plus reports, articles and selected chapters from relevant books on parking were posted on a website developed for the project (www.arlingtonva.us/departments/EnvironmentalServices/dot/Parking/page88037.aspx).
Initial meetings focused on understanding/clarifying the charge; identifying key shared principles relating to a proposed methodology; providing background material on key policies in the General Land Use Plan, Master Transportation Plan and Community Energy Plan; data on Arlington mode splits, garage occupancy, site plan process and office project approved parking ratios; the history of parking for office buildings in Arlington; budget and cost information for transit and bus service; and transportation demand management practices.

Staff provided a number of speakers to offer their perspectives to the Working Group:

- County Board Member Mary Hynes provided comments on the values and principles the Working Group should consider when developing their guidance.
- Harriet Tregoning, Director of the D.C. Office of Planning, offered comments on the proposed amendments to D.C. parking regulations, which included a complete elimination of minimum parking requirements for office construction in a defined area of the downtown core.
- Dennis Leach, Director of Transportation, DES, gave multiple presentations on Master Transportation Plan policies, transportation costs, and sustainable transportation.
- Sarah Stott, Arlington Parking Manager, presented information on off-street parking, occupancy of office garages and other research results pertaining to office parking.
- Gary Goodweather from Stonebridge Carras, gave a presentation of the economics of parking garages.
- Lori Diggins, LDA Consulting, presented information on mode split and factors influencing mode choice.
- Aaron Shriber, Planning Division, CPHD, made a presentation on the site plan process.
- Melissa McMahon, DES, presented information on TDM implementation at the worksite and the services provided by Arlington Transportation Partners.

Working Group members expressed key goals for the product of the group, which included:

- Arlington County should be more transparent and predictable in its approach to regulating site plan parking.
- Although individual Working Group members may disagree with or want to change some County policies, the CPWG’s charge is not to change fundamental policy but to have it be implemented more effectively.

Following the meetings on background information, the Working Group began to explore alternative ways to assess and mitigate the impacts of reduced office parking and to devise the proposed methodology and recommendations. During May, CPWG members sought feedback on the draft recommendations from the public and stakeholder groups at seven public meetings. In addition to a Public Forum at Washington-Lee High School, Working Group members held meetings with the Economic Development Commission; NVBIA/NAIOP; the Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission; the Transportation Commission; the Environment and Energy Conservation Commission; and the BIDS and Business Partnerships such as the Clarendon Alliance, Ballston BID and Crystal City BID. (For a complete summary, see Attachment 3, Commercial Parking Project Summary of Public Input, Draft, June 4, 2013.)

The Policy Context

As part its initial work, the Working Group reviewed and discussed relevant County policies in the General Land Use Plan (GLUP) and the Master Transportation Plan (MTP) as well as related policies such as the Community Energy Plan (CEP). These policies provided the foundation for the CPWG process.
With the adoption of the first GLUP in 1961, the County Board established a land use policy framework that has shaped development in Arlington for over 50 years. Successive County Boards have endorsed and consistently implemented land use policy that concentrates high-density mixed-use development within the Rosslyn-Ballston and Jefferson Davis Metro Corridors (approximately 11 percent of the County’s land area). This land use policy facilitated a second policy goal of preservation of lower density residential areas throughout the County.

Land use policy alone, however, cannot achieve a desirable community in which to live and work. The MTP, with the General Land Use Plan, ensures that land use and transportation are integrated (MTP Goals and Policies, pg. 1). Many aspects of the MTP have relevance to the work of the Commercial Parking Working Group (CPWG):

“Goal 1 – Provide High-Quality Transportation Services. Provide high-quality transportation services for all users and modes.

Goal 1 Strategy. Provide and promote affordable, convenient, and integrated transportation choices.” (MTP Goals and Policies, pg. 2)

“Goal 2 – Move More People Without More Traffic. Provide more travel choices and reduce the relative proportion of single-occupant vehicle (SOV) travel through Transportation Demand Management (TDM), telecommuting, and travel shifts to other modes including transit, carpooling, walking and bicycling.

Goal 2 Strategy. Encourage the use of environmentally sustainable modes, including bicycling, walking, transit, carpooling, and telecommuting.” (MTP Goals and Policies, pg. 3)

“Goal 4. Establish Equity. Serve the mobility and accessibility needs of all residents, regardless of age, income or ability.

Goal 4 Strategy. Provide good quality travel options for all residents and workers throughout the County, regardless of their location.

Provide a broad array of transportation options that ensure access to affordable travel.” (MTP Goals and Policies, pg. 3-4)

“Goal 6 – Advance Environmental Sustainability. Reduce the impact of travel on community resources including air and water quality, and increase energy efficiency.

Goal 6 Strategy. Increase energy efficiency and reduce hydrocarbon emissions by encouraging and accommodating nonmotorized travel, public transit, carpooling, telecommuting, and alternative-fuel vehicles.” (MTP Goals and Policies, pg. 4)

With every new development comes the need to get more employees to their place of employment. Throughout the life cycle of every building, it must function within its neighborhood and it is the County’s responsibility to make sure this is the case, and that developers, building owners and office tenants are partners in achieving this objective. The Arlington street network is largely developed and the Streets Policy makes clear that trip growth cannot be managed solely through new streets or widening existing streets. Streets Policy 3 states, in part: “Accommodate travel growth through shifts to non-automobile modes and improved management of the existing streets rather than the addition of significant new street capacity.” (MTP Goals and Policies, pg. 7, emphasis added). In essence, Arlington’s street network is largely fixed; improvements to traffic flows and service must be achieved through mode shifts, operational improvements and demand management.
The newly adopted Community Energy Plan (CEP) links transportation and community sustainability in several goals and strategies, including Goal 4, which states “Refine and expand transportation infrastructure and operations enhancements.” As detailed in the Implementation Framework, the CEP promotes reductions in vehicle miles traveled by integrating transportation and land use, developing Complete Streets, and managing travel demand. Additional strategies particularly related to the work of the CPWG include: Strategy 4.2, continue to support alternatives to car ownership and use and Strategy 4.3, support Federal and State efforts to increase vehicle fuel efficiency (Community Energy Plan Implementation Framework pg. 17-18). Tools supporting implementation of the CEP strategies range from implementation plans for MTP elements; review of site plan proposals; allowing employees to hotel and telecommute; promotion of transit options; and regional coordination.

Despite the foregoing, Arlington County does not have any written policy of discouraging automobile use. The CPWG is aware that there are some Arlington workers, especially among those who live outside of Arlington, who do not currently have reasonable alternatives to auto travel—whether because of disability, age, family needs or home location with inadequate transit alternatives. Therefore, Arlington seeks to achieve sustainable modal splits by providing choice, and encouraging non-auto modes of travel when feasible.

**Office Parking in Nearby Jurisdictions**

The Working Group also looked at office parking in Washington D.C. and Tysons Corner, two areas undergoing significant development. Though both have different development patterns and different approaches from Arlington, this information provided important context for the Working Group. The District of Columbia has been evaluating office parking as part of the overall Zoning Ordinance revision process. Because the District has considerably more Metro Stations in the downtown core than any jurisdiction in the region, for a number of years the D.C Office of Planning has supported developers building less parking than required by their Zoning Ordinance. According to Planning Director, Harriet Tregoning, this approach to parking has not created a shortfall for office tenants or overspill into neighborhoods, largely because of extensive transit service, and developers building to market demand. This practice is borne out by the fact that recently constructed and recently approved D.C. office building parking ratios reflect a broad range of parking ratios: a high of 1:1,239 for a building completed in 2011 on 10th Street, N.W. to a low of 1:2,882 for a building on F Street N.W. that will begin construction later this year. As part of the multi-year review of the D.C. Zoning Ordinance, D.C. staff initially proposed elimination of minimum parking requirements in the large part of the downtown. Office developers would be allowed to build to market demand based on their assessment of that demand rather than a zoning minimum; this proposal received significant push back from the community. On August 30, D.C. staff proposed a revised recommendation to eliminate minimum parking requirements in the Downtown Development Overlay District, which reduces the geographic area considerably from the initial proposal. Developers will be able to build to market demand if the proposal is approved.

The Working Group also learned Fairfax County’s new approach to parking in the Tysons Corner Plan. Under this plan and the new Planned Development-Tysons Corner zoning district, there is no minimum parking requirement for sites in the TOD District (less than ½ mile from a Metro Station entrance). Developers must submit a parking plan with their development proposal, describing how the number of spaces will meet the needs of the development, as well as any valet or tandem parking proposed, and any shuttle service that will be offered. The first 5,000 square feet of retail, restaurant, personal and business services, fast food and food mart floor area also has no parking required. (Parking maximums
are based on distance from Metro Station entrances and range from 1 space per 625 sq. ft. of GFA for sites less than 1/8 of a mile from an entrance to 1 space per 455 sq. ft. of GFA.)

The CPWG also heard about parking practices in Montgomery County, Maryland. Montgomery County allows developers to choose the level of parking to build on-site, in return for annual payments for parking below specified minimum levels. The annual payments, an Ad Valorem tax, provide significant funding for the County’s Parking Lot District (PLD) Program. The PLD Program operates “more than half of the public (publicly available) parking in three of its largest central business districts—Bethesda, Silver Spring, Wheaton—as well as in the Montgomery Hills community. These public inventories provide a shared pool of parking resources for the benefit of all area businesses, patrons, and commuters.”

Office Parking in Arlington

Information on the implementing role of the Zoning Ordinance and the special exception Site Plan process was shared with the Working Group. Over 400 site plan projects have been approved and built in the last 50 years, totaling over 35 million square feet of office space and over 44,000 residential units in the two transit corridors. Zoning districts were created or amended for the transit corridors to add incentives to redevelop consistent with the GLUP. As compared with by-right development, these zoning districts permitted higher heights and densities to be achieved through the site plan process, with associated reductions in parking ratios and flexibility in other areas. While the specified parking ratios for office development in these zoning districts varies from 1:530 (“C-O”) to 1:580 (“C-O-A” and “R-C”), (and more recently, even lower parking ratios have been adopted for Crystal City and much of Rosslyn) the commonly used parking standard has been 1:580 since the early 1980’s. Efforts to manage demand for auto use date back to this time as well.

