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One of the hallmarks of the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) is its transportation concurrency requirement. Concurrency requires the provision of adequate facilities to serve new development. In developing Destination 2030, the region’s long-range transportation strategy, concurrency was discussed at great length as a tool for linking land use and transportation. The discussion brought out a concern that the intent of the requirement was not being met and perhaps was hindering efforts to meet other GMA goals.

The GMA leaves the implementation of concurrency to local discretion. Given the lack of prescriptive guidance, jurisdictions have developed programs that are compatible with their own unique transportation, land use, and other planning goals.

This report is the second part of a three-phase project to further understand how transportation concurrency is being used in the region. Phase 1 included a comprehensive inventory of concurrency programs in the four-county region. The Phase 2 effort solicited a more evaluative or qualitative response from a selected group of jurisdictions, and the findings of this phase are summarized below. These findings provide guidance and direction for identifying recommendations at the local, regional, and state level that will be developed during the Phase 3 work.

- **No Two Programs Are The Same.** The analysis reveals that jurisdictions’ programs vary widely. Significant differences are found in the administrative details of the programs, such as the measurement system, the capacity reservation methodology, and the level of development fees charged. Perhaps more importantly, differences are found in the objectives jurisdictions have for concurrency — in simple terms, some see it as a growth management tool and others see it as a funding tool. While most feel that their individual systems work fairly well for them, they also believe that the differences among jurisdictions’ programs create significant hurdles to being fully successful.

- **The Tool Is Being Used Cautiously.** Jurisdictions seem to be carefully balancing their concurrency program with other goals — the effect of this is that the tool is not being used to its greatest extent. Jurisdictions are not aggressively seeking to focus growth through tailoring the level-of-service

---

[1] Concurrency requirements relate to different types of public facilities, including sewer, water, and transportation. The focus of this report however is only concurrency for transportation facilities.
standard for different subareas, granting exemptions from concurrency review for specific types of uses, and so on. Also, jurisdictions are not requiring growth to pay its “fair share,” with few collecting even half of the rate they calculate it will cost to serve the new development.

• **Innovations Are Occurring.** While cautious, jurisdictions are being innovative and so can look to some of their neighbors to find innovative ways to solve problems that they are encountering. Some jurisdictions are successfully focusing growth in their centers by changing how they measure congestion or by reducing concurrency requirements. Some are building projects by implementing concurrency through impact fees. Some are supporting those uses important to them — such as daycares, libraries, transit stations, or even outdoor cafes — through the granting of exemptions despite being close to reaching their adopted level-of-service standard. Some are even addressing pass-through traffic by using different standards for peak versus non-peak hours. While these innovations do not resolve all funding and growth management issues, they seem to be making a difference for the communities using them.

• **The Choice of a Measurement System Is Key.** The details of a jurisdiction’s measurement system can greatly affect what mitigations are required and, if not carefully considered, can control what is in the capital facility plan. While almost all programs measure concurrency for automobiles, not all are controlled by the results. A few go past the volume-to-capacity ratio, and use design standards, travel times, or measure system-wide. Perhaps more impressively, some jurisdictions continue to use volume-to-capacity ratios but purposefully focus their mitigations on non-capacity adding projects such as transit or demand management programs.

• **Multimodal Approaches Are Limited.** Despite federal and state requirements, multimodal approaches are not making their way into jurisdictions’ programs to any great extent. In practice, concurrency is almost exclusively an automotive measurement system. While many jurisdictions do allow for mitigations that support other transportation modes, and some authorize trip reduction credits for demand management, rarely is the presence of alternative modes used as a factor in what standard is adopted, and never do jurisdictions use a wholly separate standard or approach for areas with high levels of transit service.

• **Limited Coordination Is Occurring.** Concurrency programs focus almost exclusively on the local impacts of development and, therefore, all impacts that occur geographically distant from a proposed development are excluded from concurrency review and mitigation. Key staff in the region strongly believe that this is a fundamental problem with the existing system. In looking for solutions, a number of respondents indicated that a role exists for regional and perhaps state agencies to help address cross-boundary issues and mitigations.

• **State Facilities.** In most locations, congestion on state facilities creates local impacts, but is not stopping development from occurring. At the same time, the fact that local jurisdictions do the concurrency work means that development mitigation funds are usually not used to pay for improvements to state facilities.

The findings of the Phase 2 work provide a foundation for developing recommendations for how local governments can use the existing concurrency tool. The findings also provide the framework for considering where regional policy and/or state law can be enhanced to provide greater clarity and direction. As appropriate, recommendations will be developed during the Phase 3 work.
Introduction

A. 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\(^2\) and the Washington Administrative Code (WAC)\(^3\) 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 enforce adopted ordinances that 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.\(^4\)

A Regional Perspective. Although the bulk of work related to concurrency and level-of-service is done at the local level, Washington State law provides for regionwide perspectives. The Regional Transportation


\(^4\) Development Regulations: Concurrency 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 "it is important to recognize 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.
Planning Organization legislation requires regional review of level-of-service methodologies used by cities and counties to promote a consistent regional evaluation of transportation facilities and corridors. Regional transportation planning organizations 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.

B. 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 an increasing number of trips made in the region, has pushed many jurisdiction’s transportation facilities to their adopted levels-of-service standards.

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 their adopted standards. 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 decreased.

Compounding the situation is the fact that for most jurisdictions, control of their level-of-service is only partially in their hands. Pass-through traffic and impacts from development in surrounding jurisdictions can dramatically affect the local 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 logically 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, the 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 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 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 scope of work to assess the effectiveness of transportation concurrency programs throughout the region.

---

5 Organization’s Duties [RCW 47.80.023 (7) and (8)]

6 The Puget Sound Regional Council serves as the growth and transportation planning agency for the four-county 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.
C. Three-Phase Work Plan

To assess the impact of the transportation concurrency, Regional Council staff focused on how local jurisdictions are addressing the requirements. This involved working primarily with local government staff, as well as members of the Regional Council’s policy boards and committees, which represent a more diverse set of agencies.

The goals of Phase 1 were to survey jurisdictions in the four-county region to determine whether they have programs in place, to understand how they are using them, to understand whether they are working collaboratively, and to determine whether they believe changes are necessary. To meet these goals, the Regional Council sent a survey to all 86 jurisdictions in the four-county region, and 68 jurisdictions responded. Phase 1 was completed in January 2002, and the first report is posted on the Regional Council’s website at http://www.psrc.org/projects/growthstrategies/concurrency.htm.

The goals of Phase 2 are to review and analyze the concurrency programs for a select number of jurisdictions, highlighting innovative methods, describing best practices, and assessing the different approaches in place. This phase began in January 2002 and is complete with the distribution of this report.

The goals of Phase 3, the final component of the project, are to work with the practitioners, host a hands-on workshop to develop recommendations for how concurrency might be further refined at the local and regional level, and to determine if there are any recommendations for legislative changes to be made at the state level. This phase begins in the fall of 2002 and will be finished in the winter of 2003.

D. Description of Phase 2 Work

Working with input from members of the Regional Staff Committee, Regional Council staff designed the second phase of the concurrency project as a more in-depth case study analysis. It focuses on a selected group of jurisdictions’ transportation concurrency programs in order to highlight innovative methods, assess the different approaches being used, and ultimately, to understand whether jurisdictions’ goals for their concurrency program are being met.

Regional Council staff conducted eight focus group sessions with senior staff from a diverse group of cities and towns and all four counties in the region. Nineteen jurisdictions (see Appendix 1) were chosen based on a number of criteria, including size, growth rate, innovative practices identified in the Phase 1 work, and geographic distribution.

Two important constituencies are included in this phase of work — through their involvement in the Regional Council’s boards and committees — but were not met with directly. This includes staff from the Washington State Department of Transportation, and staff from the region’s transit agencies. These constituencies are important in understanding transportation concurrency given the prominence of state routes in the local jurisdictions and the exemption for certain highways from concurrency requirements, and the challenges of siting and development of high-capacity transit systems. Both of these systems are integral components of the region’s long-range growth management, economic and transportation strategy, VISION 2020. These constituencies, and others, will be more closely integrated in the Regional Council’s work through participation in the Phase 3 workshop.

VISION 2020 is the long-range growth management, economic and transportation strategy for the central Puget Sound region encompassing King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties.

[Vision 2020 is the long-range growth management, economic and transportation strategy for the central Puget Sound region encompassing King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish counties.]
Unlike Phase 1, which elicited quantitative responses from all jurisdictions, the Phase 2 work sought a more evaluative or qualitative response from this selected group of jurisdictions. A set of ten questions was given to the participants ahead of time to provide a common framework for the focus group discussions. The questions are based on issues that arose from the Phase 1 investigative work, as well as input provided by Regional Staff Committee members. Focus group participants were encouraged to submit written responses to the questions — 17 of the 19 jurisdictions did so.

**Focus Groups:** In general terms, the discussions revolved around the following questions (the exact questions are shown in Appendix 2):
- What goals do jurisdictions have for their programs and are they being met?
- Are jurisdictions tailoring their programs to reflect subarea planning?
- How aggressively are jurisdictions using mitigation fees, and what financial gaps still exist?
- What types of mitigation are taking place?
- Are multimodal issues being addressed?
- How are jurisdictions addressing pass-through traffic and interjurisdictional mitigation?
- What impact does the exemption of major state facilities have?
- Is the public aware of concurrency, and are major legal issues being encountered?

A second component of the Phase 2 work was a detailed case study review of the concurrency-related documents from the same selected group of jurisdictions. Regional Council staff received and reviewed the jurisdictions’ municipal codes, comprehensive plan sections, and/or ordinances.

**Case Studies:** Each case study analysis describes:
- What measurement system is used, with a discussion of tailoring and any traffic study requirements
- How the concurrency test is administered, what exemptions are granted, and thresholds used for development review
- What capacity allocation methodology is used, and a description of certificates, timeframes and transferability
- What mitigation options are given, whether decision criteria are provided, and whether there are links to the transportation or capital improvement programs
- Whether transportation demand management, multimodal, and interjurisdictional coordination issues are addressed
- A description of any additional unique or innovative features of the program.

