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Overview

A hallmark of the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) is its transportation concurrency requirement. Concurrency requires the provision of adequate facilities to serve new development. The GMA leaves the implementation of concurrency to local discretion. As a result, jurisdictions have developed a wide range of programs that are compatible with their own unique transportation, land use, and other planning goals.

In developing Destination 2030, the region’s long-range transportation plan, concurrency was discussed at great length as a tool for linking land use and transportation. The discussion brought out a need to clarify the intent of the requirement, and to improve the integration of concurrency programs with other GMA goals.

This report summarizes a workshop held in November 2002 to assess the opinions of elected officials, local jurisdiction staff, and interested parties on a range of local, regional, and state issues related to concurrency. Participants worked in small groups to discuss these issues, and to develop short-term and long-term recommendations.

The workshop served as the third and final investigative phase of a three-phase project to further understand how transportation concurrency is being conducted in the region. These proceedings reflect the opinions of the participants and provide fifteen preliminary recommendations to the Regional Council and its members on existing concurrency practices.

Regional Council staff, with guidance from the Regional Staff Committee, will develop a final report that compiles and combines the findings and recommendations from the three phases of work. The final report will be developed in early 2003, and will be used to guide the discussion of the recommendations that will be brought to the Regional Council’s policy boards. The recommendations will primarily relate to the role of the Regional Council, but may include local and state recommendations as well.
I. Introduction

Concurrency Overview

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) requires that transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate development be available when the impacts of development occur. “Concurrency” for transportation facilities is defined in the GMA and the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) to mean that any needed transportation improvements or programs be in place at the time of development or that a financial commitment exists to complete the improvements or strategies within six years. Local governments have a significant amount of flexibility regarding how to apply transportation concurrency within their plans, regulations, and permit systems.

As part of the requirement to develop a comprehensive plan, jurisdictions are required to establish level-of-service standards for arterials, transit service, and other facilities. Once a jurisdiction sets a standard, it is used to determine whether the impacts of a proposed development can be met through existing capacity and/or to decide what level of mitigation will be required.

Transportation is the only area of concurrency that specifies denial of development. If existing capacity is exceeded, jurisdictions are required to prohibit development approval unless transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development are made concurrent with the development. Even here, though, the WAC states that if the development is consistent with the comprehensive plan’s land use element, the level-of-service standard should be reevaluated.

A Regional Perspective. Although most concurrency and level-of-service work is done at the local level, state law provides for regionwide perspectives. State legislation requires Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs) to review of level-of-service methodologies used by cities and counties to promote a consistent regional evaluation of transportation facilities and corridors. RTPOs are also required to work with cities, counties, transit agencies, the department of transportation, and others to develop level-of-service standards or alternative transportation performance measures.

Problem Statement

Concurrency requirements underlie a fundamental premise of the GMA – that growth should occur where adequate facilities and infrastructure exist or are planned to exist. However, since the passage of the GMA, the public sector’s ability to build transportation infrastructure has diminished, due to funding constraints and other factors, such as endangered species requirements. The inability to make needed infrastructure available, combined with a growing population and increasing trips, has pushed many jurisdiction’s transportation facilities to their adopted level-of-service standards.

---

1 Planning Goals [RCW 36.70A.020 (12)]; Transportation Elements [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b); RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(C)]
3 Development Regulations [WAC 365-195-835(3)(d)(i) and 835(3)(d)(ii)]. The Growth Management Hearings Boards reiterated the role of a concurrency program, finding that “the concept of concurrency is not an end in and of itself but a foundation for local governments to achieve the coordinated, consistent, sustainable growth called for by the Act.” Taxpayers for Responsible Government v. City of Oak Harbor. No. 96-2-0002. July 16, 1996.
4 Regional Transportation Planning Organization’s Duties [RCW 47.80.023 (7) and (8)]
While the GMA requires jurisdictions to adopt level-of-service standards for transportation facilities, it also provides for changing the standard if jurisdictions so choose. Not surprisingly, most jurisdictions are reluctant to change standards they have already adopted following analysis work and public process. Nevertheless, the reality of the lack of funding and other hindering factors may lead jurisdictions to the decision that the adopted standards need to be lowered.

Compounding the situation is the fact that for most jurisdictions, control of level-of-service is only partially in their hands. Pass-through traffic and impacts from development in surrounding jurisdictions can increase local traffic and thereby dramatically affect the level-of-service. Additionally, highways of statewide significance are legally exempt from concurrency requirements. The justification for this is reasonable—they are the backbone of the transportation network and therefore should not be subject to the myriad local standards. Nonetheless, the impacts from traffic generated by these facilities can have a dramatic effect on local systems.

Lastly, jurisdictions are actively working to implement their comprehensive plans, and a number of the plans call for concentrating growth in their “centers.” However, this concentration leads to greater numbers of people and trips in these center areas, creating a situation where the level-of-service begins to decline precisely where a jurisdiction wants to foster growth. This challenge perhaps suggests that jurisdictions should develop more flexible and tailored concurrency programs.

During the process of updating the long-range transportation plan for the central Puget Sound region, Destination 2030, staff from many jurisdictions expressed the sentiments noted above. While most agree that the concept of concurrency has utility, many also expressed the belief that transportation concurrency requirements, in practice, fall somewhere between meaningless and harmful. Based upon these concerns and the defined role for regional transportation planning organizations noted in the previous chapter, the Puget Sound Regional Council developed a three-phased work program to assess the effectiveness of transportation concurrency programs throughout the region.

### Three-Phase Work Plan

To assess the impact of transportation concurrency, Regional Council staff, working with input from members of the Regional Staff Committee, focused on how local jurisdictions are addressing the requirement. This involved working primarily with local government staff. Also involved were members of the Regional Council’s policy boards and committees, which represent a more diverse set of organizations and agencies.

**Phase 1** surveyed jurisdictions in the four-county region to determine whether they have programs in place, to understand how they are using them and whether they are working collaboratively, and to determine whether they believe changes are necessary. The Regional Council sent a survey to all 86 jurisdictions in the four-county region, 68 of whom responded. Phase 1 was completed in January 2002.

**Phase 2** reviewed and analyzed the concurrency programs for a select number of jurisdictions, highlighting innovative methods, describing best practices, and assessing the different approaches in place. The Regional Council conducted focus groups with staff from 20 jurisdictions, reviewed the adopted concurrency reports, and posted them online.

---

5. The Puget Sound Regional Council serves as the growth and transportation planning agency for the central Puget Sound region. The Council’s membership includes King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties, 70 of the 82 cities and towns within these counties, three ports, the Washington State Department of Transportation, and the Transportation Commission.

6. The committee includes senior-level staff from member jurisdictions and transit agencies.

7. All of the concurrency reports are posted at [http://www.psrc.org/projects/growthstrategies/concurrency.htm](http://www.psrc.org/projects/growthstrategies/concurrency.htm).
rency regulations from these same jurisdictions, and conducted a detailed case study review of Growth Management Hearings Board and Washington Appeals Court cases related to concurrency. Phase 2 was completed in August 2002.

Phase 3 enlarged the outreach effort to assess the opinions of local jurisdiction staff and interested parties about a range of local, regional, and state issues related to concurrency. In order to meet this goal, the Regional Council hosted a full-day workshop. The November 2002 workshop included brief presentations, with the majority of the time being spent in small group discussions.
II. Workshop Description

The full-day workshop was held in Bellevue, Washington on November 13, 2002. Members of the Growth Management Policy Board, Transportation Policy Board, Regional Staff Committee, and other interested parties were invited. More than 90 people participated, including staff from the Washington State Department of Transportation and staff from the region’s transit agencies.

A group of speakers made brief presentations to help set the context for the ensuing small group discussions. Speakers included local and national experts, including former Washington state agency officials, a transportation planning consultant currently working on a concurrency study for local jurisdictions in the region, a local print media journalist, a Growth Management Hearings Board member, and a concurrency consultant from Florida.

Participants spent the majority of the day working in eight small groups to discuss a range of issues that had been identified in the first two phases of work. This included proposals for a number of ways to improve local concurrency programs, and to identify ways the region and state can be more effective. The topics were divided among the eight groups, and revolved around the following set of questions:

(A) Should methodologies be more consistent?
(B) Should jurisdictions tailor their programs, and should they work together to tailor standards across the region to focus growth?
(C) Should jurisdictions set development-related charges and fees higher, and would working together help in setting rates and fees higher?
(D) Should jurisdictions share revenues to more equitably address cross-jurisdictional impacts?
(E) Should jurisdictions coordinate on data, design and standards to address cross-jurisdictional impacts from local facilities?
(F) How should local jurisdictions address state facility impacts in their programs, with a separate discussion on clarifying how should highways not of “statewide significance” be addressed?
(G) Should the Regional Council have a role in concurrency, and should the role be focused on supporting local programs?
(H) Should the Regional Council’s role include developing a regional program?
(I) Should development-related charges be more flexible to allow funds to be used for ongoing projects or programs such as transit service or demand management programs?
(J) Should “exemptions” explicitly be made legal or not, and should transit facilities be made exempt?
(K) Should interjurisdictional coordination requirements be strengthened, or should already-authorized approaches such as interlocal agreements be used instead?

A set of worksheets was provided to participants to help facilitate discussions. These worksheets condensed and summarized the issues provided in the pre-workshop handout mailed to participants before the workshop. With each issue (local, regional, and state), specific questions were posed, and potential actions presented for discussion. Participants discussed the issues and actions and, ultimately, provided answers to the questions. An overarching question that was included in the
discussions was identifying those actions that are most appropriate in the short-term versus long-term. A full matrix of the issues and actions is provided in Appendix B.

The results from the small group discussions were compiled by Regional Council staff and were sent to participants for review and comment. The workshop results provide guidance to the Regional Council’s assessment project for developing recommendations for how local governments can use the existing concurrency tool. The results also provide the framework for considering where regional policy and/or state law can be enhanced to provide greater clarity and direction. As appropriate, formal recommendations will be developed in the final report, which is scheduled to be completed in early 2003.
III. Summary of Presentations

This section summarizes the presentations and keynote address made at the workshop.

Whit Blanton: “Lessons from Florida”

Biography: Whit Blanton is vice president and founding principal in the Renaissance Planning Group, a transportation and land use planning consulting firm based in Florida. Mr. Blanton chairs the American Planning Association’s Transportation Planning Division and the TEA-21 Reauthorization Task Force.

Whit Blanton offered insights from his work as a transportation concurrency consultant in Florida, the only other state in the U.S. with a concurrency law.

- Florida’s approach is top down, affecting water, sewer systems, transportation and schools. The state sets minimum standards, but there is a fair amount of flexibility in how these are applied.

- On the positive side, Blanton said that the concurrency requirement has forced many “recalcitrant” jurisdictions to develop comprehensive plans.

- On the negative, some jurisdictions have adopted a “checklist approach” that is not tied to a community vision. Blanton suggested that concurrency is most effective when used to promote a community’s land use vision.

Initially, concurrency requirements ended up encouraging sprawl in Florida, pushing development to the less congested urban fringe. After a number of fixes, the current law allows cities to exempt developments in “exception areas” to create more compact urban communities and promote public transportation. One of Florida’s recent initiatives is to develop a Transportation Quality of Service methodology to address non-auto modes of transportation, including transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel.

- When applied to concurrency in the form of designated Multimodal Transportation Districts, this methodology allows local governments to give primary emphasis to non-auto level of service, and secondary importance to roads in the calculation of concurrency.

- This is taken to mean the local government can measure the level of service for non-auto modes, identify system deficiencies and needed capital projects, and require new development to mitigate its impacts through improvements identified in the list of capital improvements. Measures include accessibility, connectivity and facility safety, comfort and convenience.

- The state has developed the methodology and guidelines, and locals must prepare an annual or biannual report on progress achieved for Multimodal Transportation Districts.

Blanton noted that while concurrency is an important tool to help pay the costs of new growth, it’s not appropriate for the “catch-up” and “keep-up” costs needed to maintain the current transportation system.

Steve Wells: “Concurrency in the Growth Management Act: Local Issues & Challenges”

Biography: Steve Wells is a former Assistant Director of the Local Government Division at the Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development. He currently owns and operates Evergreen Rowing LLC, a rowing shell company. Mr. Wells worked for King County’s Department of Parks, Planning and Resources, before working for the state. He currently serves on the Board of the Capital Land Trust.
Steve Wells noted that most jurisdictions have opted for lowering the level-of-service on their roads (allowing more congestion) rather than asking citizens to pay for improvements. And that choice is acceptable within the law.

- As an example of the challenges of local control, he described a controversy surrounding Kitsap County’s comprehensive plan. The County’s first version of the plan called for “one-acre lots from Hood Canal to Puget Sound,” but did not show the costs required to serve that sort of land use pattern.

- The case eventually went to mediation, and it was acknowledged that the costs were not included in the plan because they were far above what would be politically acceptable.

Wells also described a statewide study of capital facilities plans to determine the state’s total financial needs for infrastructure.

- The study found that two thirds of the plans were either “useless” or just “marginally useful” in accounting for costs. Only a third were actually useful.