1 Under by-right development, a developer could be required to build at ratios as high as 1:250 and would not be required to pay for any mitigation costs or TDM.

2 In a March 1983 report to the County Board, Planning staff reported: “In Arlington County as well as in the Washington Metropolitan area, there is currently a strong interest in reducing existing parking requirements and most of the local jurisdictions are in the process of examining methods for reducing parking requirements. The impetus of this trend originates from two separate sources. The private sector is confronted with high development costs and is looking for parking reductions from current standards to lessen their development costs. On the other hand, the public sector is looking for methods to reduce the amount of parking provided in order to reduce future demands on the street system. Methods of reducing parking requirements which are currently being considered throughout the Metropolitan area include:

1. A simple reduction in current parking requirements;
2. A parking reduction in joint use projects;
3. A parking reduction if valet parking is employed;
4. A parking reduction if a ride sharing program is instituted at a project; and
5. A parking reduction based on the availability of mass transit.

Staff has considered these possible methods and concluded that reductions for ride sharing programs and valet parking are not practical approaches for Arlington County because of the potential administrative and enforcement problems. In addition, valet parking can have substantial adverse impacts during rush hour because of the stacking of automobiles on streets and sidewalks. Various elements of the other methods have been incorporated into the proposed amendments. However, the reduction of parking is only desirable as long as the County is able to restrict on street commuter
The CPWG reviewed the best available information about parking utilization to determine if there were reliable ways to evaluate office parking demand. Included in this review were surveys of actual parking utilization, information about mode split and factors that might affect mode split, and a discussion of industry trends for utilization of new office space (such as hotelling employees, telework and other techniques to reduce the amount of office space per employee). While this information was compelling, ultimately, the CPWG found these data provided an insufficient basis for definitive new standards for changing minimum parking ratios in the Zoning Ordinance. The Working Group did not see its role to set new parking standards, but rather to define a methodology for considering decreases from current standards. However, because the 1:580 minimum parking ratio is now 30 years old, the Working Group sought to accurately reflect current practice as the basis of its recommendations.

Since the 1980’s, the amount of office parking approved and built has decreased; Arlington adopted policy in the 1990’s requiring transportation demand management with new site plan projects to ensure that surrounding transportation infrastructure could accommodate building employees and guests traveling to and from the building using alternate modes. In the last decade, increased developer support to transportation infrastructure and transit operations has been required, largely achieved through the Commercial Real Estate Tax which generates approximately $24 million in transportation funding annually. In addition, the County TDM program has been more consistent and robust, with increased staffing to enforce requirements and review monitoring reports. Site plan projects support transit operating costs and consistently support the construction of built facilities (such as wider sidewalks, signals and medians). Support is also provided to TDM programs and services through monetary contributions (such as contributions to Arlington County Commuter Services) to reduce the proportion of Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) trips taken by commuters and to accommodate increased numbers of carpoolers, transit riders, bikers and pedestrians (Attachment 4, Consolidated Base Mixed Use TDM Requirements & List of Standard Infrastructure Improvements/Contributions for Site Plans).

In essence, the CPWG found that while both the parking ratios and mitigation measures “on the books” appear not to have changed substantially over the last 25-30 years, the actual practice has slowly shifted toward greater lenience with minimum parking requirements in rough tandem with more robust expectations for mitigation. Furthermore, these two complimentary shifts appear to have occurred at the same time new office buildings in Arlington are achieving modal splits that result in less parking demand.

These three gradual shifts are both a key finding of the CPWG and a model for its proposal to achieve greater predictability, transparency and fairness in the future. As described in more detail below, the CPWG has worked to document and measure the shift, and then explicitly accommodate more shifting in the future in a regularized and transparent manner.

The Working Group examined data on office site plans approved between 2005 and 2013 (Attachment 5, Office Site Plans and Approved Parking Ratios by Area, 2005 – Present) and it was acknowledged that most buildings constructed since then are no longer parked at this level (1:580). Approved parking ratios varied widely over the 19 projects, ranging from a high of 1:552 (NSTA addition to an existing parking program, signs and metering programs.” As a result of this study, staff proposed that office parking be reduced to one space per 700 sq. ft. of office space in high density mixed-use districts (C-O-A, C-O, C-O-2.5, and R-C), 0.7 spaces per hotel room and one space per residential unit, subject to site plan approval. While some elements of the proposal were adopted, the 1:700 ratio was not.
building) to a low of 1:1,199 (Rosslyn Gateway, tandem and mechanically managed spaces included) and with many projects unbuilt, data on the actual parking demand in these projects was not robust. Parking ratios varied within Metro Station areas as well, depending on the ratio requested by the applicant; some developers chose to build at the 1:580 standard while others sought a reduction. When projects in the “C-O-Rosslyn” and “C-O-Crystal City” zoning districts were eliminated from the evaluation because these zoning districts had a 1:1,000 parking ratio, the resulting parking ratios ranged from 1:552 (NSTA) to 1:890 (Founder’s Square North Office Building). Pentagon City also was set apart as recent project approvals had ratios of approximately 1:750. For many projects with especially low parking ratios, special circumstances could be identified that made them difficult to use to generalize policy precedent. Because of the frequency of these special circumstances, the Working Group did not seek to calculate an exact average, but rather sought to identify an approximate average ratio of approved and built office projects in the remaining Metro Station Areas over the last 10 years for which no special additional TDM or mitigation was clearly identified. (Attachment 4 lists TDM Requirements and Infrastructure Improvements in effect today.) The Working Group’s discussion often centered on a ratio of 1:630 for those areas outside of CO-Rosslyn, CO-Crystal City and Pentagon City, which was the average ratio for approved and built projects not characterized by special circumstances that affected the parking ratio.

Describing this 1:630 ratio benchmark for the areas outside of CO-Rosslyn, CO-Crystal City and Pentagon City as an evolution in the standard parking ratio and associated increases in TDM and mitigation contributions has been remarkably difficult to explain to stakeholders and the public. It has been repeatedly confused with a “desired” or “appropriate” parking ratio, which it is not intended to be. If used as the CPWG proposes in this new methodology for assessing parking, it would merely be the CPWG’s best effort to describe current County Board practice, based on recent office project approvals. It should not be interpreted as a recommended or proposed replacement for the 1:580 parking standard; further study by staff and consideration by the community needs to occur before parking ratios are changed.

The CPWG assumes that current County Board practice represents a successful balance of adequate parking, effective TDM programs that achieve necessary mode split, and adequate funding of alternative modes of travel, including transit. Some members of the Working Group are quite skeptical of this assumption. However, the CPWG attempted to measure the components that would test this assumption (how much parking is necessary in practice, how much TDM is needed to achieve a given mode split, etc.) and unfortunately found that there was not sufficient data to develop reliable conclusions, although parking spaces were found to be underutilized in some office buildings.

---

3 This skepticism is not all in one direction. Some CPWG members believe that recent County Board approvals require too little parking and already require excessive TDM or mitigation contributions, whereas some others believe that current County Board practice requires too much parking and does not require sufficient TDM or mitigation contributions.

4 In November 2011, staff surveyed 14 office parking garages in Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor office buildings that had 90 percent or greater building occupancy. The buildings were occupied by both private tenants and Federal agencies. The average weekday garage occupancy was 69 percent; the average observed peak occupancy was 78 percent.
Proposed Methodology

The CPWG proposes a change to County policy with respect to parking in site plan office buildings. The CPWG proposes that the County shift the focus of negotiation from the “appropriate” level of parking for each site plan to mitigation of the transportation impacts of the ratio proposed by the developer. This would allow the developer to devise a parking proposal for the building that is responsive to market conditions, site conditions, and prospective tenant preferences while paying the County to offset increased transportation costs that result from reduced SOV trips and increased use of other modes of transportation (and, in many cases, augmenting the developer’s own investments in accommodating tenants’ use of other modes). Even though the developer will propose the amount of parking to build, the County retains responsibility to ensure that adequate measures are taken by the developer to mitigate community impacts and achieve the mode split that justifies the proposed parking.

Consequences of the Policy Change

Allowing the market—embodied in the project developer—to decide the proper amount of parking to build still entails necessary regulation by the County.

First, the County must recoup at least the County government’s cost of additional commuters who do not take SOV trips. Although a reduced share of SOV trips is an established County goal, the switch to other modes of travel shifts costs away from individual commuters and the providers of parking to the government, which must provide and operate public transportation facilities. Based on actual annual capital and operating costs for transit in Arlington, staff estimates that the County’s per employee costs of TDM, transit subsidies and related programs to cover transit expenses and encourage employees to move out of their cars to alternate modes of travel is approximately $245 per year, or approximately $7,250 over 30 years. Developers who build less parking than the current “standard” must contribute to the mitigation of these additional public costs.

Second, in order to minimize spillover parking by commuters in residential areas, the County has an obligation to ensure that a given site plan project “works” throughout the building’s lifespan—in other words, that commuters will actually engage in the commuting behaviors that result in the desired modal split. Developers who build less parking than the current “standard” must cooperate with the County to engage in additional measures to ensure these modal splits are achieved. To ensure that employees are using alternate modes and that desired modal splits are achieved, it is particularly important that developers and/or employers participate in demand management programs and conduct monitoring studies of garage occupancy and transit use at designated intervals. In addition, staff needs to have the resources to analyze the data and take appropriate actions if demand management efforts are unsuccessful. This is especially important to representatives of neighborhoods adjacent to the transit corridors.

The CPWG also takes into consideration a principle that “better” modal splits (i.e. modal splits with fewer SOV trips) are more difficult and expensive to achieve the farther they deviate from existing common experience. In other words, getting the first additional commuter in a given building to switch to transit or biking is much less difficult and expensive than getting the last person (i.e. every single person) in a building to forego the SOV commute.
Proposed Formula for Developer Contributions

The CPWG proposes a specific formula for the extent of enhanced developer contributions. Starting at the level of current practice (1:630 for much of the R-B Corridor, 1:750 for Pentagon City and 1:1,000 for CO-Rosslyn and CO-Crystal City), further reductions in parking would result in a defined dollar amount to be used for mitigation.