These technical and detailed reviews are meant to inform all jurisdictions about what their peer jurisdictions are doing and to look for innovative practices in the different facets of the concurrency programs. Staff from each of the participating jurisdictions determined what documents to provide and ultimately reviewed the case study for their own jurisdiction.
II. Focus Group Questions and Responses

This chapter summarizes the focus group sessions and is organized around the ten discussion questions. For each question, the full range of opinions is summarized and paraphrased. Given the voluntary nature of the responses, answers are reported in generalized terms and individual jurisdictions are not mentioned by name. This summary is intended to supplement the thorough inventory of concurrency programs presented in the Phase 1 Report and to provide guidance and direction for the recommendations to be developed in the final phase of the project.

Chapter III provides the individual case study reviews for each participating jurisdiction’s concurrency ordinances and codes. Chapter IV provides the conclusions and findings from both the focus group sessions and the case studies.

QUESTION 1:  BALANCING COMPETING GOALS

What are the goals and objectives of your concurrency program as it relates to (1) managing growth and development and (2) accessibility and mobility? How effective has your program been in meeting your goals?

Several respondents noted the inherent tension in the Growth Management Act (GMA), which mandates that jurisdictions both accommodate their assigned growth allocations and ensure that adequate facilities and services are provided at the time development occurs or within six years. At least two jurisdictions state that their goal is to take the GMA “literally,” which they defined as ensuring that services and facilities are available to serve the existing community and new development. A number of jurisdictions indicated that concurrency was not much of a problem in their communities and that they were able to both accommodate new development and maintain adequate facilities and services.

A number of respondents view the concurrency requirement as a tool for timing or phasing development, rather than for stopping it. In their opinion, the challenge of concurrency is to ensure that proper planning and ongoing improvements keep up with phased growth. Their emphasis is on trying to keep up with or stay ahead of anticipated growth or development.
Managing Growth and Development. Some jurisdictions consciously place more emphasis on “accommodating new development” even if this results in reduced levels of mobility. Their primary goal is to attract growth, and several mentioned that to accommodate the growth it is sometimes necessary to shift the focus from maintaining roadway service levels to providing adequate transit.

Some respondents noted that their jurisdictions use concurrency as a tool to attract desired types of development and to discourage unwanted development. Concurrency is also used to focus growth in locations where it is desired by the jurisdiction, recognizing an obligation to keep areas where development is occurring “in compliance” with expectations for adequate services. Other jurisdictions indicated that it is in the rural areas that the biggest concurrency-related problems are occurring.

Accessibility and Mobility. Some jurisdictions feel that it is the responsibility of new development to address and mitigate their long-term impacts on the transportation system. Some expressed the opinion that concurrency systems should allow for growth but firmly comply with policy commitments that transportation services should not deteriorate. One respondent summarized this perspective by stating that developments should pay their “fair share” for improvements to accommodate the vehicle trips they generate.

While some programs are designed primarily to address arterials operating below — or anticipated to fall below — adopted level-of-service standards, staff from some of these jurisdictions acknowledged that there are limits to focusing concurrency programs primarily on congestion relief. In more than one instance, participants noted situations in which roads really cannot be built out anymore — even if the right-of-way exists for further expansion, citizens in their neighborhoods do not want roads “widened to nine lanes.” As a result, jurisdictions are looking to alternative approaches for addressing concurrency-related accessibility concerns such as transit corridors and trip-reduction mitigation strategies.

Concurrency as a Planning Tool. A few jurisdictions see concurrency as a mechanism for evaluating development system-wide. These jurisdictions rely on concurrency to gauge performance across the system and as a capital-planning tool to help define and prioritize improvements needed to serve future growth. Some responded that a key part of concurrency is monitoring or “tracking.” One individual suggested that part of monitoring the performance of a concurrency system is “knowing about financial contributions,” that is, how private dollars are being brought into the system to pay for improvements and services. Or as another individual offered, concurrency provides an “opportunity for reckoning.”

**QUESTION 2: FUNDING ISSUES**

To what degree is your jurisdiction taking advantage of mitigation fees (including SEPA & impact fees) that you are authorized to collect? What gaps still exist to adequately finance development-related improvements and services (funded through these fees)? What types of mitigation have taken place?

Respondents indicated that the key issue is how to determine the nature of impacts from preexisting developments as opposed to those from “newcomers.” Based on this, they then try to determine how much money, or mitigation, is fair and feasible for a jurisdiction to collect.

Some jurisdictions put a great deal of emphasis on the use of impact fees for transportation or other types of mitigation, such as money collected for improvements determined through the State Environmental
Policy Act (SEPA) process. Other jurisdictions try to balance their reliance on such fees by pursuing other funding sources such as state and federal grants.

A number of respondents expressed concern that they are experiencing a growing shortfall in funding growth-related transportation improvements and indicated that they are not able to also address existing deficiencies. Several respondents suggested that impact fees are the key to avoiding concurrency failure. Where problems occur, a few asserted that the problem is not with the legislation per se but with jurisdictions being unwilling to apply the tool to its fullest potential.

**Rates Vary.** Where impact fees are assessed, rates and approaches can vary significantly. In the permitting process, some jurisdictions charge transportation fees of $600 to $800 per new home, whereas others charge up to $3000 to $4000. Interestingly, more than one respondent indicated that the true charge would be much higher if all the other facility area costs were fully capitalized (such as park and school impact fees). One jurisdiction is using a phased approach to impact fees, collecting $300 a year for three years. Another indicated that about 20 percent of its citywide transportation improvements are paid through impact fees; others cited similar or lower figures. One jurisdiction indicated that it is currently estimating its impact fees to cover about 30 percent of the anticipated costs for making needed improvements, but may soon raise its fee rate to cover 50 percent. Another noted that its jurisdiction was at the “high end” by charging close to 50 percent.

Most transportation fees are calculated based on the number of trips generated, the type of development, and the identified improvements within a benefit zone. One city has determined the entire jurisdiction to be a “benefit zone,” and charges a flat fee per trip for new development. Jurisdictions using per-trip fees vary their amounts; examples given range from $75 to $173 per trip generated.

**SEPA-Related Mitigation Fees.** While Washington state law precludes the use of GMA-impact fees as a sole source for funding identified improvements, some jurisdictions use SEPA-fees to collect the full cost of a mitigation action, including mitigating impacts to maintain level-of-service standards for transportation facilities. However, SEPA related mitigation is usually limited to site-specific impacts. Some respondents indicated a preference for the use of SEPA because it allows for an assessment of impacts on a case-by-case basis. A number indicated that the upfront work needed to set up an impact fee program sometimes becomes moot because of changing conditions. Others indicated that SEPA mitigation can be piecemeal in terms of implementing the comprehensive plan, and one noted that developers are less fond of SEPA because the results are less predictable. Some jurisdictions find the middle ground and routinely rely on both impact and SEPA mitigation fees.

**Developer Improvements.** Jurisdictions negotiate with developers to mitigate transportation-related impacts; this was acknowledged to be arbitrary, and sometimes the outcomes are more reflective of the participants’ negotiating skills rather than the actual need. In some arrangements, the city collects mitigation money and then pays the developer to make the improvements. In some instances, the improvements may be “partial,” where the developer agrees to cover a portion of the improvement, such as 50 or 75 percent. In other cases, the developer covers 100 percent of the cost, and a “latecomer agreement” is put into place, allowing the developer to recoup costs by collecting fees from developments that occur later.

**Fees Not Used.** Some respondents indicated that they have yet to use mitigation fees. In at least one case, this is because a jurisdiction felt it needed to improve its overall capital facilities planning before it could tie developer fees to new developments.
QUESTION 3: INTEGRATORJURIDCTIONAL COORDINATION

Further describe interjurisdictional relationships and issues — including how impacts from — and on — other jurisdictions are addressed. Has pass-through traffic — emanating from new development in adjacent jurisdictions — created level-of-service conditions that limit your jurisdiction’s ability to permit desired urban growth?

Pass-through traffic was frequently identified as the primary impediment to balancing development and infrastructure. One attendee summed it up and stated that their jurisdiction can take care of its own trips but cannot take care of “everyone else’s” traffic. Others also indicated that their service conditions were deteriorating primarily because of pass-through traffic. Some jurisdictions on the border of the urban growth area feel that pass-through traffic is particularly problematic because of trips generated from unincorporated areas.

Some jurisdictions do try to factor pass-through traffic into their travel analyses in generic ways; however, few factor in permitted development from neighboring jurisdictions. One respondent made a point of reporting that all neighboring jurisdictions are notified of “known impacts” when a development proposal is under consideration. Again, however, few indicated that their jurisdictions have set up formal processes for incorporating this information on development proposals.

Challenges to Coordination. Some respondents indicated that one difficulty with coordination rests with the fact that concurrency systems are usually not compatible and that every jurisdiction has different goals and objectives. Some suggested that efforts at achieving successful coordination are perhaps most promising if pursued primarily along key corridors that traverse jurisdictional boundaries.

Some jurisdictions have put interlocal agreements in place (usually where a city is permitting a development that necessitates improvements on nearby county facilities) and other such agreements are in the works. However, a fair number have consciously decided to delay developing interlocal agreements until they have a better understanding of the interjurisdictional impacts. It was noted that in almost every case, an interlocal agreement leads to situations where one jurisdiction has to pay funds to the other — this potential risk creates a strong disincentive.

On the other hand, some positive efforts are being made in the area of analysis tools; for example, several adjacent jurisdictions have made conscientious efforts to use similar forms of modeling. In one area where jurisdictions share modeling capabilities, they also work together to develop a joint list of improvement projects. One city has taken quite an innovative approach for its level-of-service standards — roads near its city limits default to the level-of-service standards of the neighboring jurisdiction.