Wells observed that we have “a long way to go technically and professionally” to fully meet the planning requirements of the Growth Management Act.

**Eric Pryne: “Concurrency: A Layperson’s Perspective”**

**Biography:** Eric Pryne is a journalist at the Seattle Times. He was a Washington, D.C. correspondent for three years, and spent three years as lead reporter on the Times’ “Front Porch Forum” project. Mr. Pryne was a finalist for a Pulitzer Prize in 1993.

Eric Pryne as part of a Seattle Times series on the Growth Management Act, wrote a story on concurrency, which generated a number of responses from readers.

- He noted that many of the readers, right or wrong, felt that concurrency was a “bait and switch”, meaning that government had not required new growth to pay for itself, as was promised.

- Many also believed that they would “get the roads - or buses or bike paths - to maintain mobility as they crowded closer together.” But that has not happened.

Pryne suggested that building trust may be an important, and perhaps overlooked, factor that needs to be considered in attempts to fix concurrency.

**Joe Tovar: “Concurrency in Central Puget Sound: Guideposts from the Case Law”**

**Biography:** Joe Tovar chairs the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board. He was appointed in 1992 and was reappointed in 1998. Mr. Tovar was the Planning Director for the City of Kirkland from 1979 to 1992. He guest lectures in the Department of Urban Design and Planning at the University of Washington and is a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners.

Joe Tovar offered information on decisions by the Hearings Boards related to concurrency, citing key cases and the lessons to be learned from them.

In *West Seattle Defense Fund v. City of Seattle*, the Defense Fund argued that the city set an inappropriate level of service, allowing too much congestion.
• The Hearings Board found that the city had complied with the law by establishing a methodology and standards that measure the level of service for arterials and transit routes.

• Establishing a level-of-service standard is all that the Growth Management Act requires. Changing a “desired” level of service is a “policy decision left to the discretion of local elected officials.”

In Jody L. McVittie v. Snohomish County, the petitioner argued that the performance of state-owned facilities should be included in concurrency analysis of the linked county road network.

• The Hearings Board found that the Growth Management Act’s concurrency goals do not apply to the state-owned facilities, because the law says that the goals “shall be used exclusively for the purpose of guiding the development of comprehensive plans and development regulations.”

• In his concurring opinion, however, Mr. Tovar noted that, “Without better coordination between the State and local governments and serious investments in the State’s road network, there is a serious risk that the promise of growth management in this region will unravel.”

In Bennett, et al. v. City of Bellevue, the Hearings Board found that the city had erroneously exempted commercial development from concurrency requirements.

• The city argued that the exemption was an attempt to reconcile the Growth Management Act’s anti-sprawl goals and its concurrency goal.

• The hearings board found that the exemption was not allowed. Bellevue could have lowered the level-of-service standard instead, and would have met the requirements of the law.

While there are other cases, he pointed to these three as providing some clear guidance on concurrency practices and interpretations.

Daniel Carlson: “Eastside Transportation Concurrency Study — Overview”

Biography: Dan Carlson is the director of Public Service Clinics at the University of Washington, and is a professor and researcher at University of Washington’s Evans School of Public Affairs. He has authored several books and studies that address transportation corridor management, land use and transportation linkages, and interjurisdictional cooperation. Mr. Carlson is part of the University’s Transportation Center (TRAC) team working on the Eastside Transportation Concurrency Study.

Dan Carlson described the Eastside Transportation Concurrency Projects, a two-year assessment of how concurrency is managed in the cities of Bellevue, Redmond, Kirkland, and Issaquah. The study is evaluating the extent to which meeting concurrency requirements assists the four cities in complying with the state’s Growth Management Act and the region’s VISION 2020 growth strategy.

Carlson observed that the main question of concurrency is: what level of service do you want?

• If you want a high level of service, realize that there are ramifications. An unintended consequence can be sprawl, instead of focusing growth within the urbanized area.

• He noted the four Eastside cities represent a continuum of level of service, with Kirkland having the highest level-of-service and Issaquah the lowest.

8 For more information, go to http://depts.washington.edu/trac/concurrency/index.html
Carlson also noted that many people believe that “concurrency is a local affair,” when in reality, we all travel within a regional “travel shed.”

The Eastside Transportation Concurrency Project will also investigate alternative measures of transportation concurrency and suggest what changes, if any, to state and local laws would provide more effective ways of dealing with concurrency issues.
IV. Summary of Key Themes and Recommendations

This section summarizes the small group discussions and arranges the results as themes and recommendations. During the discussions, similar comments were made in the different groups. These comments are arranged as key themes and recommendations, and reflect the discussions and sentiments of the workshop participants. The themes and recommendations are organized using the local, regional, and state structure used during the workshop, with an additional “overall” section for those concepts that have a relationship to all three levels of jurisdiction.

Given the number of issue topics, each small group discussed two of the six local issues. All of the tables were scheduled to discuss all of the regional and state issues; however, time limitations prevented a number of the groups from covering each of the issues.

Overall Themes

• **The law needs no major changes.** Most participants believed that the concurrency requirement, on the whole, is not working as well as they would like, but there was a strong majority of support for leaving the requirement as is and for letting jurisdictions continue to work together (in other words, letting the state of the practice mature). There were some issues where small refinements could help.

• **Concurrency should remain a local tool, but recognize that there are interjurisdictional implications.** There was acknowledgement that local transportation networks are impacted by what is happening in neighboring jurisdictions and vice versa. However, there was no consensus on how local jurisdictions should interface with each other’s programs, and mixed messages regarding what roles exist for agencies other than local jurisdictions. For example, there was a strong sentiment that “outside” roles should provide guidance and information, but remain advisory and not be prescriptive.

• **Changes should be made by using carrots, not sticks.** Where there was agreement that changes needed to be made to local programs, an incentive-based approach would likely be more effective, and acceptable, than a regulatory approach. This sentiment and approach was reiterated in discussions of how jurisdictions can work together at larger geographies.

• **Concurrency should be more multimodal.** Primarily, this translated into better integrating transit service into concurrency programs. There was agreement that a number of complicated issues such as creating a nexus between development payments and commitments to transit service levels and extending the transit planning horizons to be more in harmony with long range planning need to be resolved to make this work. There was also support for nonmotorized and demand management components at a conceptual level. However, some skepticism existed as to whether these were significant enough to warrant the effort.

• **Public understanding and acceptance continues to grow in importance.** Participants agreed that concurrency would always be something of a “black box,” but felt that making the programs more transparent and more fact-driven, as opposed to negotiated, is critical. Participants expressed concerns that jurisdictions sometimes were perceived to “cook the books.” Consistent
definitions would help alleviate concerns, and build trust. Some examples included: a level-of-service “D” should mean “D” everywhere, and calculations of volume and capacity should always incorporate permitted developments and funded projects (or not) – but that this should be the same in each jurisdiction.

• **The development approval and mitigation components of concurrency can be separated, and perhaps should be.** Throughout the day, participants noted that they had different opinions on how issues should be addressed for these two components. For example, the discussion of exemptions indicated that some uses should always be allowed (meaning they would be exempt from the development approval component), but the impacts arising from the development still needed to be addressed (meaning they might not be exempt from the mitigation component).

**Overall Recommendations**

1. No major changes need to be made to the law at this time – concurrency practices should be allowed to mature. Jurisdictions should work together to resolve differences. Continued technical assistance and additional resources are necessary.

2. Incentives are important, as is building public trust and understanding.

3. Transit service should be better integrated into concurrency programs.

**Local Themes**

• **Coordination is necessary, but should be pursued locally.** The majority of the participants felt that coordination was very important, and that the most effective approach would be to work with adjacent jurisdictions. Long-term, however, many felt that coordinating at the corridor or the subarea level would become more important. There was general agreement that jurisdictions should coordinate on data issues, then design and funding issues, and lastly on level-of-service standards. Others felt that the issues were too intertwined to separate in this manner. They believed that they should be worked on together, but in a slow, non-prescriptive manner, when specific issues were on the table.

• **Jurisdictions should work towards more consistent and compatible methodologies in a non-prescriptive manner.** Opinions were mixed, some wanting more consistency, some cautioning against a “one-size-fits-all” approach. Participants indicated that jurisdictions would need technical assistance and resources, which may require additional funding. There was the sentiment that specific goals and objectives should be identified when doing the work, so that it has value and is worth the effort.

**Local Recommendations**

4. Jurisdictions should work more closely with one another at the policy level to resolve issues. Jurisdictions should continue to pursue interlocal agreements, where necessary, to resolve issues in a mutually agreeable manner.
5. Jurisdictions should coordinate on data issues in the short-term, and seek to ensure that programs are more compatible, information is shared, and that definitions are more consistent. A consistent reporting mechanism may help with information sharing and coordination.

6. Jurisdictions should coordinate on funding and revenue issues. This will be more successful if jurisdictions charge higher development fees (creating more funding that can be shared), than if they seek to share existing, limited resources. Another key to success will be having a more consistent approach to mitigation and cost analysis.

7. Jurisdictions should tailor their programs so that requirements (such as service standards and/or development fees) are minimized in target areas in order to focus growth. In a voluntary manner, they should coordinate on this with other jurisdictions.

8. A limited, but stronger, role exists for countywide and multi-county planning in the concurrency process. Countywide and multi-county work should be incremental, provide guidance, and has the potential to set reasonable “bookends” for how concurrency is practiced within counties or subareas.

Regional Themes

- **The Regional Council has an important support role to play.** Participants believed that concurrency should continue to be locally controlled. However, there was a lot of support for the Regional Council continuing the work it is doing, and being a forum for discussions. Participants primarily supported technical assistance, information sharing on best practices, monitoring, and other data efforts.

- **The Regional Council may have a larger role when it comes to regionally significant issues.** While participants did not see the need for a regional concurrency program, many participants did agree that some issues (such as regional growth centers or corridor planning) would benefit from the “larger perspective” that the Regional Council would bring.

Regional Recommendations

9. In the short-term, the Regional Council should develop a “cookbook” of detailed methodologies, to help with consistency and compatibility. The methods should be non-prescriptive, science-based, scalable, multimodal, and transparent to the public. Jurisdiction buy-in and support will be important to developing a good product, rather than a report that “sits on the shelf.”

10. The Regional Council should create a “clearinghouse” for concurrency-related information. This could include a central place for data, and best practices information on a range of topics including modeling, interlocal agreements, impact fees, and multimodal methodologies to assist with coordination. Pilot programs were also identified as potentially being helpful.

11. The Regional Council should continue to support local programs with technical assistance and monitoring. Support for an annual or multi-year “snapshot” of the transportation system that can be used in local concurrency programs. This might take the form of a
standardized area-wide assessment of volumes and capacity or travel times, as opposed to a development-specific assessment. This could build on local annual reporting efforts.

12. The Regional Council should further discuss what type of incentive approaches might be appropriate.

13. For regionally significant issues, the Regional Council should consider how the regional review and certification process could be used. The review would probably relate to countywide, as distinguished from local, planning documents.

State Themes

- **Exemptions can be useful and should be permitted in some fashion.** Almost all the participants agreed on the value of exemptions, however, they were split between changing the law to allow exemptions and wanting to wait to see what the courts or Hearings Boards decided on the issue. There was some sentiment that cases currently in the courts would soon shed light on the subject and provide guidance.

  - Comments were mixed on what types of uses should be exempted, but most felt that one characteristic should be that the uses should have a small impact. There was some sentiment to allow exemptions for certain districts, such as regional growth centers or downtowns.

  - On the subject of transit facilities, there was near consensus that they should be exempt from the development approval component of concurrency, but not necessarily the mitigation component; although many suggested that mitigation should perhaps occur through SEPA.

- **The State Department of Transportation’s role in concurrency should not change.** Jurisdictions continue to be concerned about the state’s inability to fund transportation projects, especially those that would provide some relief from the impacts of traffic on local roads that access and intersect state facilities. Participants were unanimous in thinking that the state should not have a role in determining local concurrency decisions. Participants are interested in greater clarity regarding highways that are not of statewide significance, but they did not specifically decide what the role should be.

State Recommendations

14. An exemption for transit facilities should be authorized. If exemptions are found invalid, changes to the law may be appropriate. Further discussion needs to occur on whether to allow exemptions for specific uses and/or subareas.

15. The State, along with Regional Transportation Planning Organizations, and local agencies should continue the work of better defining level-of-service for highways not of statewide significance.
V. Summary of the Discussions of Specific Issues and Potential Actions

This section summarizes the small group discussions at the workshop, and arranges the results by issue topic. As noted previously, given the number of issue topics, each table discussed two of the six local issues. All of the tables were scheduled to discuss all of the regional and state issues; however, time limitations prevented a number of them from covering each of the issues.

Comments are reported in generalized terms, and individual participants are not mentioned by name. The “conclusions” sections reflect the discussions and sentiments of the workshop participants. This summary is intended to supplement the more thorough small group discussion summaries provided in Appendix C.