The formula has several levels of reduction that recognize the increasing difficulty of achieving and mitigating additional SOV trips (See Attachment 6, Mitigation Contribution per Reduced Space). As previously noted, the cost per space is derived from actual budgeted County costs for transit, operations and capital; according to the analysis provided by staff, the annual County contribution to transit and to move an employee from an SOV to alternate transportation modes is approximately $245 per person per year. The cost shown in the table below is the 30-year mitigation contribution per parking space. The proposal retains the current standard site plan conditions for TDM and infrastructure for all steps. Although the CPWG’s basis for the specific additional contribution amounts is based on County-wide expectations regarding the costs of transit infrastructure and operations, and the costs of enhanced TDM measures, the County will determine the allocation of funds to transit expenditures and TDM measures on a project-by-project basis.

Based on discussion in the Working Group, and developer concerns about the cost of capital, the timing of payments and the allocation of payments to TDM, capital and operating would be part of the negotiation with staff at the time of site plan approval. Transportation infrastructure essential to building operations will still need to be constructed prior to occupancy regardless of whether the developer funds it or builds it.

As shown on Attachment 6, the Working Group methodology has three starting points for mitigation, based on location. Mitigation in the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor, except for areas eligible for “C-O-Rosslyn” zoning, would begin at a parking ratio of 1:630. This ratio reflects current practice, and would require base TDM contributions and construction of transportation infrastructure per Attachment 5. Mitigation for projects in Pentagon City would begin at 1:750. This ratio was arrived after looking at the one approved office site plan, Pentagon Centre. However, the Working Group is aware that a ratio of 1:900 is being discussed for a pending project. Should that ratio be approved, the base ratio for mitigation should be revised and the map on Attachment 6 revised accordingly. The third area encompasses the areas of Rosslyn and Crystal City eligible for rezoning to “C-O-Rosslyn” and “C-O-Crystal City”, respectively. Because these two zoning districts have a base office parking ratio of 1:1,000, and projects have been approved at higher ratios in Rosslyn with managed parking as part of the justification, the Working Group concluded this ratio was an appropriate starting point for additional mitigation. It should be noted that while the ratios differ by geography, the mitigation cost per space at each step is the same. The upper limit on the parking ratios reflects a reduction unlikely to “work” from a demand management standpoint; the cost of $40,000 per space is high enough that it is unlikely a developer would choose this option. However if they should choose this option, it would provide the County the funding to build parking if it were needed.

The following table uses the example of a site plan development outside of Pentagon City, and sites eligible for or zoned “CO-Rosslyn” and “C-O-Crystal City”. A similar contribution structure would be used for mitigating reduced parking in site plans in the other areas of the County. Contributions would be paid over 30 years unless a different timeframe was negotiated at the time of site plan approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Ratio Threshold</th>
<th>Standard TDM and Infrastructure Contribution/Conditions</th>
<th>Additional Mitigation Contribution (per space)</th>
<th>Additional Efforts Required (per space)</th>
<th>Extraordinary Measures Contribution (per Space)</th>
<th>Total Supplemental Contribution per Reduced Space within Specified Ratio</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applies only to site plan projects. Many unmeasured inputs and outputs.</td>
<td>Emphasis on mitigating County costs of increased transit trips.</td>
<td>Emphasis on shifting mode use by occupants</td>
<td>Emphasis will vary based on the project but may include construction of additional parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Reduced Parking: Up to 1:630</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>Consistent with current County Board practice and assumed to be in balance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Parking Level 1: 1:630-1:780</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
<td>Assumes standard TDM will be sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Parking Level 2: 1:780-1:1100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>-none-</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>Assumes additional TDM will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Parking Level 3: &lt;1:1100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>High-risk. If unsuccessful, may require County to induce other developers to build extra parking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illustration of Developer Contributions

To clarify how the methodology would be applied, the following are examples of the above ratios applied to a “typical” 300,000 square foot site plan office building5 to be located in the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor outside of “C-O-Rosslyn”:

- A parking ratio of 1:580 is 517 spaces.
- A parking ratio of 1:630 is 476 spaces.
- A parking ratio of 1:780 is 385 spaces.
- A parking ratio of 1:1,000 is 300 spaces.

For the purposes of these illustrations, the building is assumed to have 110 spaces per parking level.

Example #1

A developer proposes a 300,000 square foot office building by site plan. The developer proposes to build 5 levels of underground parking, 550 spaces. This would result in a parking ratio of 1:545 and is within the current regulation.

Result: The developer would be required to meet the base TDM and transportation infrastructure standard site plan conditions, and is encouraged to share parking with neighbors. No additional contribution would be required.

Example #2

A developer proposes a 300,000 square foot office building by site plan. The developer proposes to build 4 levels of underground parking, plus a partial level, achieving a total of 484 spaces. This would result in a parking ratio of 1:620, and is within the standard reduced parking level.

Result: The developer would be required to meet the base TDM and transportation infrastructure standard site plan conditions. No additional contribution would be required.

Example #3

A developer proposes a 300,000 square foot office building by site plan. The developer proposes to build 4 levels of underground parking, achieving a total of 440 spaces. This would result in a parking ratio of 1:682 and results in 36 fewer spaces than the threshold of 1:630, and so would fall within reduced parking level 1.

Result: The developer would be required to meet the base TDM and transportation infrastructure standard site plan conditions. Under the Working Group proposal, the developer would also contribute $261,000 in additional mitigation costs (36 spaces under 1:630 X $7,250 per space).

Example #4

A developer proposes a 300,000 square foot office building by site plan. The developer proposes to build 3 levels of underground parking, achieving a total of 330 spaces. This would result in a parking

5 As a comparison, 300,000 square foot by-right office building would require approximately 1,300 parking spaces.
ratio of 1:909, and results in a total of 146 fewer spaces below the 1:630 ratio, consisting of 91 reduced spaces within reduced parking level 1, and 55 fewer spaces within reduced parking level 2.

Result: Under the Working Group proposal, the developer would contribute $1,347,250 in mitigation costs. This includes $1,058,500 level one payments (91 spaces under 1:630 X $7,250 per space= $659,750) and $687,500 in level 2 payments (55 spaces under 1:780 X $12,500 per space).

Example #5

A developer proposes a 300,000 square foot office building by site plan. Perhaps because of extraordinary site conditions, the developer proposes to build only 1 level of underground parking, achieving a total of 120 spaces. This would result in a parking ratio of 1:2,500, and results in 356 fewer spaces below the 1:630 ratio, consisting of 91 reduced spaces in level 1, 85 reduced spaces in level 2 and 180 reduced spaces in level 3.

Result: The developer would contribute $8,922,250 in mitigation costs. This includes $659,750 in level 1 payments (91 spaces under 1:630 X $7,250 per space), $1,062,500 in level 2 payments (85 spaces under 1:780 X $12,500 per space) and $7,200,000 in level 3 payments (180 spaces under 1:1,000 X $40,000 per space).

Additional Recommendations

The methodology proposed by the Working Group provides the County with a transparent and predictable method to evaluate requests for parking reductions and helps mitigate the costs to the transportation system. The CPWG recommends that the County Manager accept the proposed methodology and its components and present them to the County Board for endorsement. Further, the Working Group recommends that the methodology be integrated into the site plan review process as soon as staff can develop materials and procedures.

With regard to the methodology, the Working Group recommends that step $ amounts should be updated annually according to the CPI even though increases to the CPI are likely to be less than the increases in transit costs over time. Payment timing and allocation should be negotiated at the time of project approval.

The Working Group recommends that staff evaluate managed parking and shared off-site parking and develop a policy defining the circumstances in which these techniques and other parking best practices should be used. These techniques have been approved in projects in Rosslyn as parking modifications but should be reviewed as regular components of the parking provided in a project. Recognizing that the state-of-the-art and tools for parking and TDM are rapidly evolving, the Working Group recommends that County staff continue to monitor and assess the costs and benefits of using a more rigorous and refined parking management tool such as the residential parking calculator used in King County, Washington (http://www.rightsizeparking.org/) to establish parking ratios.

The Working Group recommends that developers continue to provide monitoring studies at two, five and subsequent five-year intervals (as currently provided for by site plan condition). The Working Group recommends that the County perform a technical review of the proposed policy every 5 years, with a full review every 10 years. This research and evaluation is critical to ensuring that buildings “work” throughout their lifecycle and that nearby neighborhoods are not burdened with spillover parking. Based on the results and analysis of the monitoring studies, actual performance in the field, community
comment, and staff’s technical review, the Working Group recommends consideration of a Zoning Ordinance amendment for revised office parking requirements.
County Board Directive

Adopted

January 21, 2012

County Board Direction re Parking Reduction

1. The County Board has adopted parking standards for commercial development set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and other policies.

2. Unless amended or modified by the County Board in a particular site plan, these are the standards all commercial development must meet.

3. The County Board recognizes that, in appropriate circumstances, the standard may be modified through the site plan process to permit a reduction in the amount of parking that is normally required.

4. This should not be regarded as the norm, nor should it be expected in every project.

5. The circumstances that may warrant a reduction in parking will vary from site to site and may include a variety of factors such as the unusual nature or unique characteristics of the proposed development, as well as the achievement of extraordinary goals identified in County plans and policies including affordable housing, open space, community facilities, and historic preservation, where strict adherence to the parking standard may jeopardize or render infeasible the achievement of these other goals.

6. In every case, however, any reduction in the amount of required parking must address the impacts to the transportation network that result.

7. The County Board anticipates the incorporation of Transportation Demand Management measures as part of every site plan project because such measures are integral to the transit oriented development that characterizes all County development.

8. As essential elements of good urban development, the County Board also anticipates that infrastructure improvements will be included as part of every site plan project, particularly to streets and sidewalks, in the vicinity of site plan projects.