Regional Role. Respondents agreed that pass-through traffic and interjurisdictional impacts and mitigations from developments are often regional problems and require regional solutions. Some respondents mentioned that there is a benefit to jurisdictions relying on a regional agency to provide consistent information for jurisdictions to use in their analysis of concurrency-related issues. Some cited the benefit of using a regional agency to annually provide common baseline data to capture trends in traffic levels. A few respondents suggested that a “regional concurrency” program that was not too prescriptive might provide some benefits.

The GMA requires jurisdictions to consider the impacts of their transportation plan on neighboring jurisdictions and vice versa [RCW 36.70A.070].
QUESTION 4: STATE FACILITY IMPACTS

Has traffic from state facilities — especially pass-through travel — created level-of-service conditions that limit your jurisdiction’s ability to permit desired urban development? Are there specific examples of “spillover impacts” that state facilities have had on your local facilities? How have you worked with the state in addressing impacts?

Most jurisdictions indicated that traffic on state facilities has not negatively affected their ability to approve development. However, a few did indicate that it has led to developments being denied or modified. In both cases, respondents noted that when state routes are congested, people seek out other routes on local streets, and that strong neighborhood opposition exists to expanding local streets for what is identified as pass-through traffic.

For some jurisdictions their concurrency problems arise only because of the spillover effects from state facilities — in other words, locally maintained streets have no concurrency issues except in the proximity of state roadways. A related concern is that signalization priority is given to moving traffic on state facilities, which causes back-ups on local streets that intersect with these facilities. On the other hand, as one respondent noted, local traffic as well as pass-through traffic use state facilities.

Some respondents noted that although some state facilities are exempt from concurrency requirements, their jurisdictions do work with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to identify and provide needed improvements to serve new development. One jurisdiction cited working with WSDOT on transportation demand management mitigation strategies for a corridor with concurrency problems. Another noted that they have developed an interlocal agreement with WSDOT in order to mitigate its impacts to the state highway, and indicated that they are collecting funds for a bypass project.

QUESTION 5: MULTIMODAL ISSUES

How are multimodal issues addressed in the various aspects of your concurrency program?

Respondents pointed out a number of times that multimodal transportation issues are factored into the jurisdiction’s development review process and comprehensive plans, but are not necessarily implemented through concurrency. Other jurisdictions noted diverse but limited approaches to multimodal transportation and concurrency, with a number limiting their concurrency programs exclusively to automobile travel. Others indicated that they have incorporated other modes of travel into their programs, including consideration of capacity for bicycles and pedestrians, by prescribing treatments for sidewalks and shoulders. Some respondents indicated that their programs factor in shifts in travel modes through traffic counts.

Transit. Some jurisdictions indicated that they have tried the “conventional auto-oriented approaches” and are considering moving towards a greater consideration of transit. Some see this as an obvious next step since buses are caught in the same traffic as other vehicles. In various parts of the region, transit-priority streets have been designated, and arterials have been redesigned to incorporate transit. Other jurisdictions consider the presence of transit in adopting their standards. Several respondents indicated that for transit to truly be viable, it has to be part of a high-capacity system, with its own dedicated rights-of-way. One respondent noted that its jurisdiction allows an exemption from concurrency to
public transportation facilities. Another pointed out that in Florida transit facilities are exempt from concurrency in all jurisdictions, and recommended that this approach be considered in the central Puget Sound region.9

**Nonmotorized Travel.** For a number of jurisdictions, sidewalks are seen as a critical missing link in making the transportation system operate more effectively. Several concurrency programs factor in sidewalks, and some jurisdictions have identified specific nonmotorized routes in their programs. Some jurisdictions require sidewalk improvements through their concurrency programs, including the provision of off-site sidewalks near the new development. Typically, such off-site improvements may be part of a larger pedestrian strategic plan, such as the creation of safe school walk areas or other community activity areas prioritized through a local planning process. Some jurisdictions offer trip reduction credits to developers for including nonmotorized trails into their developments.

**Transportation Demand Management (TDM).**10 In some instances, to meet concurrency requirements a jurisdiction will focus its initial efforts on demand management strategies. Jurisdictions that use this approach may require that TDM programs be tested to show their impact before accepting them. In at least one instance, a respondent indicated that the TDM component was problematic, because developers see it as an added burden in the local development process. The respondent further noted that after programs were accepted, some residents also took issue and stated their preference for more conventional street improvements. One jurisdiction incorporates land use considerations into its concurrency program, requiring new development to factor in transit compatible design and density. Another jurisdiction indicated offering credits toward impact fees to developments that encourage and enhance alternatives to traveling alone.

**QUESTION 6: TAILORING TO SUBAREAS**

If you are tailoring your program to reflect subarea planning, how is this done? Has it been effective in meeting your overall objectives for managing growth and facilities — e.g., focusing growth in compact communities (and/or discouraging growth where it is not desired)?

One of the growth initiatives advanced in Destination 2030 encourages jurisdictions to be more flexible in the manner in which they apply concurrency — particularly as they relate to growth management efforts to create more compact, transit-friendly communities. The initiative states:

Concurrency requires needed facilities and services either to be available at the time of development, or funding to be available to provide the facilities within six years. Jurisdictions can develop a strategic subarea approach to concurrency that would more effectively foster development in targeted locations. (Destination 2030, page 38)

Many jurisdictions indicated that their programs use subarea planning, but it is not always related to focusing growth.

---

9 The exemption of public transit facilities from concurrency requirements in Florida includes stations, station parking, park-and-ride lots, and rail stations (Florida Statute 163.3180(4)).

10 TDM strategies are designed to provide alternatives to driving alone. Such strategies are required by state law to be incorporated into local transportation plans and are a major policy focus in the region’s adopted transportation strategy, Destination 2030.
Designated Center or Town Center. At least one of the jurisdictions in the region recognizes that its designated urban center has a different status from the rest of the jurisdiction. Within the center, issues such as parking management are dealt with more comprehensively. That jurisdiction is planning to better define how to approach concurrency within its center during its next plan update.

One other jurisdiction with a designated urban center indicated that it tolerates more congestion in its center, as well as in other business districts. Transit service and availability are factored into consideration. Several cities with designated urban centers indicated that they do not yet distinguish their approach to concurrency by subareas, but may consider doing so.

Subareas. Another approach is a zonal system, which is used by a number of jurisdictions, where a different standard is set to reflect land use conditions and goals, the presence of existing mobility options, and the completeness of the road network. Respondents noted that such an approach could result in different types of mitigation prioritization schemes such as allowing mitigation to occur in zones other than the one in which a development proposal is being made. Additionally, a respondent noted that this approach tends to support more system-wide projects.

Transit Corridor. One jurisdiction indicated that it has higher concurrency standards (meaning it allows more congestion) for transit-compatible development that is on transit-compatible corridors.

Urban/Rural. As a rule, concurrency standards are set lower (i.e., accepting less congestion) outside of designated urban growth areas. Several of the respondents from the counties indicated that their major concurrency problems occur primarily in rural areas. In some instances, a graduated approach is used to distinguish how concurrency is to be applied in rural versus urban areas. One county has a three-part set of standards in place, which allows more congestion in urban areas than the urban/rural line, and the least in rural areas.

Exemptions. Another way in which jurisdictions indicated that they tailor their approach is through the granting of exemptions. Many jurisdictions have identified types of development that are exempt from concurrency requirements. They include small developments, construction of a new home on an existing lot, and certain types of short plats. In some instances, development of commercial, educational and/or maintenance facilities are exempt from concurrency. Other respondents indicated that public uses such as day cares and libraries are exempt.

QUESTION 7: IMPACT ON DEVELOPMENT

Why has your concurrency program either had or not had any significant impacts on development? Does this have to do with thresholds, the nature of the development reviewed to date, or level-of-service standards?

Most respondents indicated that few problems have arisen from their concurrency programs, and that the problems are usually location-specific rather than system-wide. Nevertheless, there are a few jurisdictions with areawide moratoria in place — some of these are related to transportation, and others arise because of service issues such as the need to expand sewer capacity. One respondent indicated that concurrency should be viewed more as a “management tool” than as “design review” for new developments based on the opinion that concurrency provides a systemic and proactive look at development and infrastructure needs on a regular basis.
Stopping or Delaying Development. At least one of the focus group participants indicated that concurrency has been used to stop a development project from proceeding. In other jurisdictions, concurrency has caused development to be delayed. In such instances, the development can usually proceed if the developer commits to mitigating the impact.

No Significant Impact. Most jurisdictions indicated that their concurrency programs have had no major impacts; this was usually meant as development has not been stopped or delayed, rather than whether their concurrency program had lead to mitigation projects. Several indicated that the developments taking place in their jurisdiction have primarily been small and that even in situations where there have been a large number of small developments concurrency concerns were not at issue. Others indicated that there has been no significant impact because their concurrency programs were relatively new. Some of these respondents did indicate that they anticipated having an impact in the near future.

Thresholds. Some jurisdictions have tied concurrency to their SEPA program, meaning developments that trip SEPA thresholds also trip concurrency. Some respondents expressed the opinion that developers sometimes break up larger developments to be able to fall under concurrency thresholds, and there is some concern that in the end, such developments could add up and have a significant cumulative effect on a jurisdiction. However, one jurisdiction indicated that while nearly two thirds of its developments fall under the threshold, estimates indicate that these developments cumulatively account for less than 10 percent of forecasted new trips.

QUESTION 8: PUBLIC AWARENESS

Discuss the public awareness in your community concerning concurrency and growth management.

Jurisdictions indicated a spectrum of public knowledge and involvement in concurrency and growth-management related issues. About a half dozen of the focus group participants indicated there was little or no public awareness of concurrency in their jurisdictions, while others indicated that public interest in concurrency was strong in specific neighborhoods. Where public awareness of concurrency is significant, it is usually in neighborhoods with active community groups or neighborhood councils.

Frequently, neighborhoods have educated themselves on concurrency expectations in response to proposed road widenings or other potential infrastructure improvements that local residents fear may have a negative impact locally. Some of the respondents indicated that homebuilders associations and similar groups have become more actively involved in concurrency related issues when limitations on development are taking place.