Local (A) Debating Flexibility versus Consistency in Methodology

Issue: No two programs analyzed in the region are identical, and, in fact, very different approaches are being used. This points to the flexibility afforded to local governments but also hinders efforts at coordination leading to inefficiencies and frustration.

Questions: Should jurisdictions seek more consistent methodological approaches? If so, how consistent? At what jurisdictional level should this occur?

Conclusions: Three tables discussed this issue. Participants agreed that jurisdictions should seek more consistent methodological approaches, and believed that this would take resources and technical support. There was general support for developing a narrower range of methodologies, but use of the methodologies must allow for local choice, and must include significant local control. Participants supported developing a detailed “cookbook” that focuses a narrower range of approaches. Participants stressed the need for transparency, science, consistent terminology, and scalability for the methodologies. There was also support for developing a “clearinghouse” for data and best practices information.

Participants indicated that consistency is most important where the issues are similar, such as between adjacent jurisdictions. In some cases, they indicated the work might be appropriate within small subareas or along corridors. There was support for a limited countywide presence in concurrency, but a presence larger than currently exists.
Local (B)
Tailoring Programs and Standards to Implement the Growth Management Act

Issue: Concurrency practices can support both local and regional growth management goals, and growth arguably should occur where it is planned, even if it presents concurrency challenges. This might mean creating incentives and methods for allowing growth to be fostered in local and regional urban centers, and minimizing incentives for sprawl development.

Questions: Should jurisdictions tailor their programs to focus growth and investments? Should jurisdictions work together to tailor standards across the region? At what jurisdictional level should this occur?

Conclusions: Three tables discussed this issue. Participants strongly agreed that concurrency should be applied in a tailored manner within a jurisdiction. They expressed the sentiment that coordinating on tailoring was a laudable goal, but expressed skepticism, noting that the fear of losing local control would be a major obstacle to coordinating on this issue.

Participants did not provide specific guidance on how tailoring beyond the jurisdiction level might be accomplished. Suggestions indicated that countywide planning forums might be appropriate, but again skepticism prevented participants from thinking this was likely to be successful.

Local (C) Coordinating on Funding to Increase Revenues — “Growing the Pie”

Issue: Over 70 percent of the jurisdictions surveyed by Regional Council collect less than 10 percent of their revenues from development-related fees, and discussions with local staff indicate that jurisdictions are not requiring new growth to pay its full share. A primary reason is that jurisdictions want to remain competitive with other localities in attracting new development. By working together to set rates, jurisdictions could agree to collectively require a higher level of funds to mitigate a greater portion of the impact from a new development.

Questions: Should jurisdictions be more aggressive about collecting revenues? Should jurisdictions work together to be able to collect more revenues? At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?

Conclusions: Three tables discussed this issue. Participants agreed with the premise that they could be more aggressive in collecting funds, and there was some support for working together to set funding levels higher.

To make this work, participants indicated that there needs to be a clearer linkage between development fees and transportation projects (or programs), a need for better cost methodologies and better capital facilities planning, and more certainty in the process — especially if fees are set higher. Participants cautioned against overlooking other goals, such as low-income housing and supporting transit. While participants indicated that any coordination should occur primarily between adjacent jurisdictions, some noted that certain situations could lend themselves to corridor-level coordination.

A final theme was that revenues might be collected separately from concurrency, either through the SEPA process, or through direct mitigations, which some felt was “cleaner.”
Local (D) Coordinating on Funding to Equitably Share Revenues — “Sharing the Pie”

Issue: Trips cross jurisdictional boundaries, but programs focus almost exclusively on the impacts of development in the locality in which it occurs, meaning money usually does not follow the trips. Some potential benefits of sharing could include fairness, equity, and better coordination on common facilities. Sharing revenue would likely rely on a mix of technical, model-driven and/or policy-driven processes that involve identifying key facilities and pooling funds.

Questions: Should jurisdictions work together to share revenues? Should this be based upon tracking trips, pooling funds, identifying full buildout scenarios for different facilities? At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?

Conclusions: Three tables discussed this issue. Participants agreed that sharing revenue was an important next step in working together on concurrency. They generally agreed that this should be based on technical data (as opposed to a policy alone), and sharing should be based on impacts/trips.

Participants agreed that this would take significant work, and would require a great deal of agreement on challenging issues such as agreeing to the ultimate design of shared facilities, and agreeing on level-of-service standards. Other issues that arose were better integrating transit service, creating defensible revenue-sharing methodologies, and creating incentives to make the work happen. A common sentiment was that there needs to be enough money on the table to make this effort meaningful — and that efforts to “grow the pie” help make “sharing the pie” viable and worthwhile. Participants saw this as a local responsibility, and felt that it should be done when specific situations warrant the effort.

Local (E) Coordinating on Interjurisdictional Impact — Local Facilities

Issue: Traffic from local developments often has major impacts on other jurisdictions. The “impacted” jurisdiction does not receive funds and the trips, in the worst case, may cause another jurisdiction to not meet their concurrency standard. Separate from the money aspects, coordination on standards and design seems necessary for jurisdictions to better plan for growth and investments, to have more accurate programs, and to avoid being undermined by decisions made in other jurisdictions.

Questions: Should jurisdictions coordinate on data and standards issues? At what jurisdictional level should this occur?

Conclusions: Two tables discussed this issue. Participants at both tables clearly stated that the status quo is not acceptable. At the same time, they indicated that the work would be very challenging for political as well as technical reasons, and agreed that better tools and resources are needed to help coordination.

As a short-term goal, participants agreed that development-related information should be shared. They felt that jurisdictions should work together on design issues for shared facilities. In the long-term, participants indicated that jurisdictions will have to work together more on setting level-of-service standards — but the discussions must continue to support local choice and character. For both design and service standards, participants indicated that it makes sense to relate these discussions to larger geographies, but did not provide specifics on how this is to be done.
Local (F) Coordinating on Interjurisdictional Impacts — State Facilities

Issue: Transportation facilities and servers, which include highways of statewide significance (HSS), are exempt from concurrency requirements. Congestion “failures” on state routes do not force jurisdictions to deny development outright, but this congestion causes traffic shifts that greatly affect local streets. Funding does not necessarily follow trips from local jurisdictions onto state routes. Other state facilities (referred to as regional or “non-HSS”) are not addressed in the concurrency requirement. The lack of clarity for non-HSS creates uncertainty in how jurisdictions should work with the state on mitigating impacts.

Questions: How should jurisdictions address state facility impacts? Should local money be spent on state facilities? Should fees be collected specifically for state routes? Should the exemption for HSS be continued? What guidelines are most appropriate for how non-HSS facilities are addressed?

Conclusions: Two tables discussed this issue. Both tables clearly indicated that the state’s role in concurrency should not change, and that the state should not be involved in local land use decisions. Both tables agreed that the exemption for HSS should continue, and agreed the state needs to improve its facilities separate from concurrency. Participants also believed that, for the most part, local funds should not be spent on state facilities. However, there was some willingness to “match” state funds at major intersections with state facilities.

Participants generally agreed that the HSS exemption should not be extended to non-HSS facilities at this time. Rather, more dialogue and clarity would help. There was support for setting level-of-service standards for these facilities, perhaps at a district level, instead of just at a segment level.

Other suggestions included considering transit level-of-service on state highways, and considering local projects and forecasts in state priorities. Some suggested that the countywide planning groups might be a good forum for working with the state on these issues.

Regional (G) Regional Council Helping Local Programs

Issue: State law charges the Regional Council to “promote a consistent regional evaluation of transportation facilities” but is ambiguous as to how this is to be done. The majority of local jurisdiction staff who have participated in the Regional Council’s concurrency work indicated that multiple roles exist for a regional organization to help local jurisdictions to coordinate and improve their programs.

In the survey of local jurisdictions, conducted in Phase 1 of the project, over three quarters of the respondents indicated that providing information and guidance was appropriate, and more than half indicated that facilitating coordination and fostering interjurisdictional mitigation were appropriate roles.

Questions: Should the Regional Council help jurisdictions work together? If so, should the focus be on data and information, or should the Council play a larger role?

Conclusions: All eight tables discussed this issue. Participants at all the tables agreed that the Regional Council had an important support role to play to help them coordinate, and improve their jurisdictions’ programs. The focus of the Regional Council’s program should primarily be on data issues...
and technical assistance, but some sentiment exists for a non-prescriptive “larger” role, especially for regionally significant issues such as regional growth centers and corridor planning.

The Regional Council should continue the data work it is doing and perhaps help jurisdictions to share their own data and information more effectively. The Regional Council should also help promote best practices for preferred methodologies, transportation modeling, interlocal agreements, and multimodal planning. Finally, the Regional Council should be a forum for voluntary interjurisdictional discussions.

Regional (H) Regional Council Developing a Regional Program

**Issue:** The Regional Council could take actions on its own that might provide benefits to local governments. This could take the form of a regional evaluation of facilities for regional concurrency, and potentially using federal funds to address deficient facilities.

**Questions:** Should the Regional Council have its own concurrency program? If so, should this be focused on data and information sharing or take on a larger role?

**Conclusions:** All eight tables discussed this issue. Participants agreed that the Regional Council should focus its efforts on supporting local programs, not on creating a separate or parallel effort. As it supports local programs, the Regional Council should continue its efforts in the areas of performance monitoring, promoting regional growth centers, and providing incentives. Additional efforts can take the form of pilot programs and involvement with any countywide concurrency efforts.

State (I) Making Development-Related Charges More Flexible

**Issue:** Development-related charges such as SEPA and impact fees are important revenue sources that are dedicated to capital projects. Jurisdictions using impact fees are believe they are legally constrained from using these fees for ongoing programs such as transit or demand management that by their nature are more operations-oriented than capital-oriented.

**Question:** Should jurisdictions be allowed to use impact fees to fund “ongoing” projects or programs?

**Conclusions:** Five tables discussed this issue. Participants’ opinions were mixed, with some indicating that making the funds flexible added another “tool to the toolbox” and others thinking there would be public outcry against putting the money into programs instead of projects. In both cases, participants expressed strong concerns about nexus issues, and had little interest in pursuing the topic any further.

State (J) Making Exemptions Legal

**Issue:** Exemptions allow jurisdictions to foster those uses they deem important, especially in areas facing level-of-service failures. Rather than stop all types of development, jurisdictions exempt certain uses, treating the impact on the standard as the lesser issue, and giving these uses a competitive boost. Many jurisdictions include exemptions for uses such as non-profit day cares, libraries, or transit stations. However, recent legal rulings have made the use of exemptions uncertain.
Questions: Are exemptions a useful tool that should be legalized? How should this be done? Should transit facilities be exempt?

Conclusions: Six tables discussed this issue. Participants agreed that exemptions can be a useful tool but were evenly split on whether to try to change the law or to wait for the current court cases to be decided before moving on this issue.

In general, participants expressed the desire for exemptions but urged caution in how they might be structured. Most wanted clear definitions adopted at the state level, however, jurisdictions wanted the final choice on whether to adopt exemptions into their programs. For the most part, participants expressed support for creating exemptions for defined public uses that have public benefits, usually ones that have limited impacts. There was some discussion of creating exemptions for districts, or transit-oriented developments, but no clear consensus emerged.

Five of the six tables agreed that exemptions should be authorized for transit facilities, and the sixth table settled on “maybe.” Many participants clearly stated that a transit facility exemption should be from the development approval component of concurrency, but there were mixed sentiments regarding the mitigation component. In general, however, participants thought the SEPA process was a more appropriate venue for mitigating impacts.

State (K) Strengthening Interjurisdictional Coordination Requirements

Issue: Coordinating on pass-through traffic and funding has not been effectively addressed. Jurisdictions rarely include provisions for coordination in their concurrency ordinances and codes. Coordination is stated in the law, but the requirement either is not very clear or strong, or it is not well implemented.

Questions: Given the limited coordination, should a stronger coordination requirement be set? If so, how prescriptive should it be? What methods should be used to accomplish the coordination? At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?

Conclusions: Four tables discussed this issue. Participants reiterated the sentiments of the local session discussions that coordination is important and is not pursued often enough. However, there was little support for strengthening the requirement. Where coordination is appropriate, usually at the interlocal level between adjacent jurisdictions, the tools are available, as are good models. Some participants did note that some method is needed to get transit better integrated in the concurrency process. And some indicated that coordination should be pursued through countywide forums.
VI. Next Steps

This report completes the investigative phases of the concurrency assessment project. Regional Council staff, with guidance from the Regional Staff Committee, will develop a final report that compiles and combines the findings and recommendations from the three phases of work.

The final report will be developed in early 2003, and will be used to guide the discussion of the recommendations that will be brought to the Regional Council’s policy boards. The recommendations will primarily relate to the role of the Regional Council, but may include local and state recommendations as well.
Appendix A. Concurrency Workshop Agenda

The following Agenda was provided at the workshop.