9. This is consistent with the Master Transportation Plan which recognizes the value of ensuring that minimum parking needs are met and excessive parking is not built, so as to not induce more driving and reduce community walkability.

10. Where parking requirements are reduced, and the impacts to the transportation network caused by the development are increased all the more, the County Board will look for added measures to mitigate these impacts consistent with existing Master Transportation Plan Policy 6.h.
11. These measures may include additional, enhanced Transportation Demand Management measures and improvements to streets surrounding the site plan project, but also contributions to the transit element of the transportation network which will bear much of the impacts resulting from reduced parking and enhanced Transportation Demand Management measures.

12. The appropriate mix of mitigation measures or the costs thereof cannot be specified in advance and must be a part of the site plan process where the unique circumstances of the proposed development can be analyzed; however, the County Board believes that standards can be developed to provide predictability about how mitigation measures and their costs are determined. Further, the County Board recognizes that the cost to build parking is not a relevant consideration.

13. In light of this, the County Board directs the County Manager to examine the consequences of reducing parking below the required standard and the methodologies that can be used to fully assess and mitigate the impacts attributable to a reduction of parking on a particular site plan project, and to report back to the Board by June 2012 on this effort.
## Attachment 2
### Commercial Parking Working Group Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Bell, Chair</td>
<td>Resident-at-large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Forinash</td>
<td>Planning Commission Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Ginivan</td>
<td>The JBG Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Matzkin</td>
<td>Buck &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Meservey</td>
<td>Environment and Energy Conservation Commission Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen Morgan</td>
<td>SRA International Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Ortiz</td>
<td>Transportation Commission Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Owen</td>
<td>Resident-at-large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Peters</td>
<td>Perseus Realty (formerly Vornado Realty Trust)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel VanPelt</td>
<td>Gorove/Slade Transportation Planners &amp; Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Auten, James Schroll</td>
<td>Civic Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Duffy*</td>
<td>Arl Co. CPHD Planning Division Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Stott**</td>
<td>Arl Co. DES Parking Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Hamilton</td>
<td>Arl Co. DES Commuter Services Mgr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Griffin</td>
<td>Arl Co. AED Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Sarno, Forum Facilitation Group</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Frequent Participants
- Dennis Leach, Transportation Division director
- Aaron Shriber, CPHD
- Tom Miller, CPHD
- Jeff Sikes, DES Transportation
- Hagood Morrison, Vornado Realty Trust
Attachment 3
Commercial Parking Project Summary of Public Input
Draft, June 4, 2013

The Commercial Parking Working Group met with a variety of groups and commissions and hosted a public meeting to obtain comments on its draft framework for parking methodology at site plan commercial office buildings. A wide range of ideas and input were received and are summarized in the table below in chronological order of meetings held.

Some common themes we heard included the following:

- Support for overall methodology of establishing a set starting point with stepped increases for mitigation costs as less parking is built
- Strong support for updating ratios, particularly those established in 1983
- Using the actual cost of parking ($40k) for mitigation is too high, developers will just build the parking
- General business resistance to additional fees, though see $7k as a reasonable starting amount for mitigation
- Flexibility is important to think about the future and possible changes over time
- Arlington should be at the cutting edge of parking policies and best practices
- Policies should point to the future, where do we want to be, environmental issues and impacts
- Arlington should be encouraging less driving, more transit where that makes sense
- Retail and other site-specific uses with different parking needs must be considered
- The working group needs to be clear about its office focus
- Metrorail limited capacity is a significant issue
- Paying for parking is a significant issue affecting perceived availability
- What happens to these recommendations, board approval was recommended often

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Commission</td>
<td>• Comment to earlier presentation: Need in site plan process for more transparency and predictability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2013</td>
<td>• Does this proposal have impact on zoning ordinance ratios? Answer: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Why not allow developers to park within a range of ratios? Answer: Working Group decided against range, as developers would gravitate to building at lowest ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• County Board shouldn’t charge developers for building less parking, if less parking is in keeping with County policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5-14-13 NY Times article reported that fewer young people are driving now, so need for less parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in hotelling has resulted in more employees working at the same time in offices than previously. Example of Accenture in Ballston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metrorail has limited capacity, so what happens if less people drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Overspill from the National Guard complex on George Mason Drive was a huge issue for the neighborhoods.

**Business Group, May 16, 2013**

- Station Square garage is full
- Olmstead building garage is not accessible
- Market is the ultimate arbiter
- We already subsidize metro
- Isn’t Arlington pushing to get cars off road
- $40k not that accurate for the cost of a single spot as it includes cost of foundation.
- Medical offices need more parking
- At $7k, it makes sense to build less and give county money.
- TDM support should phase out, people should just do it.
- 1:580 same for 30 years – needs to change.
- More shared parking across day/night uses
- Office parking in residential buildings during day.
- Need some flexibility for unused parking. Allow it to be used for storage etc.
- Need flexibility over time and use changes
- Costs of building new roads were not considered.
- Trans. Surcharge already pays for the garage.
- Good we are looking for modern ratios
- Good we are looking for right costs.
- Less people walk to Rosslyn than other areas.
- Day restaurant parking is ok, at night its harder as people don’t like garages or paying for parking.
- Site plan process does allow for site-specific considerations.
- Proximity to transit needs to be considered.
- People want to get rid of a level that will be main driver.
- Lenders will also drive number of spaces needed.
| Public Meeting  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 21, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rationale for ratios – Why not encourage less parking? Don’t drive developers for more parking? 1:750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cannot have one size fits all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to transit and carrying capacity important. Cannot push people to limited capacity, need to get the $ to support that transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make sure $ are targeted to the actual impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do we influence increasing the metrorail capacity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Costs of building parking and impacts are very site-specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Things will change over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need built in flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the approach from what the “right” amount of parking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What about other community benefits in return for reduced parking? Especially if it has TDM implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Considerations for off-site parking? Create some way to bank parking for future projects and lieu fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At 40K, developers will just build it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking only works at a level at a time, won’t be just a few spaces, need to account for engineering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is 1,000 lowest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Controlling or discouraging above ground parking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do we push the envelope?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where is the lending market?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Look at Tyson’s master plan – What ratios?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retail parking needs being met?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All parking and buildings are really intermixed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People’s perceptions about parking important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need more parking information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operations basic government function – don’t want to rely on outside funding source?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to pay over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a parking app.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asking garages to provide data/new tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shifting culture. Some moving faster than others. Pieces don’t fit together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs structure for flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjust as conditions change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Start with target modal splits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2011 NYC Best Practices Survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAIOP/NVIA Meeting
May 22, 2013

- Comfortable with the general methodology.
- @$7,083 per reduced space over 30 years is a reasonable starting place for the amount to pay for additional mitigation. Note: County had proposed that the contribution for TDM and operations would be paid over 30 years, but capital part of the contribution would be paid up front.
- Because this per space amount will not generate very much money for the County, it’s not a wise method for financing County infrastructure.
- The County is receiving through property tax about $500 more per employee per year with these new buildings than an average Arlington building. Developers are already contributing enough to the general fund by building new buildings.
- It’s unclear why we need an additional fee. There is already an additional commercial real estate transportation tax that is already paying for transportation infrastructure.
- It’s unfair that commercial sector should pay proportionately more taxes than residential sector, because the site plan process provides a vehicle for adding on fees that can never be used with residents.
- Request that contribution be spread over 30 years discounted back using a 7% rate to calculate an upfront payment. Response: Possible alternative would be capital contribution takes place up front and operating and TDM costs be paid over time. Response: Sounds complicated.
- There should be some guarantee that the funds generated through this process should go to the vicinity. Concern that the contribution might be spent in other parts of the County.
- The final recommendation from the Working Group should include how the money will be spent, i.e. percentage for each bucket.
- The starting point for additional mitigation should be around 1:700 in the R-B corridor (excluding CO-Rosslyn which should be 1:1,200).
- The amount of parking built should be determined by how much is needed to make the building work.
- Sometimes 1:580 is the right amount of parking, because some tenants are squeezing more employees into buildings. (800 Glebe) Some tenants use 125 sq ft per employee, rather than the old standard of 250 sq ft per employee.
- Vornado is proposing to build PenPlace at 1:900. Thinks 1:630 is too high as the starting point for the mitigation contribution.
- In Rosslyn most office buildings are now being approved at 1:1,200, though the standard is 1:1,000, so why should a “fine” now be imposed on building at lower than 1:1,200?
- Concern about LEED credits. Since this process is not impacting the Zoning Ordinance, using a lower ratio for when additional mitigation “kicks in” will probably have no impact on the number of LEED points a building will get for having less parking than the ordinance.
- There seems to be a conflict between the policies in the draft Community Energy Plan and making developers pay for building less parking.
- New buildings should not have to pay more taxes per employee than older buildings.
- Up to now, the developers have been getting a free ride with building less parking than the standard, and now the County is saying you need to mitigate the impacts of these decisions.
- This additional contribution would only be imposed if a developer chooses to build less parking than the standard suggested by the Working Group (if adopted).
- Reducing parking is the best TDM strategy there is, as it compels employees to get to work some way other than driving alone.
- Reduction of parking is a financial risk for developers.
- The contribution should go to WMATA, since they have a capacity issue.
- Recommendation should include a statement clarifying that this does not apply to residential properties.
- Recommendation should clarify whether this policy affects retail parking requirements or just office. The standard retail parking requirement is 1:580.

| Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Commission May 28 | Question: Could mitigation revenue go to programs that would reduce cut-through traffic and over parking in adjacent neighborhoods? Later question: Can it go to better building materials? Response: The intent of the mitigation funds is to encourage or finance other modes of travel besides single occupant vehicles. That said, because this is using the site plan process, the County Board could direct funds to go to other projects.
- Question: What implications can be drawn from the fact that the Working Group is not looking at residential or hotel development? Are we missing an opportunity? Occupancy of multi-family buildings has changed over time with less reliance on vehicles. Parking for residential development should be studied. Response: The County Board’s direction to the County Manager very clearly said only to examine commercial developments. The LRPC could recommend to the County to perform a study related to reductions in residential parking. A different type of analysis would be required for residential parking than for office parking.
- Will mode split be able to switch from 50% non-SOV to 70% non-SOV?
- Question: What is the tipping point for developers in that if the mitigation amount charged is too much that they will choose to build parking instead of paying a fee to the County? Response: There are a host of issues and there needs to be a case by case analysis. Parking is an income generator for many property owners as well as an expense.
- The purpose of this project is to help developers know the implications of building less parking. With a transparent and clear policy, developers will know ahead of time what the cost would be if they choose to build less parking and at what amount.
- Remove the government from deciding the right amount of parking
- $7,083 is too small a number per space, considering what it costs developers to build parking and the high costs of transportation
- Contributions for TDM and Operating costs should go out to as much as 50 years, as that is a better estimate (than 30 yrs) for the life span of a
building.