QUESTION 9: MITIGATION TIMEFRAMES

Where funding was committed to provide needed facilities within six-years of new development coming on line, what has been happening as you reach that six-year mark? Are the identified facilities being built within that timeframe? Partially built? If they have not been built, what is happening with the money that was committed?

There have been only a few instances where jurisdictions have not spent money collected for improvements within the authorized period and had to return money. Several respondents indicated that tracking
the expenditure of money is key to meeting the six-year target. Others do not track the use of fees, but have not encountered any problems.

Most jurisdictions have not needed to return funding because they transfer money from mitigation accounts into general transportation accounts or they pool funds and spend these dollars “first” as they build projects (these comments came from jurisdictions using both SEPA and impact fees). They indicated that this approach means that even if the project is only partially completed within a six-year period, but provides some benefit to those paying into the program, the money does not have to be returned.

One jurisdiction that had to return unspent money has now shifted from an improvement-specific accounting mechanism to a system-wide approach for financing improvement. Its mitigation money now goes into one funding pot (similar to pooling) that can be spent on any of the transportation improvements identified in the program.

**QUESTION 10: LEGAL ISSUES**

*Have there been any major legal issues that have impacted development or projects going forward under your concurrency provisions?*

Most jurisdictions indicated that they have not had any significant legal challenges to their concurrency programs. Moreover, where programs have been challenged, they have largely been upheld. Respondents noted that most cases revolve around modeling or analysis used in determining impacts. There have been charges of flawed data and at least one instance in which a homebuilders association questioned the methodology used to assess impacts. Other cases have resulted when developments were denied or when local residents took issue with a mitigation outcome or agreement reached with a developer. In such cases, the legal challenge has focused on the ordinance itself, rather than the specific decision.
III. Case Studies

This chapter provides a detailed review of the municipal codes, comprehensive plan sections, and/or ordinances related to concurrency from the local governments that attended the focus groups. The list of reviewed documents is shown at the top of each case study under Concurrency Program Facts. These documents are not necessarily comprehensive but do represent, from the perspective of the participating jurisdictions, the primary set of documents that describe the details of their concurrency programs. Chapter IV summarizes the findings from both the focus group sessions and the case studies.

The following are some issues to keep in mind when reading the case studies:

• Some jurisdictions conduct their concurrency work exclusively through the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) provisions. This is identified, and it is important to recognize that, to a certain extent, this creates somewhat of an apples-to-oranges comparison. Nonetheless, since the purpose is not to compare the approaches directly to one another, the case studies for jurisdictions using SEPA are included.

• An issue identified in the case studies as “not addressed in code or ordinance,” reflects what is in the submitted section of the code or ordinance, and does not necessarily mean that the jurisdiction is not considering the issue in other venues.

• The reviews are intended to provide jurisdictions with detailed information about how their peers are meeting the transportation concurrency requirement. However, a degree of summarizing and paraphrasing is used, and a review is not intended to be a comprehensive discussion of the program.

• The “Quick Facts” figures include a calculation of the rate of growth experienced between 1990 and 2000. This figure estimates the “real” rate of population change between 1990 and 2000, matching 1990 census block population data to each jurisdiction’s 2000 boundaries. Minor data adjustments were made to address mismatches between census block and jurisdiction geographies.

• The “Quick Facts” figures for counties reference only unincorporated area population.

• For the “Concurrency Program Facts” sections, ordinance is abbreviated to “Ord,” and municipal code abbreviated to “MC.” For example, the Bainbridge Island Municipal Code is referred to as “BIMC.”

Note: to decrease the size of the following cases studies, the following acronyms are used:

• TDM: Transportation Demand Management
• TIP: Transportation Improvement Program [referencing the local jurisdiction’s program]
I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on zonal volume-to-capacity ratio. Individual developments are tested.

II. DESCRIPTION
Measurement System: For all roads except SR 305, a peak hour mobility standard is used in multiple zones, based on volume-to-capacity. For SR 305, a volume-to-capacity ratio is also used, but is measured on an annual-ized average peak two hours (to capture tourist and ferry peak times) and is measured between intersections, with a mobility level-of-service of “D/E.”

Tailoring: Downtown area has a higher standard, allowing greater congestion, than other areas of the island.

Concurrency Test: Concurrency test passed if adequate capacity exists. If passed, a certificate is issued that is valid with building permit, unless building permit does not expire; then it is valid for three years. Certificate can be extended twice with building permit extensions. Certificates state uses, densities, and intensities; changes retested for incremental increase. Certificate is with parcel, not transferable. Can be subdivided with land subdivision, each parcel assigned a pro-rata share of certificate.

Thresholds: Preliminary plats of 5 or more residential lots, site plans and design review, and all permits that would increase demand by 50 or more trips per day are tested. City makes determination if a traffic study is necessary.

Exemptions: Developments in process before the program, and permits below the thresholds. Does not address whether trips from exempt developments are added to the model.

If the applicant fails, they can amend their proposal to reduce demand, or arrange to provide capacity.

Mitigation options: Not addressed in code. The comprehensive plan states that all new developments should maintain the level-of-service; this includes developers paying for any needed projects, and requiring new and expanded developments to participate in funding upgrading unimproved roadways to City standards.

TDM and Multimodal: Not addressed in code. The comprehensive plan also includes level-of-service standards for transit, ferries, bicycles, and pedestrians. These are not linked to the concurrency program.

Funding: The City is currently working on developing an impact fee.

III. MISCELLANEOUS
Interjurisdictional Coordination: Coordination is done with the WSDOT. The comprehensive plan states the City’s position regarding the key route that requires coordination, stating that SR 305 should not be widened to four lanes, and that the level-of-service “D” should be maintained through other means; if “D” cannot be maintained, the level-of-service should be lowered to “E.”

SEPA Exemption: Concurrency tests are exempt from SEPA.

Annual Reporting: Annual reporting of facilities required, and includes a summary of the level-of-service for monitored roads, summary of significant current and future development activity likely to have an impact, and recommendations based on projections for amendments to the capital improvement program and six-year capital facilities program for transportation facilities.
City of Bellevue

QUICK FACTS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2000 Population</td>
<td>109,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-2000 Population</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>12-1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCURRENCE PROGRAM FACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Traffic Standards Code (7-2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>BMC 14.10 and related Ordinances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. SUMMARY
Concurrence based on tailored zonal area-average volume-to-capacity. Individual developments tested. City imposes a traffic impact fee. Developments have been delayed, amended, but none have been denied.

II. DESCRIPTION

Measurement System: Bellevue uses an area-average method to evaluate system adequacy, with a two-hour (4 to 6 p.m.) peak period to represent extended high trip volume periods, as well as a congestion allowance that allows a specified number of intersections in the zone to exceed the standard. Tested intersections are those impacted by 20 or more p.m. peak period trips. Capacity includes all fully funded projects, which are those projects in the most recently adopted capital improvement program.

- Tailoring: Fourteen mobility management areas within city, each with separate maximum volume-to-capacity ratio and congestion allowances, based upon multiple community objectives, balances congestion with land use objectives, and is tailored to reflect mobility options.

Concurrency Test: Applicants that pass the test are given building permit. Background traffic counts include impacts of exempt developments, and regional and anticipated traffic from all approved developments.

- thresholds: Developments that generate 30 or more p.m. peak period trips are tested.
- Exemptions: Public uses such as childcare, transit, park facilities, not-for-profit social service facilities, affordable housing, libraries, public schools, hospitals, and some neighborhood shopping center redevelopment projects.

Applicants that fail can choose to reduce the size of the development, delay the schedule, or provide mitigation.

- Mitigation options: Defined as TDM or facility projects that return area to standard. In those areas already exceeding standard, mitigation must prevent further degradation.

- Mitigation decision criteria: Includes consistency with comprehensive plan, contribution to system performance, restriction on shifting traffic to other areas that are not equipped or do not have the capacity, prohibition on negatively impacting other transportation objectives (including high-occupant vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians), and not harming environment or violating traffic standards.

TDM and Multimodal: TDM allowed as form of mitigation. Developer can propose strategies to reduce single-occupant vehicles, with a maximum 30 percent trip reduction credit. City monitors and enforces program implementation.

Funding: City has an impact fee and collects SEPA mitigation fees, however, these funds are not directly generated through the concurrency program.

Timing: Construction projects must be underway within six months of the issuance of the certificate of occupancy. Payment for transportation projects must occur by the time of building permit issuance. Funds not spent within six years, are to be returned with interest. City to require an assurance device to guarantee completion, including collecting full funding up to the project estimate, but also have the discretion to require actual construction rather than funding. Latecomer agreements are allowed.

III. MISCELLANEOUS

Interjurisdictional Coordination: Bellevue has interlocal agreement with Redmond for joint planning areas, which includes using a joint computer model with Redmond and Kirkland, and jointly funding projects in Bellevue to allow growth in Redmond. The comprehensive plan calls for requiring development within Bellevue to include mitigation for significant impacts on other jurisdictions, and to work with other cities to develop similar actions if projects affect Bellevue.

11 The neighborhood shopping center exemption was found to be invalid. Contact City of Bellevue staff for additional information.
I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on citywide impact fee program, tailored requirements downtown. No exemptions granted. Individual development review and mitigation done through SEPA.

II. DESCRIPTION

Comprehensive plan notes approach to concurrency is to fund projects city can afford to build, to assess mitigation fees based upon new development’s share of the projects planned within a subarea, and to recognize that any residual congestion is an acceptable outcome which is reflected in the standard. This “tolerance” for congestion reflects necessary policy decision to promote TDM, and non-single-occupant vehicle options and to base decisions on financial constraints.

Measurement System: Standard is expressed as arterial miles exceeding generalized capacity during peak periods within a subarea. For concurrency, the City uses an impact fee structure that calculates a per-unit cost for new trips. This is based on future growth and the commensurate need for transportation projects. The costs of these projects are calculated citywide.