8:30 a.m. Registration – Coffee and Pastries

9:00 a.m. Welcome and Opening Remarks
  - Welcome Connie Marshall, Mayor of Bellevue, Chair, Growth Management Policy Board
  - Introduction to the Workshop – Purpose & Expectations Mary McComber, Executive Director, PSRC

9:10 a.m. Overview for Morning Sessions
  - Concurrency in Washington’s Growth Management Act: Local Issues/Local Challenges
    Steve Wells, former Assistant Director, Office of Community Development, Olympia
  - Assessing the Effectiveness of Concurrency – Research on Local Programs in Central Puget Sound
    Ivan Miller, Puget Sound Regional Council
  - Lessons from Florida/Concurrency: Friend or Foe? – Response
    Whit Blanton, Renaissance Planning Group, Orlando, FL

9:30 a.m. Break-Out Sessions – Local Issues
  Track I
    A. Debating Flexibility versus Consistency in Methodology
    B. Tailoring Programs and Standards to Implement GMA
  Track II
    C. Coordination on Funding – Growing the Pie
    D. Coordination on Funding – Sharing the Pie
  Track III
    E. Coordination on Interjurisdictional Impacts – Local Facilities
    F. Coordination on Interjurisdictional Impacts – State Facilities

12:00 p.m. Lunch
  - “Concurrency: A Layperson’s Perspective” Eric Pryne, Seattle Times
    - Eastside Concurrency project – Overview Dan Carlson, UW

1:00 p.m. Overview for Afternoon Sessions
  - Concurrency in Central Puget Sound: Guideposts from the Case Law – Presentation
    Joe Tovar, AICP, Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board
  - Lessons from Florida/Concurrency: Opportunities and Possibilities – Response
    Whit Blanton, Renaissance Planning Group

1:15 p.m. Break-Out Sessions – Regional and State Issues
  Regional Issues, Regional Role
    G. Regional Council Helping Local Programs
    H. Regional Council Developing a Regional Program
  Looking at Our State Law: Is It Broken or an Underused Tool?
    I. Making Development-Related Charges More Flexible
    J. Making Exemptions Legal
    K. Strengthening Interjurisdictional Coordination Requirements

3:15 p.m. Pulling It All Together
  - Reporting Back from Small Groups Whit Blanton, Renaissance Planning Group
  - Observations and Closing Thoughts Whit Blanton, Renaissance Planning Group
  - Next Steps Mary McComber, Executive Director

4:00 p.m. Adjourn
Appendix B. Matrix of Issues and Potential Actions

The following matrix condenses the worksheets that were provided at the workshop to guide the small group discussions. The explanatory text is removed, but the full list the issue topics, questions, and potential actions are shown. Note that none of the table discussed all of the sets of issues.

I. Local Issues Sessions

Local (A) Debating Flexibility versus Consistency in Methodology

Questions:
- Should jurisdictions seek more consistent methodological approaches?
- If so, how consistent?
- At what jurisdictional level should this occur?

Actions:
1: Do not move towards standardizing.
2: Determine how to work together.
   - A: Move toward better information sharing and gathering.
   - B: Work toward common methodologies.
   - C: Work towards creating and adopting a standardized set of methodologies and measures, but allow each jurisdiction to select their own service standard.
3: Determine at what jurisdictional level to work together.
   - A: Coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions.
   - B: Coordinate through countywide or multi-county planning groups.

Local (B) Tailoring Programs and Standards to Implement GMA

Questions:
- Should jurisdictions tailor their programs to focus growth and investments?
- Should jurisdictions work together to tailor standards across the region?
- At what jurisdictional level should this occur?

Actions:
1: Leave decisions on tailoring to local choice.
2: Coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions.
3: Coordinate through countywide and multi-county groups.

Local (C) Coordinating on Funding to Increase Revenues – “Growing the Pie”

Questions:
- Should jurisdictions be more aggressive about collecting revenues?
- Should jurisdictions work together to be able to collect more revenues?
- At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?

Actions:
1: Continue to set fees locally and independently.
2: Determine how to work together.
   - A: Use consistent methods.
   - B: Use consistent percentages.
   - C: Use consistent rates.
3: Determine at what jurisdictional level to work together.
   - A: Coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions.
   - B: Coordinate through countywide or multi-county planning groups.
Local (D) Coordinating on Funding to Equitably Share Revenues – “Sharing the Pie”

Questions: Should jurisdictions work together to share revenues? Should this be based upon tracking trips, pooling funds, identifying full buildout scenarios for different facilities? At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur and how should this be done?

Actions:
1: Continue to set fees locally and independently.
2: Determine how to work together.
   A: Contribute a pre-defined percentage to a “pool.”
   B: Estimate trips and have dollars follow.
3: Determine at what jurisdictional level to work together.
   A: Coordinate on revenue-sharing agreements with adjacent jurisdictions.
   B: Coordinate on rate setting through countywide or multi-county planning groups.

Local (E) Coordinating on Interjurisdictional Impacts-Local Facilities

Questions: Should jurisdictions coordinate on data and standards issues? At what jurisdictional level should this occur?

Actions:
1: Leave the local approach as is.
2: Coordinate on key issues.
   A: Include new developments in one another’s traffic models.
   B: Coordinate on setting service standards for shared facilities.
   C: Coordinate on design standards for shared facilities.
3: Determine at what jurisdictional level to work together.
   A: Coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions.
   B: Coordinate through countywide and multi-county planning groups.

Local (F) Coordinating on Interjurisdictional Impacts-State Facilities

Questions: How should jurisdictions address state facility impacts? Should local money be spent on state facilities? Should fees be collected specifically for state routes? Should the exemption for HSS be continued? What guidelines are most appropriate for how non-HSS facilities are addressed?

Actions:
1: Leave the local approach as is, and do not change the state’s role in concurrency.
2: Collaborate with other agencies (local and state) to resolve some of the state facility issues.
   A: Track the trips on and off state routes through better data systems.
   B: Have local funds follow trips both on and off state routes.
3: Leave the HSS exemption intact, work to resolve issues.
   A: Work first with the state on operations, geo-metrics, and signal coordination.
   B: Work with the state to match local funds as they affect intersections with state facilities.
4: Begin a dialogue on how to remove or alter the HSS exemption.
5: Address the lack of clarity regarding the non-HSS.
   A: Do not change the non-HSS status.
   B: Begin a dialogue on how to address non-HSS facilities in local programs.
   C: Extend the HSS exemption to non-HSS facilities.
II. Regional Issues Sessions

Regional (G) Regional Council Helping Local Programs

Questions: Should the Regional Council help jurisdictions work together? Should the focus be on data and information, or provide a larger role?

Actions:
1: Maintain the status quo.
2: The Regional Council helps coordinate data issues.
   A: Provide technical assistance on data standardization, and normalization issues.
   B: Act as a data broker/warehouse between jurisdictions.
3: The Regional Council helps coordinate standards issues.
   A: Work on design and service standard issues.
   B: Work on funding and mitigation issues.
4: Help to standardize methodologies.
   A: Use existing staff and committees.
   B: Pursue a state grant.

Regional (H) Regional Council Developing a Regional Program

Questions: Should the Regional Council have its own concurrency program? Should this be focused on data and information sharing or take on a larger role?

Actions:
1: Maintain the status quo.
2: Develop a Regional Council program focused on information and data.
3: Develop standards for “regional facilities” and evaluate these facilities for “regional concurrency.”

III. State Changes Sessions

State (I) Making Development-Related Charges More Flexible

Question: Should jurisdictions be allowed to use impact fees to fund “ongoing” projects or programs?

Actions:
1: Do not change impact fee laws to allow for use on non-capitol projects.
2: Allow impact fees to be used for ongoing projects by revising the RCW.

State (J) Making Exemptions Legal

Questions: Are exemptions a useful tool that should be legalized? How should this be done?

Actions:
1: Do not make exemptions legal.
2: Leave things alone – the Hearings Boards have not outright invalidated exemptions so they can continue to be used.
3: Authorize setting aside capacity for specific uses.
4: Authorize and define exemptions for small-scale public uses.
5: Authorize exemptions for transit facilities.
   A: Do not authorize exemptions.
   B: Create a mitigation pool and authorize exemptions.
   C: Authorize exemptions.
State (K) Strengthening Interjurisdictional Coordination Requirements

Questions:
- Given the limited coordination, should a stronger coordination requirement be set?
- If so, how prescriptive should it be?
- What method will be used to accomplish the coordination?
- At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?

Actions:
1: Leave the system as is.
2: Develop and promote interlocal agreements among adjacent jurisdictions.
3: Develop and promote agreements through countywide or multi-county planning groups, and include state and transit agencies.
4: Strengthen the coordination requirements through revising the law.
Appendix C.
Complete Summary of Small Group Discussions: Table Notes

The following set of small group summaries were written by the facilitators and notetakers, and were sent to participants for review. Comments by participants have been incorporated in these summaries.

Table 1 Summary Notes
Facilitators: Ben Bakkenta & Steve Kiehl –This group discussed issues A, B, G, H, I, J, and K.

Local (A) Debating Flexibility versus Consistency in Methodology

Questions:

Should jurisdictions seek more consistent methodological approaches?
- Yes.
If so, how consistent?
- General support for voluntary approach to a range of standardized methods.
At what jurisdictional level should this occur?
- Work with adjacent jurisdictions.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- There should be a link between a jurisdiction’s concurrency program and the “vision” in its plan. The group said cities and counties should set clear goals for their concurrency programs, and then lay out options for meeting those goals.
- A variety of methods are used to measure performance, including using numerous zones with different measures and standards in each zone, using peak hour volume-to-capacity at key intersections, area-wide measuring, using a 3-hour PM peak, and others.
- The group generally agreed that narrowing the number of methodologies to a more manageable number would be helpful. But they did not want these to be dictated to them by the Regional Council. They wanted a cookbook or menu approach that would show them a variety of scientifically sound, commonly accepted methodologies and a summary of what the implications are when using each method. They also felt these methods should be “transparent” so they could be understood by the public and local decision maker.
- Someone should monitor selected major facilities over time to test the effectiveness of the programs, measurement techniques, and standards. This is an appropriate role for the Regional Council. They also felt the Regional Council had a role in data coordination and sharing among local agencies.
- Florida DOT has developed a program called “ArtPlan” (for arterial planning) that is made available to all jurisdictions in the state. It is used to model system performance. Group 1 thought there might some usefulness in such a model here for small jurisdictions.
- There needs to be more consistency between programs, especially for neighboring cities. Several people talked about the need to look “across boundaries” to address issues.
- There is a need to integrate concurrency with SEPA.
- Thought there should be some kind of annual reporting on concurrency.
- Agreed there is a need for more and better coordination/cooperation between local agencies.
Local (B) Tailoring Programs and Standards to Implement the Growth Management Act

Questions:

Should jurisdictions tailor their programs to focus growth and investments?
- Yes.

Should jurisdictions work together to tailor standards across the region?
- Yes.

At what jurisdictional level should this occur?
- Coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- Some in the group said: concurrency was conceived as a growth gatekeeper, and it can and will be used for this purpose.
- The Regional Council should do regional concurrency analysis and modeling, and provide technical support to local agencies to help them develop technically sound programs, but these programs should be tailored to meet local needs. There was strong agreement that tailoring to meet local needs and plan goals should be allowed and encouraged, within an overall framework of a technically sound concurrency program.
- Concurrency should be “re-defined” from a case-by-case or project-by-project basis and used in area-wide planning to achieve Growth Management Act goals.
- Some felt concurrency should be used as a tool to help phase growth in larger areas.
- As the group was discussing the Regional Council role in providing technical assistance for concurrency planning, Whit Blanton mentioned that the Atlanta Regional Council provides funds to local jurisdictions for centers planning. He mentioned the Regional Council could develop a funding program to assist local agencies with their concurrency planning programs. Rather than dictate what they should do, we could provide overall support and direction, and assist them in their planning. The group expressed general support for the idea of the Regional Council enabling local agencies to develop tailored concurrency programs that meet local needs as well as regional goals.
- The group did agree that the Regional Council could have a role in helping provide guidelines and standards where needed to address regionally significant issues, such as implementing urban centers. In this case, the Regional Council could set consistent region-wide goals and guidelines for concurrency programs in centers, and allow local agencies to tailor their programs within these overall boundaries to meet the needs for their centers. In such cases, the Regional Council could also provide assistance to local agencies to meet both local and regional goals. The group suggested the Regional Council review and enhance countywide planning policies as needed to address such regional issues. But, the policies must clearly state what these regional goals are. The Regional Council’s role would watch programs to keep them “reasonable.”
- The group suggested the Regional Council could include a review of concurrency programs as part of its ongoing review of comprehensive plan amendments.
- The group discussed the need for tailoring concurrency programs when dealing with “constrained facilities,” such as roadways that cannot be widened. In these cases, the group thought concurrency programs should allow for transportation demand management, transit, and other approaches to increase mobility, rather than just on roadway vehicle capacity.
- While strongly support tailoring, also agreed there needs to be a more binding policy framework for concurrency programs to prevent abuses (arbitrarily “moving the goal posts” to meet local needs without considering the implication on neighboring jurisdictions).
Regional (G) Regional Council Helping Local Programs

Questions:
Should the Regional Council help jurisdictions work together?
• Yes.
Should the focus be on data and information, or provide a larger role?
• Group leaned towards data and information sharing, but perhaps a limited role exists in coordinating standards.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
• Whit described the State roads concurrency program for Orlando, where they produce annual reports on the status of congestion, volume-to-capacity ratios, levels-of-service, etc. The group generally thought the Regional Council should fill a role of providing regional level data to local agencies. The group had interest in the Regional Council fostering consistent congestion management and roadway performance monitoring and providing this data to locals. This would provide a consistent, ongoing regional set of measures, which might help create consistency between local programs.
• The group thought the Regional Council’s regional role in concurrency should include data collection, analysis, and dissemination; providing a menu of scientifically acceptable measurement methods and models; and technical assistance with analysis as needed.
• The group did not think we should develop a regionwide program, but should encourage cooperation among local agencies. The group felt there could be a regional role for the Regional Council in setting objectives for regional corridors. These objectives would then be incorporated into local concurrency programs.
• The group thought the Regional Council could have an oversight role to prevent “tinkering” with the details of local concurrency programs to allow development. The Regional Council should be involved in addressing the issue of regional “pass-through” traffic, and helping local agencies deal with this issue in cooperation with WSDOT.