- What evidence is there that TDM works? Response: ACCS has done a great deal of research. One report documents that buildings with TDM programs have lower SOV rates than buildings without TDM programs. (Sarah to send link to Claude)
- The Commercial Parking Working Group should address the CEP goals. Did the Working Group consider the impact of the proposed policy on reducing the County’s carbon footprint and how it relates to the County’s draft Community Energy Plan? Response: not very much
- Do we want the County to reduce the amount of parking in office buildings? Response: wasn’t the task of the Working Group
- County policy is to incentivize other modes, not discourage SOV
- The government cannot absorb the cost of an increase of people using alternative modes of travel.
- What behavior are we trying to incentivize? Response: Transparency is supposed to make the switch to alternative modes easier.
- There should be sector wide studies of parking. Could be sector wide TDM plans.
- Money could go to building parking. Montgomery County has a parking authority. We don’t have a method of using developer money for building public parking except in Columbia Pike. Penzance and Crimson projects had to put up bonds towards building more parking.
- We’re not expecting major shifts by the developers because of this policy to reduce the sizes of their garages by a large number of spaces.
- If DC is pushing for less parking for office buildings, why isn’t Arlington? PenPlace is similar to DC but without the transit infrastructure.
- There should be a list of capital and operating projects that the mitigation contribution could go to.
- Managed parking needs more research. It’s a way to make garages more efficient, but the County needs to decide whether a managed space should be counted the same way as a single space. New technology (e.g. fully mechanized systems) is a bit of a moving target.
- Use mitigation money for creating mobile apps that say where parking is located and if spaces are empty. Mobile apps do exist that say where parking is locating in Arlington, but they don’t say if the garages have empty spaces.
- What’s the point in using 1:630 as a starting point, when there is such a small difference between 1:580 and 1:630? Maybe start the mitigation amount at 1:580.
- Pentagon City starting ratio should be closer to 1:1,000 because the transit network is very strong, and will be stronger with the streetcar system.
- The commercial parking policy should be a board approved policy, because parking requirements are Board approved actions, and through site plans, the Zoning Ordinance and the Master Transportation Plan. Parking requirements are integral to planning decisions, and are not just transportation issues.
- This issue should come back to the Planning Commission as a policy
decision, and probably at the July PC mtg.
• If this policy is going to be transparent, it should be a stronger statement and go to PC and County Board.
• There’s a conflict between wanting the process to predictable with a fixed amount of money required and a desire for flexibility.

Transportation Commission
May 30, 2013

• Though our group does understand the desire to fund greener How do other jurisdictions compare to Arlington (Alexandria and Fairfax)—not presented, Fairfax too broad, some new stuff in Tysons, DC presented their plans of looking at no minimums, did not include Alexandria.
• Three impediments to becoming car free, have they been discussed? 1) easy access to a grocery store, need for dedicated parking at grocery stores, 2) difference between weekend and weekday service, lot of trackwork on metro on the weekend, 3) having young children harder to use transit with strollers, etc. This project was focused on office parking so those items were not considered.
• Parents taking children to daycare on way to work is a factor in determining mode.
• From the revenue side, commercial property taxes, how is parking taxed vs. office space? Is this a key issue for developers, is it a challenge for them? If we build more parking, do they pay tax on the spaces at the same rate as building space? Commercial property tax rates are based on income, so parking revenue not size is the factor. Developers do want more predictability for this process of determining parking ratios and mitigation for reduced parking.
• Need to get these numbers well defined if we are to get past the current level of fuzziness. Can we create a formula/cost at each level. We recognize that we need to create these numbers, but we do lack the data to make a lot of these choices based on real conditions.
• Like the framework, the tiering works well.
• Will the mitigation money go directly to support the real impacts on the overall transportation system?
• Recognize need to have a number to start mitigation, the $7000 number seems low in relation to the value of a parking space. Are there ways to more accurately value a parking space.
• Suppose the building is being built in an area currently underserved by parking, how do we do that? What happens if sector plan calls for retail in part of that area. (we have not addressed how to handle retail components of mixed use buildings, there is no penalty for building more parking)
• TDM traditionally put into site plan, would the committee put more mandatory TDM into site plan to support mode shift?
• How does Arlington compare with Manhattan mode split?
• Implications of providing parking below desired levels—do you mean below zoning requirements? This would be an important clarification. What are the metrics used to demonstrate that current parking is working well? Made numerous points of inadequate data.
- Have never had difficulty finding a place to park, may not want to pay but spaces are always available.
- It is not unheard of to look at quick dramatic decreases in parking.
- If we are going to require one property one thing in one area and another in a different area, then we need to have a good justification.
- Big difference in reducing parking on a fourth level than a first level, will this be taken into account, and will it be adjusted for inflation. Will it go into formal code or just go into informal practice?

**Individual comment**

- I want to put in my generalized support for reductions in parking ratios throughout the county, preferably in tandem with improvements in transit and bike-share.
- We will never reach great urbanism (not to mention fend off the crisis of global warming) without properly pricing the cost of driving, and parking is one straightforward way to do this.
- Of course you will get loud pressure from some residents, but know that you also have supporters of limits to free and subsidized auto use. Keep up the transition, and make sure to use very good messaging and big-picture explaining in everything you do.
- My preferred solution is to publicly tie a portion of parking revenue to the subsidy of transit and bike-sharing. (For instance, note that bike-sharing in Arlington has not yet reached any of the neighborhoods along Lee Highway or further north.) (P. Harnik)

**Individual comment**

- As the president of the Cherrydale Citizens Association I want to remind you that the CCA officially voted DOWN the lowered parking ratio for the so-called Cherrydale Lee Hwy Revitalization area. Specifically, we require the normal parking ratio for retail not the lower ratio.
- Just by looking at the parking ratio you can tell which stores do well:
  - Cherrydale Station – Sun moon yoga, 2 restaurants, flower shop, 2 beauty shops, all do well. FULLY LUXURIANTLY PARKED.
  - N Vetinary – does OK bc not much traffic for Cherrydale Motor Parts, which delivers. Well parked.
  - Safeway – Luxuriantly parked, does great.
  - Bromptons – having trouble filling its stores, years after it opened. Has only HALF the parking usually required.
  - Hunters Park – Mattress discounters – and the hair salon – half normal parking, not doing well
  - Dunkin Donuts – nightmare effect on residential street, insufficient parking but it’s take out, so just tortures residents.
- Just run down the street and it’s predictable.
- But I want you to know our vote now 10 years ago stands. IN addition the impact on nearby residential streets when there is not enough parking for retail is simply terrible. N Monroe St for example, where customers drop their Dunkin Donuts trash up the street, and there are fights in the morning over parking. (M. Ross)
Attachment 4

Consolidated Base Mixed-Use TDM Provisions &
List of Standard Infrastructure Improvements/Contributions for Site Plans

1. Develop (before CO) and implement a Transportation Management Plan (TMP).
2. Maintain an active relationship with Arlington Transportation Partners (ATP).
3. Designate a Property Transportation Coordinator (PTC) to be a primary point of contact with the county and undertake the responsibility for coordinating and completing all Transportation Management Plan (TMP) obligations.
4. Contribute to ACCS annual contribution based on a rate $0.06 per Sqft of GFA for commercial (office, retail, hotel) use and $0.035 per Sqft of GFA for residential use, escalated by CPI from the year 2008, per year for thirty (30) years. Payment on this commitment will begin as a condition of issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy. Subsequent payments will be made annually.
5. Provide an information display kiosk in the lobby or lobbies.
6. Comply with requirements of Site Plan conditions to provide bicycle parking/storage facilities and develop a plan of operation of the bicycle facilities.
7. Comply with requirements of Site Plan conditions to provide construction worker parking.
8. Bus stops and shelters within 50 feet of the property and contiguous to the property shall be maintained free of snow, ice, trash, and debris.
9. Provide an ADA-compliant hotel van (with lift) to provide shuttle service to and from the nearest Metro station(s) for employees and guests. (hotel only).
10. Prepare a Parking Management Plan for on-street activities. No on-street loading will be permitted.
11. Provide effective directional signage to direct residents and visitors to appropriate locations on the property.
12. Establish monthly parking rates for single occupant vehicles (SOV) consistent with comparable buildings located in the Arlington County development corridors.
13. Provide reserved, signed, spaces for carpools and vanpools.
14. Oversee program to provide registered vanpools with free parking and two and three+ person carpools with subsidized parking.
15. Provide a one-time membership (per unit) fee subsidy in car sharing (Residential).
16. Provide $65 SmarTrip card per person, for free, one time, to each resident.
17. Provide $65 SmarTrip card for free, one time, to each employee in the building.
18. Provide $65 SmarTrip card for free, one time, to each building employee.
19. Provide a sustainable commute benefit program for each building employee of at least $70.00 per month. (hotel only)
20. Provide website links to CommuterPage.com® “transportation information.”
21. Distribute a new-resident/new-employee package no later than the day of move-in or first day of work.
22. Place a reference to nearest Metro station in promotional materials (hotel only).
23. Make available (sell) transit fares at front desk (hotel only).
24. Distribute ACCS provided information up to four times per year to all residents, tenants, employees, and visitors and participate in regionally sponsored clean air, transit, and traffic mitigation promotions requested by ACCS.
25. Participate and pay for a transportation performance monitoring study at two years, five years,
and each subsequent five years (at the County’s option), after first CO.