- Traffic studies: Includes traffic generated, transportation effects, and project and system mitigation measures. Study not limited to city boundaries. Mitigation analyzed in traffic study.
- Tailoring: Projects in core have their trip generation estimates reduced by 50 percent, and do not require a traffic study; however, they still pay the $900 per trip, which is phased over two years rather than one.
- Thresholds: Impact fees are paid if development generates more than 10 trips per day ($900 for each peak hour trip); traffic study required if development generates more than 50 peak hour trips ($900 plus the fair share percentage of mitigation costs needed to maintain level-of-service “D”). If level-of-service “D” met, no additional fair share contribution needed. Fair share calculation used to determine percentage of impact caused by the new development.
- Exemptions: None granted.

Additional Mitigation Plan: Applicant to prepare analysis and address both project and system mitigations, which should include basic requirement projects (street frontage, safety, etc.); TDM analysis for projects that cannot attain an level-of-service of “D”; alternative mode projects; and cost estimates for each potential element. The mitigation plan must detail which elements should be included, and provide options for applicant to construct or to pay the City to construct. These projects are not to duplicate other fees, and credit is to be given for dedication of land, contributions to local improvement districts, developer agreements, and so on.

TDM & Multimodal: Some of the project costs that make up the impact fee amount are for non-point specific projects which means, for example, that funds are available for transit projects across the city, and are more flexible since they are not specifically listed.

Timing: Payments made before final plat approval for subdivisions and building permit for all others. Fees to be obligated within 5 years. Refunds required if not spent.

III. MISCELLANEOUS

Interjurisdictional Coordination: Study area defined as including all areas projected to be used by a minimum of 50 new peak hour trips – not limited to city boundaries. Region-wide impacts determined in consultation with county, state, tribal, and others.

Impact Fee and Level-of-service Review: Fee structure and analysis reviewed every five years as part of the City’s GMA five-year comprehensive plan review process. Standards annually monitored and adjusted based on growth rates, comprehensive plan amendments and project financing.
Puget Sound Regional Council

City of Issaquah

QUICK FACTS
Year 2000 Population ............................................. 11,212
1990-2000 Population Growth .................................. 25%
Comprehensive Plan Adopted ............................... 4-1995

CONCURRENCY PROGRAM FACTS
Title .......... Transportation Concurrency Management (5-1998)
Source ................................................................. IMC 18.15.210

I. SUMMARY
Concurrence based on volume-to-planned capacity ratio at screen-points, with higher standards on regional links. Individual developments tested. Traffic volumes near Interstate 90 have significantly reduced the ability to develop in the City, except for exempt developments. Developments have been denied, delayed, amended, and withdrawn.

II. DESCRIPTION
Measurement System: The City uses a volume/planned capacity standard (which includes funded projects) measured at designated screen points. Screen points also have capacity caps that only allow a maximum number of additional new p.m. peak hour trips. If a road is built to city standards, planned capacity equals engineering capacity. Capacity is reduced in model if not built to standards, and if missing shoulders, sidewalks, bike lanes, turn lanes, etc., depending on the road classification and standard.

The impacts of new developments are measured at all screen points throughout the City – approval given if no more than four screen point checks are pushed above the volume-to-planned capacity ratio standard. For defined regional links, planned capacities will be 20 percent higher to allow for higher levels of congestion.

• Tailoring: Not addressed in code. To some extent, tailoring done on arterials through recognition of local and regional links.

Concurrency Test: The concurrency review occurs before the development application. Computer modeling may be required for developments producing more than 10 p.m. peak hour trips. If the applicant passes, a certificate of transportation concurrency is issued which reserves the capacity; this certificate is linked with the parcel, is non-transferable to other sites, and is linked to the specific permit application. The certificate expires within 180 days, but may be extended 180 days. Certificate is valid for development application time frame – if application does not have expiration date, certificate valid from 1 year of development approval, or until development receives building permit. May be extended 1 additional year.

• Thresholds: All developments reviewed except for exempt permits.

• Exemptions: Developments in process prior to the program, a single-family home not part of an application for a subdivision, new developments (with a cap of 100 peak hour trips) adding fewer than 3 p.m. peak hour trips that also have a water concurrency permit, re-use of existing buildings that generate less than 10 new peak hour trips, public elementary or middle or junior high schools, and existing high schools (which must develop a TDM plan).

If the application is denied, the following options are available: abandon development, appeal the determination, or seek a 90-day reservation of capacity in order to amend the application to mitigate impacts.

• Mitigation options: Include projects that help meet standard and which are identified in six-year TIP list (described below) of un-funded projects. Developer provides financial commitment to guarantee full funding; reduce the traffic impacts by phasing to match future transportation facility construction; reduce impacts by scaling down development; implementing a TDM program.

• Timing: Completion date of mitigation measures must be six years or less – development permits that require mitigations must condition approval on financial commitment to for completion of projects. Latecomer agreements are allowed. The comprehensive plan policy for concurrency management system includes an “Adequacy Time Frame” based on functional class. Principal arterials given 6 years, minor given 4 years, commercial and residential collector given 2 years, and local non-residential and residential must be immediate.

... continued
TDM and Multimodal: For TDM, City determines the single-occupant vehicle trip reduction benefit to be applied. TDM project proposals must include monitoring and performance enforcement, and a contingency plan if the measures are not working. TDM becomes a legal condition of development permit, tied to all future owners of property.

Funding: City includes goals on how the transportation system is to be paid for, with 10 percent from its road funds, 25 percent from developer impact fees, and 65 percent from outside agency funds. Transportation impact fees calculated citywide, with projects in comprehensive plan.

• Projects: Growth-related system improvements selected by the Council. Located on City facilities or those in other jurisdictions that have an interlocal agreement. Funds do not pay for existing deficiencies.

• Exemptions: Affordable housing, which includes low-income families earning between zero and fifty percent of the county median household income, and moderate-income families earning between fifty and eighty percent.

III. MISCELLANEOUS

Interjurisdictional Coordination: Not addressed in code. City has adopted interlocal agreement with County for concurrency and impact fees.

Annual Reporting: Annual capacity statement indicating availability of capacity issued each year. The comprehensive plan states that the concurrency program must include a GIS system, annual traffic counts and monitoring, updating the model, maintenance programs to prevent degradation of existing performance, and annual updates to TIP.
City of Kent

QUICK FACTS

| Year 2000 Population | ............................................. 79,524 |
| 1990-2000 Population Growth | ............................................. 32% |
| Comprehensive Plan Adopted | ............................................. 4-1995 |

CONCURRENGENCY PROGRAM FACTS

| Title | ............................................. Concurrency Management |
| Source | ............................................. KMC 12.11 |

I. SUMMARY

Concurrency based on tailored zonal area-average level-of-service. Individual developments tested. Development applications have been withdrawn, but none have been denied.

II. DESCRIPTION

Measurement System: Standard is based on area-average summations of the volumes and capacity on critical arterials and key intersections, based on p.m. peak hour, within 22 mobility management zones. Within each zone, key arterials and intersections are identified, and are used in the concurrency analysis. Standards for transit and non-motorized are set for each zone.

• Tailoring: Subarea standards for 22 zones, with levels-of-service for each based on the proposed land uses. This is further refined through transit and non-motorized level-of-service standards.

Concurrency Test: Application requires a traffic analysis to quantify all traffic impacts upon key arterials, intersections, and non-motorized facilities within a particular zone to determine if mitigation is required and appropriate. Development not approved if it causes other zones to not meet standard. If capacity does exist, a permit may be granted and a determination of capacity is issued. This determination is valid for one year, or for the same period as the development permit. The determination is with the parcel, and is non-transferable.

• Thresholds: Any development creating 10 or more peak hour trips is tested.

• Exemptions: Non-profit day care facilities, not-for-profit social service facilities, low income housing which is affordable to persons whose income is below 50 percent of median [with cap for this exemption per development], vested development, single family homes on lots of record. Exemptions cover concurrency testing but not site-specific improvements. Trips from exempted projects included in computing capacity.

If applicant fails, they can reduce the size of the development until standard is met, delay the schedule until city provides improvements, or provide mitigation themselves.

• Mitigation options: Mitigation includes facility projects constructed or financed by a developer, and allows for TDM or non-roadway strategies.

• Mitigation decision criteria: Mitigation must be acceptable to the City in form and amount, to guarantee the applicant’s pro-rata share of the financial obligation for capital projects for the benefit of the subject property. Determination made if the mitigation is consistent with comprehensive plan; contributes to system performance; does not shift traffic to residential area, other intersection that would fail, other jurisdiction that would not meet their standard, or other zone; would not result in loss of another transportation objective; environmental impacts can be addressed; and conforms to engineering standards. A mitigation denial appeals process is also included.

TDM and Multimodal: These are allowed as mitigation options. The applicant must document specific measures to be implemented and trips to reduced by each. The projects are to be monitored and enforced to determine if effective. Annual reports may be required, and additional measures may be required if initial measures fail to work. In lieu of projects: City may require construction rather than payments that require an assurance device. Payments for facilities or areas outside city require other city’s approval; city collects and holds until approval is granted. Funds given to city for projects must be paid in full before issuing of development permit.

III. MISCELLANEOUS

Interjurisdictional Coordination: Not addressed in code. Kent’s comprehensive plan notes that their standard follows the King County 12-point framework for developing level-of-service. Also, development information for other jurisdictions accounted for in transportation model based on forecasted land uses.

Rezones: May require specific facility projects to mitigate the impact of the proposed rezone to assure compliance with the concurrency program.
I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on tailored urban/rural maximum zonal volume-to-capacity averaging and additional maximum link ratio test; a cap on additional trips is calculated for each zone nearing the standard. Individual developments tested, with distinct residential versus non-residential methods. County imposes traffic impact fee. Many zones do not meet the standard and developments have been denied, amended, and withdrawn.

II. DESCRIPTION
A concurrency map is adopted once a year and shows areas that are or are not meeting the standard. The map is used for residential projects. For zones nearing capacity, a number is determined for how many additional trips can be approved before the standard is exceeded, and no further development can occur until the next map update. Non-residential projects require a site-specific analysis using the County’s traffic model. The yearly update includes land use, permit and “pipeline” activity in both the county and the jurisdictions, as well as city and county capital improvement program information, traffic volume counts, and other appropriate data.