Regional (H) Regional Council Developing a Regional Program

Questions:
Should the Regional Council have its own concurrency program?
• No separate program.
Should this be focused on data and information sharing or take on a larger role?
• Focus on data and information to support local programs (Action G).

Participant Discussion and Comments:
• The group felt there was a limited role for the Regional Council, such as monitoring system performance, coordinating our Congestion Management System program with local concurrency efforts, and feeding concurrency programs into the regional Transportation Improvement Program.
• The group did not support development of regional standards or evaluation, but supported data activities. They felt the Regional Council’s role should be one of technical support, coordination, and advocacy for local programs. The group felt the Regional Council should be involved in addressing regional issues such as urban center or major corridors.
State (I) Making Development-Related Charges More Flexible

Question:
Should jurisdictions be allowed to use impact fees to fund ongoing projects or programs?
  • Yes.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
  • Small jurisdictions have concerns with the level of funds collected through concurrency programs, since they are not enough to actually build any projects, even small ones. Staff from small agencies felt there should be a change in the law to allow concurrency funds to be spent on non-project programs, such as transportation demand management or transit, where small amounts of money could make a difference.
  • Other staff felt there should be a way for concurrency funds to be spent outside the 6-year window, saying some projects take longer to build. They also want a better way to calculate project costs.

State (J) Making Exemptions Legal

Questions:
Are exemptions a useful tool that should be legalized?
  • Undecided.

How should this be done?
  • Agreed that no new action should be taken at this time.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
  • They did support the idea of allowing exemptions for public facilities identified in an official 5-year capital facility program, such as a library, transit station, or daycare.
  • The group had significant discussion on exceptions, and supported taking no new action until the Hearings Board takes definitive action.

State (K) Strengthening Interjurisdictional Coordination Requirements

Questions:
Given the limited coordination, should a stronger coordination requirement be set? If so, how prescriptive should it be?
  • Undecided.

What method will be used to accomplish the coordination?
  • Preference for promoting interlocal agreements.

At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?
  • With adjacent jurisdictions.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
  • The group strongly supported coordination. They agreed that promoting inter-local agreements is the best approach to coordination.
Table 2 Summary Notes

Facilitators: Norman Abbott & Carol Naito – This group discussed issues A, B, G, H, I, J, and K.

Local (A) Debating Flexibility versus Consistency in Methodology

Questions:
Should jurisdictions seek more consistent methodological approaches?
  • Yes.
If so, how consistent?
  • Focus on data gathering and sharing.
At what jurisdictional level should this occur?
  • Primarily between adjacent jurisdictions.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

Methodology
  • Consensus that better information gathering and sharing is good. Regional Council could act as clearinghouse for data, information on local programs, catalogue of best practices, etc.
  • Standard modeling platform and analytical tools can be useful at subarea level to facilitate interlocal cooperation and communication, e.g., Eastside Concurrency Project. Not necessarily useful at county, multi-county levels; loses benefit of local detail and focus; does not account for local differences and needs.
  • “Cookbook” of common methods and measures, that is not prescriptive and does allow for local flexibility, was the favored approach. Regional Council can compile a handbook of a selected number (not just one, and not everything under the sun) of best practice methods and measures, from which local governments can choose which is most appropriate to their jurisdictions. Different methodologies may work better for different jurisdictions. Local jurisdictions would like to see an assessment of the relative effectiveness and usefulness of various methods and measures included in such a handbook.
  • This approach separates “technical” issues from “policy” determinations. Allows for progress toward greater regional consistency among local methodologies, without dictating policy to local jurisdictions. Local jurisdictions should be able to determine their own level-of-service standards.
  • The standardization of methodologies is a long-term action. Changing methodologies will likely result in local jurisdictions having to reassess their level-of-service standard. Local jurisdictions need time and resources to do this. Local jurisdictions might develop a long term/short term phased approach to standardization.

Jurisdictional Level
  • Appropriate level for coordination of methodologies is primarily interlocal between jurisdictions located in similar geographic subareas. Adjacent jurisdictions with common characteristics, facilities, and concerns are the logical and most efficient level for coordination. Examples of effective interlocal coordination efforts: Eastside Concurrency Project, Bellevue-Redmond Overlake Transportation Study (BROTS) interlocal agreement.
  • At the regional level, Regional Council can facilitate consistency by developing a data clearinghouse and “cookbook” of best practice methods and measures. Local jurisdictions can use these resources to work toward greater regional consistency. In the short term, until these resources are developed, local jurisdictions can continue to coordinate their programs at the interlocal level.
• Consistency can also be facilitated by countywide coordination to develop a consistent set of level-of-service standards. Definitions and consistent rationales driving locally determined level-of-service standards. This can be helpful to address existing inconsistencies in definitions used and standards applied between cities and county unincorporated areas, as well as between jurisdictions inside and outside the Urban Growth Area.
• “Development of regional significance” tied to regional revenue-generating fee structure or program

Local (B) Tailoring Programs and Standards to Implement the Growth Management Act
Questions:
Should jurisdictions tailor their programs to focus growth and investments?
• Yes, important to do this to help shape development.
Should jurisdictions work together to tailor standards across the region?
• Useful, if voluntary.
At what jurisdictional level should this occur?
• Coordinate with adjacent jurisdiction, perhaps limited sub-regional or regional role.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
• Consensus was that local governments should be able to retain flexibility to tailor their own programs in the way that best serves their jurisdiction and development goals.
• Tailoring can be coordinated between local jurisdictions on a voluntary basis where it makes sense, e.g., by adjacent jurisdictions in geographic subareas, between cities and counties.
• Countywide planning policies can provide an appropriate mechanism to coordinate and facilitate consistency between local development goals in selected ways, e.g., designating an level-of-service of “F” for all designated urban centers, level-of-service of “D” for locally determined neighborhood centers, etc. Incorporating concurrency standards into Countywide Planning Policies makes them consistently part of the countywide planning framework.

Regional (G) Regional Council Helping Local Programs
Questions:
Should the Regional Council help jurisdictions work together?
• Yes. Should provide guidance for voluntary activities.
Should the focus be on data and information, or provide a larger role?
• Focus on data and information. Perhaps an “upon request” regional role.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
• Yes, so long as Regional Council involvement is offered as an optional resource or service to local jurisdictions, rather than on a prescriptive basis.
• Consensus that Regional Council can provide helpful role with data standardization and as a data broker/warehouse [i.e., a “data clearinghouse”].
• Consensus that Regional Council can provide valuable role by developing a standardized set of methodologies [i.e., “cookbook of best practice methods and measures”]. Regional Council should try to pursue a state grant to fund such a project. If grant is not received, this worthwhile effort justifies using existing staff and committees.
• There were mixed opinion regarding Regional Council’s involvement in coordinating standards issues for cross-jurisdictional facilities and regional funding and mitigation issues. Some suggested the Regional Council might provide facilitation/mediation services to local jurisdictions upon request to help develop visions for cross-jurisdictional facilities, assess cross-jurisdictional impacts, develop interlocal agreements, and develop a regional impact fee structure. Others were not comfortable with Regional Council involvement in some or all of these larger roles.
**Regional (H) Regional Council Developing a Regional Program**

Questions:

Should the Regional Council have its own concurrency program?
- No separate program.

Should this be focused on data and information sharing or take on a larger role?
- Focus on data and information to support local programs (Action G).

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- Responses were either: “No, this is not an appropriate role for Regional Council” or “Don’t know, what would a Regional Council program look like or do?” A point was raised that Regional Council does not have authority to issue or deny permits, so what would be the enforcement mechanism for regional concurrency standards?
- A data and information focused Regional Council program would be helpful, assuming it serve as a “data clearinghouse” and “cookbook of best practice.” Question raised regarding how much information gathering and sharing is already being done via the Congestion Management System program.
- General consensus that group did not want to see Regional Council involved in establishing regional facilities or setting regional concurrency standards. Some suggested that the Regional Council could provide assistance in assessing multi-modal facilities.

**State (I) Making Development-Related Charges More Flexible**

Question:

Should jurisdictions be allowed to use impact fees to fund ongoing projects or programs?
- Some support but concern about viability.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- Group did not feel strongly either way about this topic. Some wondered how or what kind of structure would be used to assess impact fees on non-capital projects.
- Group concluded that this is not a priority, but it can be explored, with recognition that there could be a number of fatal flaws embedded in such a change.

**State (J) Making Exemptions Legal**

Questions:

Are exemptions a useful tool that should be legalized?
- Yes.

How should this be done?
- Authorize for specified public uses (and perhaps specified districts) and for transit facilities.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- Group generally agreed that exemptions should be allowable and enacted into state law. There were mixed opinions about what types of exemptions should be allowed, and how far they should go.
- After some debate, group achieved consensus that exemptions for a clearly specified and limited group of public land uses should be allowed. Local jurisdictions want to retain choice over whether to use such exemptions or not.
Group discussed how exemptions for specified “areas,” such as urban centers and neighborhood centers, might be worthwhile to pursue. For example, City of Bellevue wanted to allow an “area exemption” for a shopping center in a residential neighborhood. A shopping center would not qualify as an exempt public land use, yet the only option available to the city that would have allowed the development to pass concurrency was to lower the level-of-service standard for the neighborhood, which the city did not want to do.

Group felt that transit facilities should qualify for exemptions as well. There was a preference for authorizing exemptions without creating a mitigation fund, which the group felt could be addressed separately through SEPA. There was some debate over whether park & ride lots should qualify for exemption as a transit facility. The local jurisdiction in which the park & ride lot is located would probably not want to allow the exemption since the traffic it generates directly impacts their level-of-service. From a regional perspective, however, the park & ride lot can be seen as a public benefit that facilitates transit ridership and reduces congestions, and is therefore worthy of an exemption. Group generally agreed that SEPA would be the appropriate avenue to mitigate local impacts.

Group preferred defining exemptions for small-scale public uses and exempting transit facilities, but if exemptions are not authorized, they saw authorizing the setting aside of capacity for specified uses as the next alternative.

**State (K) Strengthening Interjurisdictional Coordination Requirements**

**Questions:**

Given the limited coordination, should a stronger coordination requirement be set? If so, how prescriptive should it be?

- More coordination is good, should not be required.

What method will be used to accomplish the coordination?

- Voluntary interlocal agreements.

At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?

- Primarily between adjacent jurisdictions, limited sub-regional and regional role.

**Participant Discussion and Comments:**

- Responses were extremely varied, with stronger leanings toward “maybe” and “no.”
- The group clearly did not want such a requirement to be enacted into law.
- The group expressed preference for encouraging adjacent jurisdictions, rather than requiring them, to establish interlocal agreements.
- The Regional Council can develop a prototype interlocal agreement that local jurisdictions may borrow and tailor to fit their needs. Countywide Planning Policies may be another appropriate avenue for encouraging and facilitating local coordination.
Table 3 Summary Notes

Facilitators: Dan Carlson & Michele Leslie – This group discussed issues A, B, G, H, I, J, and K.

Local (A) Debating Flexibility versus Consistency in Methodology

Questions:

Should jurisdictions seek more consistent methodological approaches?
- Yes.

If so, how consistent?
- Move toward more consistent approaches and perhaps begin to prioritize a more limited set of approaches while retaining local control.

At what jurisdictional level should this occur?
- Coordinate between adjacent jurisdictions.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- Jurisdictions appreciate being able to set their own methodology but definitely see benefits in sharing data. However, in some cases they may want to share data but find that the nuances of how data is collected for their methodology is inconsistent with neighboring jurisdictions.
- The group felt that standardization would need to be done from the ground up rather than a top-down edict, meaning that it would happen as they shared data or through a forum, which could be through the Regional Council, when specific goals are on the horizon.
- Jurisdictions would also like to be able to share information on human behavior, response to level-of-service, how trips are made and perceived.