26. Annually submit an annual report describing completely and correctly, the TDM related activities of the site, and continuous reports of changes in commercial tenants during each year.

List of Standard Infrastructure Improvements/Contributions for Site Plans:

1. New curb and gutter, with street paving/repaving and striping as required, along all site frontages
2. New streetscape per applicable sector plan, Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor Streetscape Guidelines, or MTP, with sidewalk paving, street trees, new streetlights, and sometimes other street furniture along all site frontages; maintenance of sidewalks and street trees for life of project
3. Undergrounding of all aerial utilities along site frontages, with extensions offsite to appropriate poles or other underground service to continue network
4. Contribution to utility undergrounding fund based on $50,000/acre in December 2011 dollars, inflated annually by CPI to year of CB approval.
5. New or relocated parking meters or multimeters, with appropriate signs, as appropriate
6. Curb nubs at intersections and bus stops along site frontages as needed
7. Crosswalks and curb ramps as identified
8. Bus stops/shelters as needed; snow clearing to bus stop/shelters
9. Contributions toward traffic signals adjacent to site as needed (typically ½ of estimated cost)
10. Median construction/landscaping and/or maintenance for the life of the site plan as appropriate
11. Wet utility upgrades as planned and/or needed to serve the project
12. Provision of conduit for communications cable on all site frontages or portion as needed for planned network
13. Dedication of site area in public streets to back of curb to the County in fee (on request, developer receives density supported by that amount of site area in exchange)
14. Dedication of relevant easements to County—sidewalk easements from back of curb to back of sidewalk, necessary utility easements, negotiated public access or other easements
15. Provision of parking spaces to the public, usually for office buildings during non-business hours, but with some variations
16. A variety of items to minimize disruption and safety concerns for the public during construction—temporary lighting, maintenance of pedestrian access, street cleaning and patching, limitation of construction hours, off-street construction worker parking, etc.
### Attachment 5

**Office Site Plans and Approved Parking Ratios by Area**
**2005 – Present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE PLAN CASE #</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME &amp; ADDRESS</th>
<th>PROJECT APPROVAL DATE</th>
<th>PROJECT STATUS</th>
<th>OFFICE SQ. FT. (GFA)</th>
<th># OF PARKING SPACES</th>
<th>APPLICABLE MIN. (STANDARD) PARKING RATIO</th>
<th>APPROVED PARKING RATIO (1/XXX SQ. FT.)</th>
<th>BELOW MINIMUM STANDARD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEFFERSON DAVIS CORRIDOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRYSTAL CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #400 Monument View (Boeing) (9) 608 South Ball St.</td>
<td>10/18/2011</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
<td>453,422</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #346 Potomac Yards – Land Bay C (5) Jefferson Davis Highway</td>
<td>12/18/2007</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>1,064,298</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #346 Potomac Yards – Land Bay E West 3500 South Clark Street</td>
<td>4/21/2007</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>374,379</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #421 1900 Crystal Drive (6) 1900 Crystal Drive</td>
<td>9/15/2012</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>719,704</td>
<td>732 (5)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRISTAL CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTAGON CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #297 Pentagon Centre Phase I 1201 South Hayes Street</td>
<td>7/21/2008</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>489,911</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data prepared by the Planning Division, Department of Community Planning, Housing & Development, Arlington County Commercial Parking Working Group, 04/24/13
## Attachment 5

### Office Site Plans and Approved Parking Ratios by Area

**2005 – Present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
<th>Commercial Parking</th>
<th>Approved Parking</th>
<th>Approved Parking Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PENTAGON CITY</td>
<td>489,911</td>
<td>691</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRYSTAL CITY + PENTAGON CITY</td>
<td>3,101,714</td>
<td>4,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSSLYN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #18 1812 North Moore St. (6)</td>
<td>569,739</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #335 Central Place Office Building (6) 1801 N. Moore St. 5/5/2007 Approved 570,549 487 1,000 1,172 Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #409 1776 Wilson/Dr. Contis 1776 Wilson Blvd. 10/13/2007 Under construction 114,922 187 580 580 No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #419 Rosslyn Gateway Office (6) 1901 North Ft. Myer Drive 7/24/2012 Approved 624,567 521 (5) 1,000 1,199 Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSSLYN</td>
<td>1,879,777</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 5

Office Site Plans and Approved Parking Ratios by Area
2005 – Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE PLAN CASE #</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME &amp; ADDRESS</th>
<th>PROJECT APPROVAL DATE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>OFFICE SQ. FT. (GFA)</th>
<th># OF PARKING SPACES</th>
<th>APPLICABLE MIN. (STANDARD) PARKING RATIO</th>
<th>APPROVED PARKING RATIO (1/XXX SQ. FT.)</th>
<th>BELOW MINIMUM STANDARD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROSSLYN – BALLSTON CORRIDOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLSTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #20</td>
<td>Two Liberty Center (2) 801 N. Randolph St.</td>
<td>1/29/2002</td>
<td>Completed and occupied</td>
<td>183,914</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #401</td>
<td>Peck/Staples Office Building 900 N. Glebe Rd.</td>
<td>2/23/2008</td>
<td>Completed and occupied</td>
<td>415,816</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #413</td>
<td>Founder’s Square (DARPA Office Building) 675 N. Randolph St.</td>
<td>7/19/2008</td>
<td>Completed and occupied</td>
<td>355,530</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #413</td>
<td>Founder’s Square (North Office Bldg.) (7) 707 N. Randolph St.</td>
<td>1/22/2011</td>
<td>Completed and occupied</td>
<td>418,810</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLSTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA SQUARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #386</td>
<td>Crimson (formerly the Arlington Funeral Home) 3901 N. Fairfax Dr.</td>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>178,131</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA SQUARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARENDON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data prepared by the Planning Division, Department of Community Planning, Housing & Development, Arlington County Commercial Parking Working Group, 04/24/13
### Office Site Plans and Approved Parking Ratios by Area
#### 2005 – Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Clarendon Center (North &amp; South Office Buildings)</td>
<td>6/13/2006</td>
<td>Completed and occupied</td>
<td>220,919</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>759 (North) 451 (South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Penzance Office 3001 Washington Blvd.</td>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
<td>284,012</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLARENDON**

- Floors: 680
- 1/743

Data prepared by the Planning Division, Department of Community Planning, Housing & Development, Arlington County
Commercial Parking Working Group, 04/24/13
# Office Site Plans and Approved Parking Ratios by Area

## 2005 – Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE PLAN CASE #</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME &amp; ADDRESS</th>
<th>PROJECT APPROVAL DATE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>OFFICE SQ. FT. (GFA)</th>
<th># OF PARKING SPACES</th>
<th>APPLICABLE MIN. STANDARD PARKING RATIO</th>
<th>APPROVED PARKING RATIO (1/XXX SQ FT.)</th>
<th>BELOW MINIMUM STANDARD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP# 263</td>
<td>Clean Technology Bldg. (10) 2311 Wilson Blvd.</td>
<td>12/8/2012</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>165,686</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #382</td>
<td>National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) Major Site Plan Amendment (8) 1840 Wilson Blvd. at N. Rhodes St.</td>
<td>11/15/2008 (original approval 2005)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>107,590</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURTHOUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| SP #106         | Randolph Square (4) South Randolph Street | 9/16/2006 | Completed and Occupied | 195,000 | 562 | 580 | 1/346 | No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIRGINIA SQ. + CLARENDON + COURTHOUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BALLSTON + VIRGINIA SQ. + CLARENDON + COURTHOUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHIRLINGTON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Attachment 5

Office Site Plans and Approved Parking Ratios by Area
2005 – Present

(1) This table includes new site plan approvals and major site plan amendments for office projects or the office components of mixed-use projects. All data are for the office component only and does not include retail GFA or retail parking, except for the Clean Technology Building. TDM Elements and Project Benefits are examples taken from site plan reports. These lists are not exhaustive. Every project is evaluated on a case-by-case basis, in the context of adopted plans and policies at the time of approval. (The term “community benefits” is not defined in the Zoning Ordinance but is commonly used to describe contributions and improvements made by the developer to mitigate the impacts of additional height and density).

(2) Data from November 2002 Major Site Plan amendment.

(3) 38,664 sq. ft. of office density associated with the Old Dominion Building excluded from parking requirements based on the Clarendon Sector Plan.

(4) 1/379 parking ratio approved in a Phased Development Site Plan Amendment in 2000

(5) Parking count excludes 124 tandem spaces

(6) Parking count includes tandem and mechanically managed spaces

(7) Data from January 2011 Major Site Plan Amendment.

(8) Data from November 2008 Major Site Plan Amendment.

(9) Data from October 2011 Major Site Plan Amendment.

(10) Density includes office and retail; child care, conference center, fitness center (11,100 sq. ft.) which were excluded from density calculation.
Mitigation Contribution per Reduced Space

- **Parking > 1:630**: Base TDM & Transportation Infrastructure = $7,250, $12,500, $40,000
- **1:630 – 1:780**: $7,250, $5,250, $27,500
- **1:780 – 1:1,000**: $7,250, $5,250, $27,500
- **Parking < 1:1,200**: $7,250, $5,250, $27,500
- **Parking < 1:1,900**: $7,250, $5,250, $27,500

*Potomac Yard FDSI additional mitigation to start at 1:630*

Total contribution amount calculated on an annual cost over 30 years.
Arlington County’s multi-modal environment requires a sharing of responsibilities for infrastructure and operations by the public sector and private sector to ensure an effective balance of modal use and sustainability.

The new Reduced Office Parking Policy ("Policy") acknowledges changes that are taking place within the County. These include changing market conditions for the development industry as well as changes in the way employees are commuting to work. This policy brings additional flexibility to the County’s site plan process enabling less parking to be built than was previously allowed but which meets the project’s parking demand, assuring that incentives are in place to increase the use of alternative modes of transportation and that infrastructure is in place for transit, bicycling and walking to support those who use these alternates instead of automobile parking.