Measurement System: The County uses a zonal system that compares the network capacity (existing and committed) to the standard using a maximum averaged volume-to-capacity zonal score. In addition, the county also tests for “critical links” which are segments of a monitored corridor that exceed the capacity ratio and carry more than 30 percent of the trips from the zone or proposed development. Both tests occur at the peak period which is a one-hour weekday afternoon period. Transit service and high-occupant vehicle lanes are considered for certain monitored corridors. Committed network includes planned projects if they are in the capital improvement program or if they have a financial commitment.

• Tailoring: Comprehensive plan sets standards for each of the five transportation service areas. For those areas that have a standard of “F,” the plan lists service strategies for each zone, including strategies for roads, TDM, transit, ferries, and nonmotorized. Standards are more restrictive in the rural areas, less so in the urban areas.

Concurrency Test: If applicant passes both parts of the test, a concurrency certificate is granted. A certificate of concurrency is necessary to receive a development permit. Certificates include location, number of units and uses tested and approved, an effective date and an expiration date. Certificate is valid for one year from date of issuance. Once a completed building permit application is submitted, the certificate is attached to the permit. The certificate is also linked with the parcel and the proposed development, and is non-transferable. For non-residential, conditional certificates can be granted if funding is available to build facilities necessary to meet the standard.

• Thresholds: All developments in unincorporated area reviewed except for exempt permits.

• Exemptions: Developments in process before the program, short subdivisions inside the urban growth area, single-family structures, renewals of previously issued un-expired permits, residential structures with 8 dwelling units or less, minor farming structures, minor office/commercial or recreational facilities, already-tested phases of a development, a new public elementary, middle or junior high schools, a new high school in the urban growth area or modification of high school regardless of location with the requirement for a TDM plan (new high schools outside the urban growth area are not exempt), and parks. Traffic from exempt developments added to the model to account for cumulative affects.

If applicant fails the test, they can mitigate.

• Mitigation options: Applicants given ninety days to appeal and/or provide mitigation measures (which only apply to non-residential projects).
King County continued

**TDM and Multimodal:** Not addressed in code.

**Mitigation Payment System:** Impact fee with projects in a number of districts that are used to calculate rates. Projects developed through comprehensive plan, meaning they are based on a twenty-year timeframe, rather than concurrency’s six-year timeframe.

- **Projects:** Growth-related system improvements selected by the Council located on county controlled facilities or those in other jurisdictions that have an interlocal agreement.
- **Fee reductions:** Factor that recognizes that residents of a development will use the new facility, 15 percent reduction recognizing residents use facilities already being paid for by other projects paid for with mitigation payment system funds; and reduction recognizing any dedication of land/developer improvements.
- **Tailoring:** Multi-family units pay 60 percent of the fees that are charged to single family units
- **Exemptions:** Allowed for public schools, public housing and private non-profit housing developers (with other public funds paying the exempted amounts). Developments must remain available to low-income persons a minimum of fifteen years.

**III. MISCELLANEOUS**

**Interjurisdictional Coordination:** County allows itself to develop interlocal agreements to coordinate standards, impact fees and other mitigation; apply standards and fees to developments that impact other local governments and the state; receive fees from developments in other jurisdictions and agree to accept and implement conditions imposed by other jurisdictions. These actions require an agreement before fees and standards are addressed or used. The county has signed Concurrency and mitigation payment system interlocal agreements with Covington and Issaquah, and a mitigation payment system interlocal agreement with Redmond and Newcastle.

**Annual Reporting:** Occurs during the yearly update of the concurrency map. Note: The County is currently assessing its program and will be considering possible changes by the end of calendar year 2002.
I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on tailored zonal intersection volume-to-capacity averaging, with limitations on the number of intersections allowed to exceed the standard. Individual developments tested. City imposes a traffic mitigation fee.

II. DESCRIPTION
Concurrency means capacity exists or facilities/strategies are in place to achieve standard. For roads, projects must be in comprehensive plan at the time development is approved and projects will be completed within six years. The City requires traffic impact analyses, based on city procedures, with defined uses, densities, and intensities.

Measurement System: The concurrency measurement system consists of two steps: a maximum volume-to-capacity average for the subarea(s) affected by the proposed development, and a separate standard (1.4) that no intersections can exceed.

• Tailoring: City has four zones with distinct standards; code does not address rationale for standards.

Concurrency Test: If the applicant passes the test, they receive a test notice valid for one year (but can be extended for an additional year) to give the applicant time to pursue the building permit and concurrency certificate. For multi-building phased development, the concurrency test notice is valid to a maximum of 6 years (a development phasing schedule to establish when each phase must acquire a concurrency certificate). The certificate is issued at the same time as the development permit if all conditions (such as mitigations) have been met. The certificate is linked with the parcel, and is not transferable; it is valid for the lifespan of the building or development permit.

• Thresholds: Residential development with more than 10 units, and parking structures above 20 stalls are tested. Small agriculture structures; small schools, commercial, recreational, service, or storage buildings are not reviewed.

• Exemptions: Developments that have limited impact, including accessory dwelling units, cellular towers, driveway resurfacing, lot line adjustments, outdoor café permits, street vacations, some temporary structures, design review, and permits submitted before the program was developed. Traffic from exempt developments accounted for in model.

If the application fails, the applicant can modify the proposal to reduce the size of the development, reduce the trips generated or phase the development with infrastructure, or arrange for funding projects that allow the standard to be met.

• Mitigation options: Development that cannot meet standards may install a project in the impacted subarea(s) in order to allow standard to be met. The mitigation decision is based on the improvement allowing the standard to be met with an accounting of anticipated future travel. This includes existing certificates and new development permits.

TDM and Multimodal: Transportation strategies mean TDM or other techniques to reduce single-occupant vehicles. Also, the comprehensive plan encourages multimodal travel and calls for developing a new concurrency standard that integrates all modes.

Funding: Road impact fees assessed for system-wide traffic impacts, within each subarea using per-unit formulas. SEPA also considered and may require the installation of site-specific improvements. Where appropriate, the fees are credited against each other to not duplicate.

III. MISCELLANEOUS
Interjurisdictional Coordination: Code allows city to enter into agreements with other jurisdictions to coordinate the standards and mitigations, to apply the standards and mitigations to projects that are inside the city but that impact other jurisdictions, and to potentially accept and implement conditions imposed by other jurisdictions for the impacts on the city. To account for growth in neighboring jurisdictions, City assumes a 2 percent traffic growth in the model.

SEPA Exemption: Determinations under the concurrency program are categorically exempt.
I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on 24-hour volume-to-capacity average in urban and rural traffic zones. Individual developments tested. County is developing a traffic impact fee.

II. DESCRIPTION
Goals of the standards are to ensure that facilities are planned in conjunction with developments in unincorporated County, to provide facilities that achieve and maintain county standards in comprehensive plan, to provide adequate capacity to link major corridors with residents and jobs, and to minimize road expansions through multimodal projects and TDM.

Measurement System: Level of service measurement uses average daily trips which is the vehicles per day over a full year averaged to the 24 hour period for transportation facilities (principal, minor arterials, major collectors, and collectors) in the geographic area within which a proposed development shows the maximum impact.

System uses the committed road network which includes projects with full funding in six-year TIP for rural areas and urban areas under the County’s jurisdiction or which the County has an interest in according to an interlocal agreement. County temporarily allows roads to exceed standards if there are projects with committed funding. Comprehensive plan also includes transit and ferry levels of service.

- Tailoring: Standard set differently for urban areas (.89 or level-of-service “D”) and rural areas (.79 or level-of-service “C”). Comprehensive plan states rationale that higher levels of congestion are more acceptable, and more tolerated by the public, in urban areas.

Concurrency Test: Based on standard trip generation tables, and reference specific permit uses, densities, and intensities. Modeling takes into account cumulative effects of prior certificates, the impacts of the proposed development. If the applicant passes the test, a capacity reservation certificate is issued, which is valid for 90 days, by which time a development approval permit must be determined as complete. After that, a certificate of concurrency is issued, which remains in effect with building permit; if the building permit does not expire, the certificate is valid for five years. The certificate is linked with the parcel and is non-transferable to other parcels.

- Thresholds: Developments adding over 40 average daily trips are tested.

- Exemptions: Permits in process prior to the ordinance, single family residences, additional phases of development already included in an original application, and development causing no additional impact such as an accessory structure, renovations, replacement structures, temporary construction trailers, re-roofing, and demolitions. Trips from exempt developments added to the traffic model as part of the annual monitoring program.

- Annexation: If land is annexed, transferability will be determined through any interlocal agreements in place. Also, a concurrency inquiry certificate can be requested without an application for a building certificate – a fee is charged and a determination made, but this does not reserve capacity.

If the applicant fails the test, a 90-day period is granted to amend the application.

- Mitigation options: include reducing the need [by reducing size, phasing, or using TDM], or voluntarily arranging, by a financial commitment or other instrument approved by the county, to implement the facilities or transportation strategies to meet concurrency. TDM and multimodal: The mitigation options allowed TDM and other techniques to reduce single-occupant vehicle commuting travel such as vanpooling, carpooling, public transit, and more. Trip reduction credits are assigned to TDM projects.
III. MISCELLANEOUS

Interjurisdictional Coordination: The County seeks to establish agreements with other local governments to coordinate standards, impact fees and other mitigation requirements. Mitigations inside/outside of the unincorporated areas to be addressed through interlocal agreements; however, no fees or mitigation are required unless an agreement has been executed between the County and the affected agency. Policy in comprehensive plan to participate with Regional Council and the Peninsula regional transportation planning organization to seek consistent level-of-service standards between the agencies for identified regional system facilities.

Annual Reporting: The level-of-service is to be monitored and updated on an annual basis through comprehensive plan process, and to include new traffic (background and permitted), new projects, the effects of exempt developments, and the effects of TDM.

SEPA Exemption: Determinations of concurrency are categorically exempt.