“You get what you measure”

- Jurisdictions are measuring level-of-service almost exclusively as a function of volume-to-capacity at intersections and roadway segments during a peak period hour or two. A few cities measure delay, others measure travel times in and out of the downtown, some measure over a longer period (“peak spreading”).
- It was generally felt that measuring level-of-service should include information on travel time, accessibility, and modal variety. Level-of-service standards should be sustainable, transit friendly, and varied by location, use and type of road (rural areas have different needs from urban).
- It may not be a bad thing to have “failing” level-of-service standards, what is important is the perception of people using these facilities. People appreciate “scenic” slower routes, being able to run errands on the way home, and familiarity.
- Activity needs to stay in the center; improving level-of-service by diverting trips will not solve any problems. Concurrency needs to measure accessibility.

Problems jurisdictions are facing

- Highways of Statewide Significance are exempt from concurrency requirements. Traffic from state roads and congestion on state roads can greatly increase traffic on local roads.
- Jurisdictions cannot use impact fee (or “development charges”) revenue to generate transit service or offer services that could reduce demand for road capacity. While they can shift funds from other sources to these activities, the groups cautioned on this, noting the need to consider legal nexus issues.
- On occasion, jurisdictions with differing standards have affected developer’s location decisions – there was some discussion about varying parking standards affecting the choice to locate in Redmond over Bellevue.
“A bigger toolbox”

- Jurisdictions need help with research, what is working, what are the best practices, how to mitigate drive through trips. Pilot programs are a huge asset. Flex-car programs could be a good service. Workshops are very helpful. Help setting up interlocal agreements.
- Jurisdictions need help coordinating with the state and transit providers.
- Jurisdictions need to be able to use “development charges” for services, and to meet planning goals.
- Help serving neighborhoods and connecting corridors, since the problems are not in central business districts, but rather connecting to them.

Local (B) Tailoring Programs and Standards to Implement the Growth Management Act

Questions:

Should jurisdictions tailor their programs to focus growth and investments?
- Yes.

Should jurisdictions work together to tailor standards across the region?
- Some coordination of standards may be appropriate.

At what jurisdictional level should this occur?
- In short-term, between adjacent jurisdictions. Long-term, there may be sub-regional or regional roles.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- Note: The group never specifically discussed this section – part A was the primary basis for the morning discussion. However, it could be understood that the group felt that there should be some coordination of standards, which is especially valuable for working with adjacent jurisdictions, but local control is still extremely important and nothing should override that.

Regional (G) Regional Council Helping Local Programs

Questions:

Should the Regional Council help jurisdictions work together?
- Yes, in a limited fashion.

Should the focus be on data and information, or provide a larger role?
- Focus on data and information.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- Consensus: Develop a Regional Council program focused on information and data.
- Note: group reached a consensus as to which action items from the handouts were appropriate, however there were different opinions suggested in the discussion.
- The group felt that the Regional Council’s role should fall somewhere between the status quo and helping on data issues, stressing that the Regional Council should always be a forum rather than a ruling body. The group was more vocal about wanting the Regional Council to coordinate data issues and to act as a data clearinghouse. They were also interested in having the Regional Council provide technical assistance and “a bigger toolbox.”
- It was suggested that Snohomish County would not appreciate a stronger regional role.
- At the same time, discussion also included mention of a regional revenue sharing scheme to help mitigate “background traffic.”
Regional (H) Regional Council Developing a Regional Program

Questions:
Should the Regional Council have its own concurrency program?
- No, just continue existing data programs.
Should this be focused on data and information sharing or take on a larger role?
- Focus on data and information to support local programs (Action G).

Participant Discussion and Comments:
- The discussion included using the Congestion Management System for monitoring and reporting, wanting the Regional Council to deliver technical assistance, and to look for solutions (research). One potential research area might be to examine how development-related money is being spent where promised.
- There was some mention of “standardizing from the ground up.”
- It was also suggested that setting standards for “regional facilities” and evaluating these for “regional concurrency” would be challenging.

State (I) Making Development-Related Charges More Flexible

Question:
Should jurisdictions be allowed to use impact fees to fund ongoing projects or programs?
- Yes.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
- Strong consensus: Allow impact fees to be used for ongoing projects by revising the state law.
- Add flexibility to the toolbox, fund experimental projects; pilot projects would be especially helpful for measuring multimodal systems, problems with measuring.
- Other suggestions included: using SEPA to fund services (but only works for 6 years), not only using impact fees for services. Jurisdictions need the money for matching grants and want to invest in things that will last.
- One jurisdiction also mentioned wanting to be able to improve coordination and shift money from project to project.

State (J) Making Exemptions Legal

Questions:
Are exemptions a useful tool that should be legalized?
- Undecided.
How should this be done?
- Group agreed to take no new actions.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
- Consensus: Leave things alone - the Hearings Boards have not outright invalidated exemptions so they can be used (carefully).
- Exemptions are very tricky, there are always exceptions to the rule - you cannot make ‘essential public facilities’ exempt because often they are big trip generators like the airport. However, non-essential public facilities, like “little city halls” could be exempt because they sometimes do not generate many trips.
- Many suggested that there are ways around this through local tailoring, such as having the city pay for mitigation through other funds, or wording things carefully in the ordinance.
• Government needs to be careful about exemptions, it can give the public the wrong idea - exemptions can give the public perception that everyone has to pay impact fees except for the thing the government favors.

**State (K) Strengthening Interjurisdictional Coordination Requirements**

Questions:

Given the limited coordination, should a stronger coordination requirement be set? If so, how prescriptive should it be?

- Work should occur, but do not need a stronger requirement.

What method will be used to accomplish the coordination?

- Interlocal agreements.

At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?

- Work at sub-area and regional level.

**Participant Discussion and Comments:**

- Consensus: Develop and promote agreements through countywide or multi-county planning groups, and include state and transit agencies. Note: many in the group felt that this was the current state of affairs, but some jurisdictions are not at this level and should be helped to get here through a “toolbox.”

- Coordination is helpful especially for information sharing but not necessary for everything. Countywide planning groups and regional plans are already accomplishing some of this.

- There is a need to include transit agencies at the table. Fix roads for transit, and provide transit to new growth.

- Interlocal agreements have been very successful, and have the benefit of providing a systematic approach that is very helpful. Sharing impact fees is okay, as is mutually funding agreed upon projects.

- The problem is not always getting worse usually it is just shifting somewhere else.

- Conflict creates resolution. New rules are not always helpful.

- There are some advantages to top down coordination.

- The Regional Council could help subregions coordinate and help jurisdictions improve toolbox. Include template for interlocal agreements, using the Bellevue-Redmond Overlake Transportation Study (BROTS) interlocal as an example, and compile best practices for cities.

- The lack of level-of-service standards for state routes is an ongoing coordination problem.
Table 4 Summary Notes
Facilitators: Allison Dobbins & Lindy Johnson – This group discussed issues C, D, G, and H.

Local (C) Coordinating on Funding to Increase Revenues – “Growing the Pie”

Questions:

Should jurisdictions be more aggressive about collecting revenues?
• Yes.

Should jurisdictions work together to be able to collect more revenues?
• Yes.

At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?
• Sub-regional.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

• Rapid growth in one jurisdiction is causing problems for adjacent jurisdictions.
• For developers, the amount is less important than when revenues are collected so projects can be delivered in timely manner. Delays in programming/delivering the projects means the prices increase (cost estimating is time-consuming and expensive itself).
• There is a lack of linkage between concurrency process and 6-year program.
• Developers and public often cannot follow the mitigation funds to the improvement projects (i.e., system is too much of a “black box”).
• Consider direct mitigation versus collecting money for projects.
• If the developer creates value, tie the impact fee money to improving the value of the site through proximate improvements. Reflect how the improvement changes traffic flows, such as where the improvement is not proximate, but diverts traffic from the site.

Increase total level of funding?
• Yes, but not from impact fees because there is not enough development to generate that much more revenue. Need to combine resources (impact fees and others).
• Could increase impact fees if able to demonstrate that a value has been created for developers as a result.
• Encourage low cost housing by reducing impact fees (trade one public benefit for another).
• Often developer ability to fund capacity increases is not there because many developments are small.

Coordination

• There should be a way to identify where pass-through trips are generated; jurisdictions should at least acknowledge this and it should be reported on some sort of regional basis.
• Need a model that can identify how development in one jurisdiction affects other jurisdictions.
• Subregional level is most appropriate for coordination — should cross county boundaries where appropriate and consider impacts beyond the subarea. Need better data to determine subarea boundaries and where coordination is most important.
• Need more impact fee funds to go to transit in appropriate areas.
• Difficult for small cities to do analysis and deliver projects due to lack of staff and resources. They can collaborate with larger jurisdictions.
• Useful to create a template for determining impacts, impact fee amounts.
• Use old “suburban cities coalition” as a model for subregional concurrency coordination.
• Use old Puget Sound Council of Governments subarea model for subregional concurrency coordination, especially for standards. Subregional model could coordinate better with WSDOT for technical assistance. Use subregional level coordination for deciding priorities, and to leverage resources (although it hasn’t worked well to date due to lack of incentives).
• Coordination must be voluntary.
• Find a way to coordinate on corridor basis.
• Increase funding pot – state matching funds would be helpful. Need consistent source of revenues at state and local levels.
• Infrastructure costs are not necessarily borne by those who benefit (both new and existing people need to share costs for new facilities).

Local (D) Coordinating on Funding to Equitably Share Revenues – “Sharing the Pie”

Questions:
Should jurisdictions work together to share revenues?
  • Yes.
Should this be based on tracking trips, pooling funds, identifying full buildout scenarios for different facilities?
  • Base on tracking trips.
At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur and how should this be done?
  • Short-term: coordinate at subregional level on voluntary basis. Long-term: seek better solution.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
• Needs to be agreement on level-of-service standards plus measurement methodology (to identify improvements and for equity in sharing revenues). Local level level-of-service should be consistent on subregional basis.
• Need to have an instrument for measuring impacts and level-of-service that can be used by coordinating jurisdictions.
• Potential for disagreement between jurisdictions on design for improvements. First must agree on projects and design — then how to split up costs.
• Using different travel forecasting models causes difficulty (even with same model, using different criteria causes problems).
• Critical link analysis needed to avoid moving the problem down to the next intersection.
• Try to get planning to mirror more closely actual market forces.
• Tie transit investments into other mitigation efforts. Transit expansion has lower total cost for providing peak period people moving capacity than highway improvements. Auto-based concurrency measurement does not factor in value of transit performance.
• Link concurrency-related improvements to increase in land use value.
• Keeping project cost estimates up-to-date is expensive.

Regional (G) Regional Council Helping Local Programs

Questions:
Should the Regional Council help jurisdictions work together?
  • Yes.
Should the focus be on data and information, or provide a larger role?
  • Data and information should be the focus.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
• Use buildable lands inventory to develop database.
• The Regional Council should run the regional model to identify regional impacts. The Regional Council should be more proactive in getting local jurisdictions to agree to a more coordinated model. Data should be resource that is available to local jurisdictions but not mandatory.
• Eastside cities concurrency study, with potential model improvements as result, is a good initial step.
• Existing models are macro - need parcel level data. Transportation Analysis Zone boundaries should follow Urban Growth Area and municipal boundaries.
• Models need to be consistent with each other, but local jurisdictions have different needs.
• The Regional Council should develop Puget Sound-area trip generation rates (substitute for Institute of Transportation Engineer rates). Look at unit cost to provide infrastructure at various densities. Develop a cost-estimating tool for improvements.
• The Regional Council is more neutral than countywide planning bodies. The Regional Council should audit the countywide planning policies, as they are different in detail and design.
• What is appropriate regional role in methodologies/level-of-service? State highway level-of-service and design proposals disputed by some cities (state highway as main street); ramp metering backs traffic up onto local street system.
• Explore multimodal districts and develop non-auto level-of-service standards, similar to Florida system.
• Need to have system so that centers objectives can be met and developers can still make profit.
• Tax Increment Financing is needed.
• Need regional model - trips “disappear” when they hit city boundary if using city model. The Regional Council should collect the data and run the models.
• Use different model for small, residential developments vs. larger, more complicated developments.
• The Regional Council should provide forum for larger-scale concurrency decisions to be discussed subregionally on a regular basis (e.g., meetings of Planning & Transportation Directors).

Regional (H) Regional Council Developing a Regional Program
Questions:
Should the Regional Council have its own concurrency program?
• Yes.
Should this be focused on data and information sharing or take on a larger role?
• Data and information sharing should be the focus.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
• Maintain/expand data collection. Regional pilot program – new models and new monitoring.
• Concurrency should be done by local jurisdictions, coordinating at subregional level. Concern in taking away local authority – land use permitting is a local decision.
• Too many developments for region to analyze them all.
• House Bill 1487 purpose – develop consistency across jurisdictions and identify impact of local plans on regional facilities.
• Include WSDOT in discussions.
Table 5 Summary Notes

Facilitators: Mark Simonson & Kelly McGourty — This group discussed issues C, D, G, H, and J.

Local (C) Coordinating on Funding to Increase Revenues — “Growing the Pie”

Questions:

Should jurisdictions be more aggressive about collecting revenues?
  • Yes, but not necessarily through concurrency.