This commuting pattern change from automobile usage to transit shifts the transportation cost burden from the private sector to the public sector. The purpose of the Policy is to provide a clear and consistent methodology that enables the private sector to build its preferred amount of parking while mitigating the impacts on the community of its office workers traveling to and from office buildings via methods other than single occupancy vehicle trips.

The Policy is a voluntary program which implements Policy 6 of the Master Transportation Plan Parking and Curb Space Management Element: “Ensure that minimum parking needs are met and excessive parking is not built. Divert resources saved by reducing excess off-street parking to other community benefits.” The Policy provides a methodology whereby a developer of site plan office buildings or the office portion of a mixed-use project, can propose a parking ratio that is less than the amount identified by the County as being adequate (with usual TDM measures and site plan conditions), to meet the needs of the project (recognized “starting point”). The mitigation measures would offset increased transportation costs that result from reduced single occupant vehicle (SOV) trips and increased use of other modes of transportation. If a parking ratio at or above the starting point is proposed, the developer is responsible for providing the standard contribution toward transportation demand management and transportation infrastructure and services as described in the project’s approved conditions.

Using the methodology below as its general standard, County staff will continue to perform an analysis of each proposal for the adequacy of parking and mitigation given the location, the proposed ratio and other specifics for the project. In certain cases, such as conflicts with other County policies or goals or unusual site or project characteristics, ratios derived from the methodology below may not be appropriate for a particular project. Based on the analysis of the individual property, development or other factors, staff could recommend a departure from the strict application of the policy for a particular project.
The Methodology

The Policy is applicable in areas of the County where office buildings may be developed using the site plan process (Figure 1). The Policy methodology uses three parking ratios as starting points for mitigation, based on location of the project. These starting points are based on the current practice of the amount of parking approved for office site plan buildings which reflects the market, and parking needs in a particular area for particular uses. In the areas of Rosslyn and Crystal City that are eligible for rezoning to “C-O-Rosslyn” and “C-O-Crystal City,” mitigation would begin where the developer proposes to build less parking than yielded by a parking ratio of one parking space per 1,000 s.f. of office gross floor area (1:1,000.) In Pentagon City mitigation would begin at a parking ratio of 1:975. Mitigation for all other site plan areas would begin at a parking ratio of 1:630.

The amount of contribution is based on the amount of reduction below the starting points listed in Figure 2. There are three tiers of contribution based on the extent of reduction below the starting ratio: $7,250 for the first increment of reduction (Tier 1), $12,500 for the next increment (Tier 2) and $40,000 for the 3rd tier. In Zoning districts where the regulations provide that a project “earns” additional density by the provision of “community benefits,” the parking contribution would address only the amelioration of the effect of reduced parking; it would not contribute to achieving additional density.
Figure 2: Mitigation amount per reduced space over 30 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation amt per reduced space:</th>
<th>Tier 1 ($/yr)</th>
<th>Tier 2 ($/yr)</th>
<th>Tier 3 ($/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:630</td>
<td>$7,250*</td>
<td>$12,500*</td>
<td>$40,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:975</td>
<td>($245 per yr)</td>
<td>($420 per yr)</td>
<td>($1,333 per yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The amounts would be adjusted annually for inflation by the U.S. Dept of Labor CPI Inflation Calculator beginning with the second payment.

For clarification, two examples follow. Examples #1 and #2 show how the mitigation contribution would be calculated, in two situations, for a “typical” 300,000 square foot site plan office building located in the Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor outside of “C-O-Rosslyn.” For the purpose of these illustrations, the building is assumed to have 110 spaces per parking level. A parking ratio of 1 space per 630 sq. ft, for this building, would require 476 spaces.

Example #1

A developer proposes a 300,000 square foot office building by site plan. The developer proposes to build 4 levels of underground parking, achieving a total of 440 spaces. This would result in a parking ratio of 1:682 and results in 36 fewer spaces within reduced parking level 1. Result: The developer would be required to meet the base TDM and transportation infrastructure standard site plan conditions. The developer would also contribute $261,000 in additional mitigation costs (36 spaces under 1:630 X $7,250 per space).

Example #2

A developer proposes a 300,000 square foot office building by site plan. The developer proposes to build 3 levels of underground parking, achieving a total of 330 spaces. This would result in a parking ratio of 1:909, and results in 146 fewer spaces within reduced parking level 1, and 55 fewer spaces within reduced parking level 2. Result: The developer would have the base TDM and transportation infrastructure standard site plan conditions. The developer also contributes $1,058,500 in mitigation costs (146 spaces under 1:630 X $7,250 per space) and $288,750 in additional TDM measures (55 spaces under 1:780 X $5,250 per space).

The mitigation contribution would be used for either transportation demand management (TDM) programs for the specific property, operating costs for transit that serves the property and/or transportation infrastructure supporting transit, biking and walking serving the property. Contributions for transit operating and TDM programs would be spent over 30 years and contributions towards transportation infrastructure could either be made before building occupancy or over time depending on the circumstance. The required programs and the percentages of contribution for capital costs, TDM measures, and transit operations, as well as whether transportation capital would be contributed over time or at one time, would be documented in a site plan condition. The mitigation strategies would be documented in the Transportation Management Plan approved before the Shell and Core Certificate of Occupancy.
This policy would be applied to all site plan projects accepted by the County Manager on or after December 14, 2013. A mitigation contribution would not be applied to site plan projects within Phased Development Site Plans where parking is provided in accordance with a ratio that was expressly approved in the PDSP at a ratio lower than the standard ratio set above. Also, in the event the County requested that a developer provide less parking than the developer proposed, and the developer agreed, no mitigation contribution would be expected for the reduction from the developer-proposed ratio, as requested by the County.
List of Standard Infrastructure Improvements/Contributions for Site Plans:

1. New curb and gutter, with street paving/repaving and striping as required, along all site frontages
2. New streetscape per applicable sector plan, Rosslyn-Ballston Corridor Streetscape Guidelines, or MTP, with sidewalk paving, street trees, new streetlights, and sometimes other street furniture along all site frontages; maintenance of sidewalks and street trees for life of project
3. Undergroofing of all aerial utilities along site frontages, with extensions offsite to appropriate poles or other underground service to continue network
4. Contribution to utility undergroofing fund based on $50,000/acre in December 2011 dollars, inflated annually by CPI to year of CB approval.
5. New or relocated parking meters or multimeters, with appropriate signs, as appropriate
6. Curb nubs at intersections and bus stops along site frontages as needed
7. Crosswalks and curb ramps as identified
8. Bus stops/shelters as needed; snow clearing to bus stop/shelters
9. Contributions toward traffic signals adjacent to site as needed (typically ½ of estimated cost)
10. Median construction/landscaping and/or maintenance for the life of the site plan as appropriate
11. Wet utility upgrades as planned and/or needed to serve the project
12. Provision of conduit for communications cable on all site frontages or portion as needed for planned network
13. Dedication of site area in public streets to back of curb to the County in fee (on request, developer receives density supported by that amount of site area in exchange)
14. Dedication of relevant easements to County—sidewalk easements from back of curb to back of sidewalk, necessary utility easements, negotiated public access or other easements
15. Provision of parking spaces to the public, usually for office buildings during non-business hours, but with some variations
16. A variety of items to minimize disruption and safety concerns for the public during construction—temporary lighting, maintenance of pedestrian access, street cleaning and patching, limitation of construction hours, off-street construction worker parking, etc.
Base TDM Requirements