Monitoring: Notes that if a development that is consistent with the comprehensive plan is denied, a feedback loop to the underlying zoning and the feasibility of providing increased capacity should exist.
City of Mill Creek

QUICK FACTS
Year 2000 Population.............................................. 11,525
1990-2000 Population Growth................................. 45%
Comprehensive Plan Adopted ............................ 10-1994

CONCURRENCE PROGRAM FACTS
Title ................ Zoning: General Provision and Standards
Source ..................................... MCMC 17.22 & MCMC 17.48
Title ................ Zoning: Development Impact Mitigation
& Traffic Impact Fee Resolution (4-1997)
Source .................................................... Res. 97-227

I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on intersection level-of-service for peak and non-peak hours. Individual developments tested. City uses traffic mitigation fees to implement concurrency program.

II. DESCRIPTION
City goal to require proportional mitigation from new developments for their impacts, in order to continue the high quality of life standards, and continue to provide high standards for public health, safety, and welfare by not reducing the existing facilities and services.

Measurement System: Standards are set for intersection peak hour and non-peak hour times, for key signalized and un-signalized intersections. Peak hour level-of-service is "F" and non-peak hour is "D" and "E." The split peak is designed to balance transportation improvements so they are not exclusively focused on peak hour problems, and to address pass-through traffic on the state route that runs through the City.

• Tailoring: Not addressed in code.

Concurrency Test: Development proposals reviewed to determine the impact, and to assess mitigation measures. Special studies or analysis are paid for by applicant. Thresholds and exemptions not addressed in code. Certificates not addressed in code.

If the applicant fails the concurrency test, mitigation options exist.

• Mitigation options: Applied as part of the permit system so mitigation is identified at earliest stage, which permits greater public review and comment. Determinations made as part of SEPA. If mitigation requires regional action, a benefit area is set to allocate mitigation on a fair share basis.

• On-site and off-site mitigation available: Altering the development to avoid impacts, dedication of land for public purposes, allowing payments as authorized under state law, or environmental mitigation (under SEPA). Impact fees used only to fund capital expenditures, arrangements for public use of private facilities in the development, or other measures proposed by the developer. Latecomer agreements authorized.

TDM and Multimodal: City requires TDM measures for new developments, but through SEPA not concurrency. The comprehensive plan notes that components of the transportation system will exceed the adopted standard in 2012, and that capacity projects, high-occupant vehicles, TDM, park and rides, and transit treatments will be used to help maintain the adopted standards.

Funding: Impact fee schedule is adopted by resolution, to be reviewed on an annual basis. The formula uses a specific citywide project list with associated aggregated costs; frontage improvements are subtracted from the total. This new total is divided by the total trips forecasted for 2012, which produces a “mitigation per segment trip” cost of $71 per trip, which is any trip per day on any of the street segments on the project list.

III. MISCELLANEOUS
Interjurisdictional Coordination: City has adopted a reciprocal interlocal agreement with County that requires developments to mitigate impacts to both city and county streets. Policies in code to coordinate mitigation efforts with affected jurisdictions, including the state, Snohomish County, and adjacent jurisdictions.
I. SUMMARY
Concurrence program based on volume-to-capacity, with different standards for commercial and residential
streets. Individual developments tested. City uses interlocal agreement with state to address issues related to
state route. City also imposes an impact fee.

II. DESCRIPTION
Measurement System: The city uses an intersection based volume-to-capacity standard, which has significant links
to their interlocal agreement with WSDOT. Public facilities with level-of-service standards include potable water,
wastewater, stormwater drainage, police and fire, parks and recreation, arterial roadways, and public schools.
Comprehensive plan notes that level-of-service includes arterials and transit (at intersections), as well as advisory
guidelines for bicycle & pedestrian facilities, and transportation system management. City sets level-of-service at
“D” at all non-state highway arterials intersections, “D” for state highways, and “C” on local streets.

Concurrency Test: Every non-exempt applicant undergoes a non-binding concurrency determination. This determi-
nation may be made without a development application, but requires paying a fee.
• Thresholds: Developments generating more than 38 average daily trips are tested.
• Exemptions: Non-profit agencies chartered to provide low-income housing; government agencies are exempt
from paying concurrency-testing fees.

Applicants that pass are issued a concurrency certificate that remains in effect for the same time as the develop-
ment approval; if the approval has no timeframe, the certificate is valid for 1 year. Certificates are non-transferable,
except to new owners of land or development permit.

If applicants fail the test, they are given the option to mitigate the impacts of the development.
• Mitigation options: Comprehensive plan notes that new development is only allowed where roadways which
require concurrency are adequate or a financial commitment is in place to complete projects within six years,
and the development will not reduce levels-of-service elsewhere. City will not issue permits where mitigation
is required beyond City’s ability to pay, but City will allow developers to mitigate impacts through payments,
strategies, or services.

TDM and Multimodal: Not addressed in code.

Funding: Transportation impact fees are based on specific roadways, with costs assigned based on average daily
traffic. Fees range widely, from $384.25 per average daily trips for Woods Creek Road, to $5.14 per average
daily trips for Kelsey Street & State Route 2.

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH WSDOT
Purpose is to coordinate mitigation of development impacts. Peak hours described as potentially including a.m.
and p.m., for the assignment of the pro-rata share of costs. Developments that generate 25 peak hour trips to
a state highway intersection that has a level-of-service of “C” or greater require a traffic analysis. The standard
is set for signalized intersections and set at the worst movement for unsignalized intersections. Where “D”
 prior to development, will attempt to maintain; where “E” prior to, will request that it be maintained; where “F”
City of Monroe continued

prior to, will request that estimated delay (signalized) or reserve capacity (unsignalized) or volume-to-capacity ratio (segments) be no worse; where “E” or “F” prior, and no direct mitigation is feasible, may request other appropriate mitigations.

Mitigations may include donation of right-of-way; construction of highway project funded by the developer and which may include half the roadway improvements along the frontage; payment of pro-rata share of cost, determined on peak hour volumes using existing volumes, background, and pipeline volumes; or contribution to an LID. Developers may be asked to repay state for up-front improvements. City has option to condition development on meeting State’s mitigation requests.

• Comprehensive plan notes that mitigation fees paid for traffic impacts on State Route 2 should be used to enhance the construction of the State Route 2 bypass, which is not in the interlocal, while continuing to coordinate with WSDOT to maintain efficiencies on State Route 2.

• Comprehensive plan also notes that WSDOT’s current trip threshold is 10 trips, and that the City should work with WSDOT to lower the threshold in the interlocal from 25 to 10 trips.

Note: The interlocal agreement is currently being revised (8/2002)

III. MISCELLANEOUS

Interjurisdictional Coordination: See interlocal above. Also, the comprehensive plan includes a goal to develop standards that are consistent with surrounding jurisdictions, and to work with regional planning agencies to ensure compatibility among plans, and to foster interlocal agreements to address traffic mitigation and standardized methodologies for transportation systems.

Most Restrictive Section Applies: Code notes that if there is a conflict between the concurrency management chapter of the code and other chapter that the more restrictive chapter shall apply.
City of Mountlake Terrace

QUICK FACTS
Year 2000 Population.............................................20,362
1990-2000 Population Growth....................................5%
Comprehensive Plan Adopted .........................2-1995

CONCURRENCY PROGRAM FACTS
Title ...........................................Transportation Element [1996]
Source ..................................................Comprehensive Plan

I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on volume-to-capacity ratios at signalized intersections and planning level finding that sufficient revenue exists to maintain standards through the forecast year. Individual development review and mitigation done through SEPA. City uses a two-tiered approach that adopts adjacent jurisdiction’s standards.

II. DESCRIPTION
Comprehensive plan indicates that the City should establish written procedures to evaluate impacts of development to determine when standard would decline, and to establish methods to provide an acceptable level-of-service concurrent with the impacts of development. Interim system noted below.

Measurement System: City uses volume-to-capacity ratios at signalized intersections, with strong link to other adjacent jurisdiction’s plan. The system is a double-ring concept that distinguishes intra-city (inner ring and the majority of the community) and inter-city (outer ring) travel. Level-of-service policy is based on existing conditions, potential future conditions in 2010, and Snohomish County, Edmonds, and Lynnwood’s recommendations.
- Traffic study: Requires traffic report when project adds 10 or more peak hour trips to an intersection.
- Thresholds: Developments generating more than 10 peak hour trips per intersection are tested.
- Exemptions: Not addressed in plan.

Mitigation: SEPA mitigation amount based on pro-rata percentage of project’s peak hour trips in the threshold year. Developments given option to accept calculated fee, or conduct their own analysis to determine costs. The comprehensive plan states that mitigation fees from SEPA requirements have been collected to offset costs of intersection projects. Plan indicates that City should study GMA-based transportation impact fee as an alternative to the SEPA basis.

TDM and Multimodal: Comprehensive plan notes that should capacity problems occur, emphasis should be placed on non-structural (TDM) solution.

III. MISCELLANEOUS
Interjurisdictional Coordination: City roadways that access adjoining jurisdictions use adjacent jurisdiction’s standard, however plan notes that City will not require a level-of-service better than “C.” Inner ring streets are also at “C.” City also monitors level-of-service for intersections that serve adjacent cities, and will monitor other jurisdiction’s land use plans and development projects.
I. SUMMARY
Concurrency used as a planning tool, with concurrency achieved through County’s construction of needed capacity projects. Individual development review and mitigation done through SEPA.

II. DESCRIPTION

Measurement System: County uses a screenline measurement system based on volume-to-capacity ratios.
- Tailoring: Levels-of-service developed for roads in different areas of the County: urban center screenlines have a ratio of 0.65; urban fringe screenlines have a ratio of 0.55; and other urban screenlines have a ratio of 0.60.
- Traffic study: All development above the thresholds requires a traffic impact analysis.