Should jurisdictions work together to be able to collect more revenues?
  • Work together if it is worthwhile — incentives to foster coordination.

At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?
  • Short-term: between adjacent jurisdictions. Long-term: may include subregional or regional involvement.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

Should the Pie Grow?
  • Consensus was that the overall transportation pie should grow, but not necessarily through development fees.
  • While the result of inadequate revenue collection is unmet financial obligations for projects, there are political reasons why more revenues are not collected. This includes the fear that competition among jurisdictions to attract development leads to lowering of fees; this is seen as a bad thing.
  • Also, the revenue collected comes not just from concurrency/impact fee programs – SEPA is also used.
  • Capital facilities elements/planning is inadequate and there are no consistent methods across jurisdictions.

Should jurisdictions work together?
  • Consensus was on having consistent methods, coordination and incentives to work together. No consensus on how jurisdictions could or should work together in terms of the details of the methodologies – just that consistent methods and interlocal agreements were key.
  • Existing methods of working together are on an individual basis, i.e., planner to planner. There will need to be a process developed for how to share the pie. Fees and/or systems could be based on geographic boundaries rather than a regionwide use. Also, a lot of staff time is spent on administering concurrency; simplifying would result in some savings.
  • Having comparable methods, uniformity and a simpler method would lessen the existing barriers to implementation.
  • There are issues of wealthy communities versus those less wealthy and how both impacts and revenues are and should be shared.
  • Should growth really pay for itself? If so, it would take a regional approach/concept.
  • There should be exemptions for essential public facilities – no consensus on what these facilities are, or how the exemptions should be structured.

Jurisdictional Level
  • No consensus on the question of at what level – there was discussion that a regional coordination role would be helpful, or perhaps a subarea coordination role, but to what extent was not determined. There is the need for a regional context, but there are local authority and control issues. Contiguous jurisdictions need interlocal agreements.
  • Possible regional roles could include assessment, consistency, standards, and revenue distribution.
Local (D) Coordinating on Funding to Equitably Share Revenues — “Sharing the Pie”

Questions:
Should jurisdictions work together to share revenues?
- Yes.

Should this be based upon tracking trips, pooling funds, identifying full buildout scenarios for different facilities?
- Undecided, but based on impacts. Perhaps separate money and standards issues.

At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur and how should this be done?
- Primarily between adjacent jurisdictions, but may be potential for regional roles.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
- There was consensus that interlocal agreements are key, and that a regional body should provide incentives and/or disincentives to jurisdictions to put those in place — e.g., via comprehensive plan certifications or the Transportation Improvement Program funding process. There is perhaps the potential for subarea interlocal agreements, or interlocals being corridor-based.
- Working on these issues with neighboring jurisdictions can be difficult, given that there are political issues at play, and that there is an issue of local control. There are also issues of regional vs. local control, and mandates vs. incentives.
- Methodologically, fees could be based on impacts and be distributed geographically. Also, the benefits of interlocal agreements are that they contain facilities and costs, and use explicit methodologies.
- Funds should be kept at the local level, since they are now used for local match.
- Some thought that perhaps concurrency should be “set” at the regional level (e.g., setting standards), but funds should remain at the local level — discussion that a regional role may be too difficult to implement, but that perhaps some form of two-tier system may be appropriate.

Regional (G) Regional Council Helping Local Programs

Questions:
Should the Regional Council help jurisdictions work together?
- Yes.

Should the focus be on data and information, or provide a larger role?
- Help with standardization issues beyond data and information, but not in prescriptive way.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
Many appropriate roles exist for the Regional Council, including:
- Assisting with long-range planning, providing technical assistance, subarea planning.
- Should be a strong role on coordination by using incentives.
- Secure the connection between transportation and land use beyond jurisdictional boundaries — e.g., Sound Move.
- Provide technical assistance, perhaps create a toolbox for methods, and perhaps assistance in creating travel time measurements; serve as lead on a standardized methodology, although there may be local resistance to this.
- Serve a centralized data-sharing role.
Regional (H) Regional Council Developing a Regional Program

Questions:
Should the Regional Council have its own concurrency program?
- No separate program.

Should this be focused on data and information sharing or take on a larger role?
- Focus on data and information to support local programs (Action G). Some agency/organization may be needed to take larger role.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
- There was consensus that interlocal agreements are the key, and that incentives need to be provided. These incentives/disincentives (such as plan certifications and funding ties) should have deadlines and perhaps some tie to urban centers (perhaps exemptions?).
- There were comments that perhaps the Regional Council is not the appropriate body to take on this role. Perhaps the counties should take on a role, setting exemptions and guidelines. This has the benefit of being at an existing level of government — a comment was made that previous “cross-jurisdictional” attempts have failed.
- There was consensus that there is a need for some role above the local level, whether it is regional, county or subarea. This role would include oversight, serving as a clearinghouse.
- The concept of the Regional Council filling a role of the clearinghouse or a “best practices” publisher seemed to have the most consensus support.
- Also, developers are in favor of one, reliable, predictable system of standards and fees — the example of the King County concurrency maps were used to highlight the value of predictability in concurrency applications (red on map means area not meeting concurrency standards).

State (J) Making Exemptions Legal

Questions:
Are exemptions a useful tool that should be legalized?
- Yes.

How should this be done?
- Undecided. Should be clearly defined. Perhaps targeted areas. Maybe transit agencies.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
- The group did not have time to fully discuss this topic. Initial suggestions included providing exemptions in targeted areas, for example, urban centers, or for projects that generate a lot of public benefit, such as transit stations. The Regional Council role could be to research and report on feasibility of exemptions.
- Exemptions should be defined up front and be specific. They should be used consistently — developers need certainty. Perhaps there should be statewide or regional criteria.
- Be clear on what the exemption means. Perhaps the exemption is from the development approval component, but not the fees and mitigation component.
Table 6 Summary Notes

Facilitators: Hilda Blanco & Richard Berndt – This group discussed issues C, D, G, H, and J.

Local (C) Coordinating on Funding to Increase Revenues — “Growing the Pie”

Questions:
- Should jurisdictions be more aggressive about collecting revenues?
  - Yes.
- Should jurisdictions work together to be able to collect more revenues?
  - Work together to be more consistent in calculations.
- At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?
  - Leaned towards working between jurisdictions since subregional or regional seems infeasible.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
- This group generally thought regional coordination and standards would be much more efficient and result in higher recovery of development expenses, more equitable sharing of development costs by jurisdictions, and more effective channeling of growth (and an implied higher quality of life) than the current, largely piecemeal system.
- While they saw utility in a regional approach, a large amount of skepticism existed regarding whether it could be realized.
- Short-Term – There was a consensus that jurisdictions should agree on uniform cost calculation issues. Most thought jurisdictions should be more aggressive in collecting costs of development, but feared losing development due to competitive pressure. There was consensus that better, more consistent cost data was needed, and that greater training would be helpful. It is most realistic in short-term to work at the sub-county level.
- Long-Term – The group did not spell out their ideal. It seemed like they wanted regional coordination, but they could not get past skepticism that it would not be politically feasible. There was hesitation with too much visibility of collecting costs, and sharing revenue (and giving up autonomy) is difficult. They wanted better communication with the planning community such as events similar to the workshop.
- A consultant who worked with developers said the development community enjoys low costs, but the uncertainty in the current process wasted their time. Some developers (especially for higher quality developments) would trade higher costs for certainty of costs before starting a project and for improved facilities and services.
- One participant expressed frustration that jurisdictions need money for infrastructure improvements but were not realistic about revenues, instead hoping for grant monies. The current situation would cause long-term financial problems given that deferred infrastructure costs substantially more in the end.
Local (D) Coordinating on Funding to Equitably Share Revenues — “Sharing the Pie”

Questions:

Should jurisdictions work together to share revenues?
- Yes.

Should this be based upon tracking trips, pooling funds, identifying full buildout scenarios for different facilities?
- Undecided on how to work together, many potential methods.

At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur and how should this be done?
- Short-term: work between adjacent jurisdictions. Long-term: there may be subregional or regional roles.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- Short-Term — work on a case-by-case basis between affected jurisdictions at the project level (tracking by “people” trips), remain flexible in the approach.
- Long-Term — Work together at the multi-county regional level, taking into account transportation and other factors, such as which communities accept affordable housing, protect the environment, etc. This sounded similar to the revenue sharing plan in the Twin Cities region that Myron Orfield has promoted, with incentives for taking in growth and certain kinds of growth.
- Participants were still skeptical that regional revenue sharing would be politically feasible, but did say it would be optimal, increasing fairness and more effectively managing growth.

Regional (G) Regional Council Helping Local Programs

Questions:

Should the Regional Council help jurisdictions work together?
- Yes.

Should the focus be on data and information, or provide a larger role?
- Short-term: focus on data and information Long-term: “work into” larger roles.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- The group again promoted a regional solution as being optimal, though they continued to be skeptical on how politically realistic it would be. Regional standards would be much more efficient than each jurisdiction performing it. One promoted Portland METRO as a possible model for the Regional Council, given that METRO has very detailed street information and much smaller transportation zones.
- Short-Term: The group thought the Regional Council should provide technical assistance and act as a data broker.
- Mid-Term: Participants stated that the Regional Council could work into the role of creating design and services standards, as well as funding and mitigation issues.
- Long-Term: The Regional Council should, ideally, help to standardize methodologies. Funding methods were not discussed, though it was strongly suggested that if the region funded such an initiative, it would need commitment that the region’s jurisdictions would use the system.
Regional (H) Regional Council Developing a Regional Program

Questions:
Should the Regional Council have its own concurrency program?
• Likely, no.
Should this be focused on data and information sharing or take on a larger role?
• Focus on data and information to support local programs (Action G).

Participant Discussion and Comments:
• Short-term: the Regional Council should work with the state and give guidance to local jurisdictions.
• Long-term: the Regional Council should begin to develop standards on regional concurrency.

State (J) Making Exemptions Legal

Questions:
Are exemptions a useful tool that should be legalized?
• Yes.
How should this be done?
• Exemptions for transit facilities, perhaps for transit-oriented development.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
• The group discussion was cut short, so they did not come up with concrete recommendations.
• The transit discussion took most of the available time. It was noted that not only should transit be encouraged, but that transit agencies were in a weak negotiating position, as they did not have the siting flexibility of a for profit developer. There was also the inference that some jurisdictions looked at concurrency and transit facilities as a way to enhance revenues.
• Short-Term: There should be exemptions for transit facilities, since encouraging transit is part of growth management. Unanswered was if exemptions should merely be authorized or mandated. Also proposed was authorizing exemptions for development immediately surrounding a transit center, since transit-oriented development should be encouraged.
• Beyond this, there was not time to discuss other types of exemptions. The group wanted to encourage urban centers, however, though it was unclear if exemptions or adjusting the level-of-service in an urban center would be the best approach.
Table 7 Summary Notes

Facilitators: King Cushman & Anne Avery – This group discussed issues E, F, G, H, and I.

Local (E) Coordinating on Interjurisdictional Impacts-Local Facilities

Questions:
Should jurisdictions coordinate on data and standards issues?
  • Coordinate on data, not on standards.
At what jurisdictional level should this occur?
  • Undecided.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

Methodology
  • The “status quo” is not acceptable. There appears to be “lots of data,” but sense it is not complete or particularly consistent. Concurrency process related to pass-through traffic needs to be improved, but to what extent? Also, when a big development goes in, surrounding cities need to know. How can we accomplish that? Perhaps the Bellevue-Kirkland-Redmond model is a good place to start.
  • Short term: the group supports including new developments in one another’s models. We should find improved means to inform adjacent jurisdictions about new developments. Try to accomplish by establishing a central place to get information on planned and new developments (clearinghouse).
  • Long term: the group supports coordinating on land use and transportation planning for shared facilities.
  • The group did not support coordinating on setting level-of-service standards for shared facilities. Not politically realistic and are many arguments for why “same standards” are neither necessary nor logical as corridors pass through different communities. Different segments have inherently different needs and character (State Route 99 in south King County as example).
  • Some group members posed questions about whether good data exists on pass-through traffic. Others noted that local jurisdictions use models and data sources (relying mostly on the Regional Council for origin-destination data) to get some idea of where traffic is coming and going. More targeted license plate surveys could give more detail and accuracy. Not all are familiar with how to access the Regional Council data for estimating local vs. pass-through traffic.
  • In some parts of the region, most congestion, inter-city, and inter-community travel ends up on state highways.
  • Jurisdictions should have the ability to know what everyone’s plans are, but they should retain the ability to set their own level-of-service. (Highway 99 is example – common vision but different level-of-service in SeaTac and Tukwila.)
  • Group felt it was important to have “common understanding” and appreciation for each other’s plan differences, including different level-of-service. But there is not a need for “common standards,” either for level-of-service or design. In real world, corridors are okay to be different in “feel” and purpose from community-to-community. Do not tend to support too much “standardization” if it would result in loss of local character.