1. Develop and implement a Transportation Management Plan (TMP).
2. Maintain an active relationship with Arlington Transportation Partners (ATP).
3. Designate a Property Transportation Coordinator (PTC) to be a primary point of contact with the county and undertake the responsibility for coordinating and completing all Transportation Management Plan (TMP) obligations.
4. Contribute to ACCS annual contribution based on a rate $0.06 per Sqft of GFA for commercial (office, retail, hotel) use and $0.035 per Sqft of GFA for residential use, escalated by CPI from the year 2008, per year for thirty (30) years.
5. Provide an information display kiosk in the lobby or lobbies.
6. Comply with requirements of Site Plan conditions to provide bicycle parking/storage facilities and develop a plan of operation of the bicycle facilities.
7. Comply with requirements of Site Plan conditions to provide construction worker parking.
8. Bus stops and shelters within 50 feet of the property and contiguous to the property shall be maintained free of snow, ice, trash, and debris.
9. Provide an ADA-compliant hotel van (with lift) to provide shuttle service to and from the nearest Metro station(s) for employees and guests. (hotel only, dependant on location).
10. Provide effective directional signage to direct residents and visitors to appropriate locations on the property.
11. Establish monthly parking rates for single occupant vehicles (SOV) consistent with comparable buildings located in the Arlington County development corridors.
12. Provide reserved, signed, spaces for carpools and vanpools.
13. Oversee program to provide registered vanpools with free parking and two and three+ person carpools with subsidized parking.
14. Provide a one-time membership (per unit) fee subsidy in car sharing (Residential).
15. Provide $65 SmarTrip card per person, for free, one time, to each resident (residential).
16. Provide $65 SmarTrip card for free, one time, to each tenant and building management employee in the building.
17. Provide a sustainable commute benefit program for each building employee of at least $70.00 per month. (hotel only)
18. Provide website links to CommuterPage.com® “transportation information.”
19. Distribute a new-resident/new-employee package no later than the day of move-in or first day of work.
20. Place a reference to nearest Metro station in promotional materials (hotel only).
21. Make available (sell) transit fares at front desk (hotel only).
22. Distribute ACCS provided information up to four times per year to all residents, tenants, employees, and visitors and participate in regionally sponsored clean air, transit, and traffic mitigation promotions requested by ACCS.
23. Participate and pay for a transportation performance monitoring study at two years, five years, and each subsequent five years.
24. Submit an annual report describing the TDM related activities of the site, and continuous reports of changes in commercial tenants during each year.
### Office Site Plans and Approved Parking Ratios by Area
#### 2005 – Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE PLAN CASE #</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME &amp; ADDRESS</th>
<th>PROJECT APPROVAL DATE</th>
<th>PROJECT STATUS</th>
<th>OFFICE SQ. FT. (GFA)</th>
<th># OF PARKING SPACES</th>
<th>APPLICABLE MIN. (STANDARD) PARKING RATIO</th>
<th>APPROVED PARKING RATIO (1/XXX SQ. FT.)</th>
<th>BELOW MINIMUM STANDARD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRYSTAL CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #400</td>
<td>Monument View (Boeing) (9) 608 South Ball St.</td>
<td>10/18/2011</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
<td>453,422</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #346</td>
<td>Potomac Yards – Land Bay C (5) Jefferson Davis Highway</td>
<td>12/18/2007</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>1,064,298</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #346</td>
<td>Potomac Yards – Land Bay E West 3500 South Clark Street</td>
<td>4/21/2007</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>374,379</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #421</td>
<td>1900 Crystal Drive (6) 1900 Crystal Drive</td>
<td>9/15/2012</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>719,704</td>
<td>732 (5)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRYSTAL CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRYSTAL CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENTAGON CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #297</td>
<td>Pentagon Centre Phase I 1201 South Hayes Street</td>
<td>7/21/2008</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>489,911</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data prepared by the Planning Division, Department of Community Planning, Housing & Development, Arlington County Commercial Parking Working Group, 04/24/13
| CRYSTAL CITY + PENTAGON CITY | 3,101,714 | 4,198 | 1/739 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROSSLYN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SP #18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SP #335</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SP #409</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SP #419</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROSSLYN</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data prepared by the Planning Division, Department of Community Planning, Housing & Development, Arlington County Commercial Parking Working Group, 04/24/13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE PLAN CASE #</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME &amp; ADDRESS</th>
<th>PROJECT APPROVAL DATE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>OFFICE SQ. FT. (GFA)</th>
<th># OF PARKING SPACES</th>
<th>APPLICABLE MIN. (STANDARD) PARKING RATIO</th>
<th>APPROVED PARKING RATIO (1/XXX SQ. FT.)</th>
<th>BELOW MINIMUM STANDARD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROSSLYN – BALLSTON CORRIDOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLSTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #20</td>
<td>Two Liberty Center (2) 801 N. Randolph St.</td>
<td>1/29/2002</td>
<td>Completed and occupied</td>
<td>183,914</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #401</td>
<td>Peck/Staples Office Building 900 N. Glebe Rd.</td>
<td>2/23/2008</td>
<td>Completed and occupied</td>
<td>415,816</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #413</td>
<td>Founder’s Square (DARPA Office Building) 675 N. Randolph St.</td>
<td>7/19/2008</td>
<td>Completed and occupied</td>
<td>355,530</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #413</td>
<td>Founder’s Square (North Office Bldg.) (7) 707 N. Randolph St.</td>
<td>1/22/2011</td>
<td>Completed and occupied</td>
<td>418,810</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLSTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA SQUARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #386</td>
<td>Crimson (formerly the Arlington Funeral Home) 3901 N. Fairfax Dr.</td>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>178,131</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA SQUARE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARENDON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #397</td>
<td>Clarendon Center (North &amp; South Office Buildings) (3)</td>
<td>6/13/2006</td>
<td>Completed and occupied</td>
<td>220,919</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>759 (North) 451 (South)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data prepared by the Planning Division, Department of Community Planning, Housing & Development, Arlington County Commercial Parking Working Group, 04/24/13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wilson Blvd., N. Highland St., 11th St., N. Garfield St.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP #418</td>
<td>Penzance Office 3001 Washington Blvd.</td>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
<td>284,012</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLARENDON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>504,931</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE PLAN CASE #</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME &amp; ADDRESS</td>
<td>PROJECT APPROVAL DATE</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>OFFICE SQ. FT. (GFA)</td>
<td># OF PARKING SPACES</td>
<td>APPLICABLE MIN. (STANDARD) PARKING RATIO</td>
<td>APPROVED PARKING RATIO (1/XXX SQ FT.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP# 263</td>
<td>Clean Technology Bldg. (10) 2311 Wilson Blvd.</td>
<td>12/8/2012</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>165,686</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #382</td>
<td>National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) Major Site Plan Amendment (8) 1840 Wilson Blvd. at N. Rhodes St.</td>
<td>11/15/2008 (original approval 2005)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>107,590</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURTHOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA SQ. + CLARENDON + COURTHOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLSTON + VIRGINIA SQ. + CLARENDON + COURTHOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP #106</td>
<td>Randolph Square (4) South Randolph Street</td>
<td>9/16/2006</td>
<td>Completed and Occupied</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1/346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) This table includes new site plan approvals and major site plan amendments for office projects or the office components of mixed-use projects. All data are for the office component only and does not include retail GFA or retail parking, except for the Clean Technology Building. TDM Elements and Project Benefits are examples taken from site plan reports. These lists are not exhaustive. Every project is evaluated on a case-by-case basis, in the context of adopted plans and policies at the time of approval. (The term “community benefits” is not defined in the Zoning Ordinance but is commonly used to describe contributions and improvements made by the developer to mitigate the impacts of additional height and density).

(2) Data from November 2002 Major Site Plan amendment.

(3) 38,664 sq. ft. of office density associated with the Old Dominion Building excluded from parking requirements based on the Clarendon Sector Plan.

(4) 1/379 parking ratio approved in a Phased Development Site Plan Amendment in 2000

(5) Parking count excludes 124 tandem spaces

(6) Parking count includes tandem and mechanically managed spaces

(7) Data from January 2011 Major Site Plan Amendment.

(8) Data from November 2008 Major Site Plan Amendment.

(9) Data from October 2011 Major Site Plan Amendment.

(10) Density includes office and retail; child care, conference center, fitness center (11,100 sq. ft.) which were excluded from density calculation.
FAQs: The Reduced Parking Policy for Site Plan Office Buildings

December, 2013

Q: Why does the County need this policy?
A: Since the late 2000s many site plan office buildings were approved with less parking than the County’s minimum site plan ratios stated in the Zoning Ordinance. The County Board often required the developers to mitigate the impacts of building less parking than the standard by requiring additional transportation demand management measures or transportation infrastructure, but there was not a formalized process for assessing the appropriate amount of mitigation. On January 21, 2012, the County Board directed the County Manager to develop a clear and consistent methodology to evaluate site-specific parking ratios and methodologies for mitigating the impacts of parking reductions in association with site plan applications for office buildings.

Q: What will this policy change?
A: This policy provides a process to follow when developers propose to provide less parking spaces for office buildings (or the office portion of a mixed-use project) than one of three parking ratios established in the Policy. The Policy states that developers must mitigate the impact of reduced parking starting at 1 space per 1:1,000 sq. ft. in areas eligible for rezoning in “C-O- Rosslyn” and “C-O-Crystal City,” at 1 space per 975 sq. ft. for Pentagon City, and at 1 space per 630 sq. ft. for other areas of the County eligible for building site plan office buildings. In order to mitigate the impact of building less parking then these amounts, the developer would compensate the County for increased transportation services or supply additional transportation programs themselves. The amount of contribution is based on an escalating scale depending on the amount of reduced parking spaces requested by the developer. The purpose of these mitigation measures is to ensure that adequate transportation improvements are provided to support office workers traveling to and from office buildings via methods other than single occupancy vehicles.

Q: Is this new policy based on any existing County policy?
A: This policy is in accordance with Policy 6 of the Parking and Curb Space Management Element of the Master Transportation Plan, “Ensure that minimum parking needs are met and excessive parking is not built. Divert resources saved by reducing excess off-street parking to other community benefits.”

Q: What part of the County will it impact?
A: The parking requirements apply to specific Zoning Districts that allow site plan projects with office uses. These are mainly located in development areas near metro stations.

Q: What was the public input into developing the process?
A: The County Manager appointed the Commercial Parking Working Group (CPWG) with members from the Planning, Transportation, and Environment and Energy Conservation Commissions, the development industry, the Civic Federation, The National Association of Industrial and Office Parks (NAIOP), the Chamber of Commerce, a large employer, residents-at-large and County staff. The Working Group met 11 times and conducted six outreach sessions between January and July, 2013.
Q: Will developers be able to build as little parking as they want?
A: The developers will propose the amount of parking based on market and site conditions. The Policy requires developers to mitigate the impact of reduced parking by offsetting increased transportation costs and the costs of encouraging motorists to use non-SOV modes of travel. Staff will evaluate each proposal. In certain cases, such as conflicts with other County policies or goals or because of unusual site or project characteristics, certain proposed ratios may not be appropriate or approved.

Q: How will the impact of the developer’s reduced parking be mitigated?
A: In three ways. Depending on what is appropriate for the particular situation, the impacts will be mitigated beyond what would be needed to accommodate a project with the standard parking ratio by the construction of transportation infrastructure by the developer or the County (for example bus stops or additional bicycle or pedestrian improvements), by additional transit services and/or by additional transportation demand management programs that encourage commuters to use non-single-occupant vehicle modes of travel.

Q: If developers are allowed to build less parking than the standard, will this result in more outside vehicles parking in the residential neighborhoods?
A: No. Because of the mitigating programs, there should be no more employees driving to the area, than there are parking spaces in the garage.

Q: How does the Residential Permit Parking program protect the residential communities from outside parkers?
A: The Residential Permit Parking Program is available to protect residential streets from an overflow of cars from outside the neighborhood, in this case by employees in nearby office buildings. Only residents and their guests displaying County-issued permits or passes are allowed to park on permit parking blocks during restricted time limits.

Q: Will there be an evaluation of this policy after it is put in place?
A: The CPWG proposed that the Policy have an internal staff evaluation every five years. And a formal review with public input every ten years.

Q: Where can I find more information?
A: On the County Website (www.arlingtonva.us). Type “Commercial Parking” in the Search field.