Jurisdictional Level
  • There was no strong preference about what jurisdictional level to work together. For data, try to accomplish by establishing a central place to get information on planned and new developments (clearinghouse). Another idea was to strengthen countywide groups to certify land use and transportation plans for shared facilities as coordinated among jurisdictions.
  • For estimating traffic impacts for coordination purposes, a question remains on how large an
area should the estimation area be (i.e., how far do cities need to go to measure impacts of a development?) Difficult to come up with any proscribed definition, as developments also differ greatly in degree to traffic impacts.

- Development community finds current concurrency process impossible. Local jurisdictions would be more effective with developers if they could communicate a comprehensive vision for an entire corridor passing through multiple jurisdictions (highway 99 is an example).
- Ability to coordinate standards is almost impossible. Do not see city or county councils giving up control.
- Strengthen countywide groups to certify that land use and transportation plans had interjurisdictional coordination.

Other discussion:

- Jurisdictions are schizophrenic about what they want: they really want little villages (unique places), but they are building big centers with cash registers that generate tax revenue.
- A participant suggested getting rid of concurrency, and using parking instead. Example: let Microsoft add as much density as it wants, but say: you cannot have any more parking spaces and you cannot generate one more trip. Let the capitalists take care of the problem.

Local (F) Coordinating on Interjurisdictional Impacts-State Facilities

Questions:

How should jurisdictions address state facility impacts?
- Leave system as is.

Should local money be spent on state facilities? Should fees be collected specifically for state routes?
- Generally, no. Support for case-by-case actions.

Should the exemption for Highways of Statewide Significance (HSS) be continued?
- Yes, work to resolve issues.

What guidelines are most appropriate for how non-HSS facilities are addressed?
- Short-term: do not change. Long-term: begin dialogue, consider changes.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- The group supported leaving the local approach to concurrency as is, and not changing the state’s role in concurrency. The HSS should stay state’s responsibility and the state should pay to fix deficiencies.
- Perhaps we should be looking at basic level-of-service for transit (rather than auto) on state highways. Recognize that we will not be expanding capacity on most HSS in the region in the near future. Do not include HSS in concurrency, but look at level-of-service for transit.
- On the question of using local money for state facilities, in most cases, the group indicated that this was not appropriate. They had some willingness to consider using local funds to improve intersections with HSS.
- On the question of the retaining the exemption for the HSS, group agreed that it is okay to leave HSS exemption intact, but it is still critical to improve the system. Improvements to the HSS should be handled separately from concurrency. Impact fees from new developments will not make a dent in the “catch-up” and “keep up.”
- The group also supported working more closely with the state to resolve issues, such as operations, geometrics and signal coordination. And on a case-by-case basis, working with state to match local funds as they affect intersections with state facilities.
- The group also wanted to ask the state to use regional transportation projects and forecasts in their programming process to help set priorities. This would provide a better basis to make decisions on what is funded.
Non-HSS Facilities

- They supported not changing the non-HSS status in the short-term, but in the long-term, beginning a dialogue on how to address non-HSS facilities in local programs. There was no clear consensus on whether it was appropriate to extend the HSS exemption to non-HSS facilities.

Other discussion:

- Again, the suggestion was made to let the capitalists take care of the problem (i.e., you can have all the density you want, but you can’t generate any new trips.)

Regional (G) Regional Council Helping Local Programs

Questions:

Should the Regional Council help jurisdictions work together?
- Yes.

Should the focus be on data and information, or provide a larger role?
- Focus on data and information, not on standards.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- The group supported the Regional Council helping coordinate data issues. They noted that the Regional Council already provides good data and technical assistance, but that a greater “clearinghouse” role might exist for sharing information on new developments.
- One person suggested that Regional Council staff could review local comprehensive plans to see how they fit together, determine if there are inconsistencies between adjacent jurisdictions. Generate “advisory” report.
- The Regional Council should provide research and education to local jurisdictions. “More education and understanding before creating committees.” It is not effective to go off in a committee and come up with a solution when people do not understand the information/issues. There is suspicion that it is politically motivated. “No imposed solutions.”
- Educate the region about capacity, mobility and accessibility. Look at the cost of capacity versus the cost of mobility per trip. Give a “SimCity” type of game to every person in the region to help him or her understand the choices.
- Transit service should be integrated with planning process (separate from concurrency).
- The group did not support the Regional Council helping to coordinate on standards issues. Rather, let the locals work it out.
- The group was lukewarm support for standardizing methodologies, but there was some support for pursue state grant for developing standardized methodology, but any methodology developed should not be prescriptive. There would be resistance to a standard. “No” to anything that is regulatory.
- One person strongly supported the Regional Council helping to standardize methodologies. Idea would be to create a standard multimodal (transit, bike, pedestrian) methodology that would be available to local jurisdictions. Another person had concerns about a “one size fits all” approach.

Regional (H) Regional Council Developing a Regional Program

Questions:

Should the Regional Council have its own concurrency program?
- Undecided. Likely, maintain status quo.

Should this be focused on data and information sharing or take on a larger role?
- Focus on data and information to support local programs [Action G].
Participant Discussion and Comments:

- The group supported the status quo – the Regional Council not having a regional program, but using Regional Council information and data. Process in place now is flexible enough.
- There was limited support for the Regional Council having its own concurrency program, but the focus would continue to be on information and data.
- There was no clear preference on developing standards for “regional facilities” and evaluating these facilities for “regional concurrency.” The group agreed on need to target investments to regional facilities, but maybe this is separate from concurrency.

State (I) Making Development-Related Charges More Flexible

Question:

Should jurisdictions be allowed to use impact fees to fund ongoing projects or programs?

- No.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

- There was a strong consensus that impact fees should be used only for capital projects, and should not be used for operations and maintenance.
Table 8 Summary Notes

Facilitators: Dave Anderson & Ned Conroy – This group discussed issues E, F, G, H, I, J, and K.

Local (E) Coordinating on Interjurisdictional Impacts-Local Facilities

Questions:
Should jurisdictions coordinate on data and standards issues?
• Yes.
At what jurisdictional level should this occur?
• At subregional level.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
• Jurisdictions should coordinate on both data and standards. Coordination is needed at all levels but most effective at the subarea level.
• The group felt that the status quo is not a real alternative – not in major portions of the metro area. Outlying rural cities may have less need to coordinate. No action may be alternative in some locations where the current approach is working and coordination occurs [example: Bellevue Redmond Overlake Transportation (BROTS) interlocal agreement]. The group also felt that there is no effective means of addressing pass-through traffic currently in any comprehensive way. Fundamental idea assumes a closed system. Land use and facility choices are widely distributed throughout the region requiring greater that subarea coordination. All projects have regional impact.
• The group felt that many complexities would exist. Models only work at level designed which is generally more localized. Pass through is so multifaceted (from adjacent jurisdictions, regional trips) that ability of modeling is limited. Corridor level load is the most fundamental breakdown and most difficult to reflect in localized modeling. Resources to maintain model capabilities vary significantly. Use of common multi-jurisdictional model has produced successful results in Overlake. Modeling requires a better understanding of external trips than we currently have. Also, have to address who would be in charge of the model upkeep? Another issue is how to tackle dueling model conflicts? These create administrative problems. Developing an effective multi-jurisdictional model is an important step but not sufficient to deal with most coordination issues.
• On the issue of service standards, the group felt that these are in fact more difficult (than modeling) to coordinate, in part because so many alternative standards exist and standards vary. Coordination would require a common vision and principles for land use or other management strategies.
• On the issue of design standards, coordination is also difficult but there could be agreement on “ultimate design” of a facility.
• Lastly, subarea coordination is a common and successful form [South County Area Transportation Board or BROTS]. This level of coordination is difficult enough; going further may be implausible.
Local (F) Coordinating on Interjurisdictional Impacts-State Facilities

Questions:

How should jurisdictions address state facility impacts?
  • Leave system as is.

Should local money be spent on state facilities? Should fees be collected specifically for state routes?
  • Generally, no.

Should the exemption for Highways of Statewide Significance (HSS) be continued?
  • Yes, work to resolve issues.

What guidelines are most appropriate for how non-HSS facilities are addressed?
  • Do not extend exemption, work to resolve issues.

Participant Discussion and Comments:

• In general, state facility impacts should be addressed outside of concurrency. State has and should continue to have full responsibility for HSS. The exemption should continue but there needs to be a way to deal with improvements that are needed but not funded. Should be a larger regional role in non-HSS facilities.

• The group felt that concurrency is working in places, but not in others — therefore this may not be a state issue. Currently state monitors development by corridor, even though there is limited money.

• The group generally supported keeping the HSS exemption. If there were no HSS exemption, it could create a moratorium on development. Also, concurrency is largely about land use control, which is a local issue. Without land use control, the state cannot be held to concurrency.

• Some felt that the exemption of HSS is working; that mitigation can come from SEPA, and that local land use decisions should not be restricted by state facilities problems.

• Others were less sure, noting that the justification for an HSS exemption assumes state funding through WA budget — funding which has not materialized. The impacts on HSS facilities are so large that SEPA is not enough. There is a need for more state funding.

• A minority suggested that local governments should assess mitigation fees for large projects affecting HSS and the state must consider spill over impacts from HSS to local streets and visa versa. Some suggested this is the current state.

Non-HSS Facilities

• The group felt that HSS should be dealt with differently than non-HSS, and that the exemption should not be extended.

• There was sentiment that locals and the state need to work together on non-HSS, and that non-concurrency fees need to be addressed for both HSS and non-HSS.

• Some stated support for the current work being done by RTPOs for developing level-of-service for non-HSS (which has just been started in the Puget Sound region). Some suggested that RTPOs could set standard by district versus just roadways.

• The group felt that improvements could be made towards consistency on some facilities. The regional population and employment allocation process might be a good model for negotiating agreement on non-HSS.
Regional (G) Regional Council Helping Local Programs

Questions:
Should the Regional Council help jurisdictions work together?
- Yes.
Should the focus be on data and information, or provide a larger role?
- Primarily focus on data and information.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
- The Regional Council should help jurisdictions work together, primarily focusing on data and information sharing. No regional concurrency program is needed.
- Regional coordination involves more than just data – it involves help with facilitating discussion between and among jurisdictions.

Regional (H) Regional Council Developing a Regional Program

Questions:
Should the Regional Council have its own concurrency program?
- No separate program.
Should this be focused on data and information sharing or take on a larger role?
- Focus on data and information to support local programs (Action G).

Participant Discussion and Comments:
- The Regional Council should help jurisdictions work together, primarily focusing on data and information sharing. No regional concurrency program is needed.
- No over-arching regional authority to administer any part of concurrency: level-of-service, methodology, fees, and development approval should all be local decisions.

State (I) Making Development-Related Charges More Flexible

Question:
Should jurisdictions be allowed to use impact fees to fund ongoing projects or programs?
- No.

Participant Discussion and Comments:
- Jurisdictions should not depend on impact fees for ongoing programs/services. Impact fees are not appropriate for ongoing services, particularly affects transit. It makes sense theoretically, but difficult to maintain. There would need to be an “endowment” fund created.
- Difficult to establish justifiable nexus between project impact and transportation demand management or other non-capacity improvement. Might be acceptable if nexus can be established. Even then, how do you calculate the fee level, because mitigation must be tied to fees.
- Also, local governments do not control transit and transit agencies have difficulty committing to ongoing service.
- Beyond legislative authority and legal issues, there may be constitutional issues.
- Need a legally sanctioned authority to support nexus between fees and ongoing program or non-vehicle capacity improvement.
- Another option is to not look at concurrency on a project-by-project basis, but use a King County “metering” approach.
**State (J) Making Exemptions Legal**

*Questions:*

- Are exemptions a useful tool that should be legalized?
  - Yes.

*How should this be done?*

- Legalize and clarify. Exempt transit, defined uses, and perhaps districts.

*Participant Discussion and Comments:*

- Exemptions are a useful tool and their use should be legalized and clarified, but not dictated at state level. Exemptions make sense for certain uses: affordable housing, schools, parks, public facilities, and social services.
- Need to carefully define what is exempt or you could allocate capacity to different uses. Need to balance fairness with predictability. State legislative changes are needed...but should allow significant local flexibility. Another comment was that if level-of-service is a local decision, why not let locals determine exemptions.
- A number of approaches exist, such as 1) variance approach (project by project), 2) specifically defined uses (predictability), and 3) districts (redevelopment). Exemptions might also be allowed for define areas rather than or in addition to land uses. Exemptions could also be based on public process or support.
- Transit facilities and/or transit-oriented development should be exempt. Impacts might be better handled through SEPA. Definitely exempt if transit facility has no associated parking.

**State (K) Strengthening Interjurisdictional Coordination Requirements**

*Questions:*

- Given the limited coordination, should a stronger coordination requirement be set? If so, how prescriptive should it be?
  - No stronger requirement.

*What method will be used to accomplish the coordination?*

- Not addressed.

*At what jurisdictional level should the coordination occur?*

- Not addressed.

*Participant Discussion and Comments:*

- The group had limited time for this item, but generally felt that coordination requirements should not be set at the state level. No further, state role needed to foster coordination.
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