SEPA Testing: All developments require frontage and access improvements, and geometric improvements may be required. If significant impacts are found, additional mitigation is required.
- Thresholds: Single family plat of 20 lots or more; apartment of 12 dwelling units or more; condominium/townhouse of 34 dwelling units or more; and commercial/retail or other development generating 25 or more peak hour trips are tested.
- Exemptions: Not applicable since it is focused on system analysis, rather than individual permits.
- Mitigation options: Options include constructing the project, collaborating with others to build, delaying the development, or modifying the development. An additional “fair-share pay as you go” option is allowed if the developer is not fully responsible for the project. County pay-and-go system allows developers to pay fair share to County and receive final building permit. Impacts are required to be mitigated at time of occupancy; for roads, this means within six years of final permit.

TDM and Multimodal: Included as components of the traffic study, and as possible mitigation options that the developer can propose.

III. MISCELLANEOUS

Interjurisdictional Coordination: Not addressed in code. (However, see Tacoma case study section on coordination).

Annual Reporting: Required to identify capacity issues and to assess level-of-service standards for public facilities.
I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on average arterial intersection level-of-service within zones, with tailored standards. Individual developments are tested. City imposes a transportation impact fee. Developments have been delayed or amended, but have not been denied.

II. DESCRIPTION
Zones (known as Transportation Management Districts) tailored based on balancing congestion with land use objectives, reflecting local mobility options, projects not completed, and consideration of trips crossing zonal boundaries.

Measurement System: Redmond uses an arterial intersection level-of-service tailored to each of the seven districts, which averages the volume and capacity ratio for each intersection within a particular zone.

- Tailoring: City has seven zones each with separate standards. Commercial zone standards allow more congestion (.90) than residential (.85), with the commercial centers allowing the most congestion (.95). The comprehensive plan describes the level-of-service standard for each zone, which include maximum volume-to-capacity ratios, standards for the percentage of land uses within 1⁄4 mile of transit, and mode split targets for 2012.

Concurrency Test: Proposed developments cannot decrease the standard or, in zones already exceeding the standard, cannot make the level-of-service worse (the standard is already exceeded in 5 of the 7 zones in 2002). Testing is done before issuing development permits: city determines the net trips generated, consider CTR strategies, internal trips, and diverted/pass-by trips from existing traffic. Capacity testing includes projects in the transportation capital improvement plan, other funded projects, background traffic volumes, and supplemental mitigation. A concurrency certificate is issued, which is valid for 120 days (can be extended 240 more days) by which time the development application must be submitted. The certificate is valid for the same time as an issued building permit, and is not transferable.

- Thresholds: Developments that generate 30 or more p.m. peak hour trips are tested.
- Exemptions: Child care facilities, not-for-profit social service and hospital facilities, low and moderate income housing, libraries, publicly funded educational facilities, or a use that achieves a broad public policy objective by nature of its use or location whose benefits outweigh the short term impacts. In addition, some private uses can be exempted from concurrency regulations. Adding traffic from exempt developments to the model not addressed in code.

If the proposed development cannot pass the concurrency test, a number of options exist.

- Mitigation options: Must be proposed within 30 days of failing test, with a final proposal within 90 days. This can include reducing the size of the development, delaying the development schedule, designing and constructing necessary transportation facilities, implementing a TDM program over and above what is required by the city as a standard condition of development approval, or providing other supplemental mitigation (see below).
- Supplemental mitigation: Funding an unfunded but planned transportation project that when built, will allow the private development to meet the standard. Projects must be in the transportation facilities plan, transit plan, bikeway plan or another component of the comprehensive plan. Projects must be completed within six years, or, if payments are given, all funds must be spent. Latecomer agreements are allowed. Projects may be credited to impact fee obligations.
- Supplemental mitigation decision criteria: Project must be in comprehensive plan (developer can propose other projects – these must be amended into the plan), contributes to system performance, intersection 

...continued
projects must raise intersection to standard (but developer can propose alternate mode project instead). There are restrictions on shifting traffic to other areas that are not equipped or do not have capacity, does not negatively affect other transportation objectives (including those for high-occupant vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians), and does not harm environment or violate traffic standards of another jurisdiction. Projects should be compatible with adjacent areas, especially residential, in scale and design. Road widenings only permitted when consistent with other mobility objectives, and only if adopted and contained in the comprehensive plan. Where practical, the project should occur at locations most impacted by the development.

**TDM and Multimodal:** TDM allowed as form of mitigation. Developer can propose strategies to reduce single-occupant vehicles with city determining trip reduction value. City to monitor and enforce program implementation. Requires fallback plan if goals not met, and becomes a legal requirement of development approval, tied to all future owners.

**Funding:** Transportation impact fees are to pay for off-site transportation system improvements and do not duplicate SEPA mitigations.

**III. MISCELLANEOUS**

**Interjurisdictional Coordination:** Comprehensive plan policy addresses coordination and possible development of interlocal agreements, with the caveat that neighboring jurisdiction’s policies for concurrency be consistent with city.

**Consistency:** Concurrency must be consistent with city and countywide planning policies.
I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on multimodal travel distance system, measuring the distance from city one can travel in half hour. Individual developments tested. City imposes an impact fee.

II. DESCRIPTION
The level-of-service policy is described as having three premises: service levels in Renton are primarily controlled by regional travel demands, it is not economically or environmentally sound to try and meet all single-occupant vehicle demand, and alternative modes must be provided. Measurement System: Renton’s standard is based on a weighted sum of the p.m. peak travel distance one can travel from the city in 30 minutes, averaged in all directions, using single-occupant vehicles (SOV), high-occupant vehicles (HOV), and transit. This creates an index value that must be met or exceeded in future years. The standard uses the 1990 baseline distances with SOV at 18 miles, HOV at 21 miles, and Transit at 10 miles. The policy exists to maintain the index, but to shift modes so that the 2010 index component will be SOV at 14, HOV at 21, Transit at 14. This means that SOV-only projects will not be sufficient to meet the standard.

- **Tailoring:** Not addressed in code. However, the citywide system pre-empts this to some extent.

Concurrency Test: A finding of concurrency is a written notice of passing test, and references specific densities, intensities, and land uses. Applicants can inquire as to capacity to accommodate a development without submitting a development application. The finding expires if development permit expires, or within three years if the development permit does not move forward. The finding is not transferable to other land, but may be transferred to new owners or lessees.

- **Thresholds:** Tests for all construction, expansion, or change in use that creates additional demand on the transportation facilities and requires development permit, excluding exemptions.

- **Exemptions:** Projects exempt from SEPA, short plats, or if development is part of a larger development with concurrency finding.

If the applicant fails, mitigation options exist.

- **Mitigation options:** Administrative reconsideration on technical grounds, submitting alternative data, providing a traffic mitigation plan, or reducing the size of the development. A revision to a development that reduces the impact is required to retake the test to so that the model reflects the reduced commitment of capacity. Unless new issues arise in the retaking of the test, a previous finding will remain in effect. Reconsideration suspends the City’s 120-day permit review schedule.

TDM and Multimodal: Developer can qualify for a reduction to SEPA per-trip fees through constructing projects or implementing TDM; these are credited in the concurrency process.

Funding: Developments are assessed $75 per daily vehicle trip generated, with site-specific mitigation addressed through SEPA. Fees are based on the fair-share cost of the long-range transportation improvement plan that has been assigned to development.

III. MISCELLANEOUS
Interjurisdictional Coordination: City conducts joint project review through SEPA. Comprehensive plan policy to maximize mobility through maintaining a standard that emphasizes transit and HOV and to coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions. The level-of-service policy includes the five objectives: allow reasonable development...
City of Renton continued

to occur, link local to regional systems, work within King County’s level-of-service Framework Policies, require developers to pay their fair share, and provide flexibility to city to adjust the policy if regional facilities are not built.

**Annual Testing Required:** Annual level-of-service test ensure conformance with comprehensive plan. Program includes monitoring and evaluation of the transportation improvement plan, the adopted standard, and the per-trip fee.
I. SUMMARY
City has not adopted their comprehensive plan, and is in a development moratorium. City uses an impact fee for developments allowed under the moratorium. Individual development review and mitigation done through SEPA. Developments have been delayed or amended, but none have been denied.

II. DESCRIPTION
Development Moratorium: Has been in place since the city incorporated in 1999 and is likely to continue until the Comprehensive Plan is adopted in December 2002.

Development limited by moratorium, however, many permits vested before adoption. Other development allowed (subject to the Mitigation Payment System described below), includes: religious facilities, health service uses, educational service uses, park and recreational uses, day care facilities, government facilities including streets, utilities, and surface water improvements, single family residences, law enforcement, emergency and disaster relief facilities and parking, and two-lot subdivisions.

Development types under moratorium include subdivisions, site plans, multi-family dwelling units, rezones, building permits, conditional use permits, communication facilities, commercial construction in business and office zones, and substantial shoreline permits. Hardship exceptions are authorized.

Mitigation Payment System: Impact fee with projects in a number of districts that are used to calculate rates. Projects developed through comprehensive planning and needs report.

• Projects: Growth-related system improvements selected by the City Council for joint private and public funding. These are located on a city street, unincorporated county road, another city street which City has interlocal agreement with, or state route proximate to the City and City has interlocal agreement with state.

• Tailoring: Multi-family units pay 60 percent of the fees that are charged to single family units.

• Exemptions: Allowed for public schools, public housing and private non-profit housing developers (with other public funds paying for the exempted amounts). Developments must remain available to low-income persons a minimum of fifteen years.

• Fee reductions: “Benefit” factor [15 percent] recognizes that existing residents use new facilities, recognizes that new residents use facilities paid for by other mitigation payment fund projects; and reduction recognizing any dedication of land / developer improvements.

III. MISCELLANEOUS
Annual Reporting: Mitigation payment system requires annual reporting and conformance with the comprehensive plan. Program allows pooling of multiple payments, and holding funds for greater than six years if special circumstances exist.
I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on volume-to-capacity at screenlines. Individual developments tested.

II. DESCRIPTION
Measurement System: Arterial and transit level-of-service based on volume-to-capacity at screenlines during peak hour. Screenlines encompass one or more parallel arterials, measuring corridor travel and reflects the availability of alternate routes. Volumes and capacities are summed at the points where the screenline crosses the roads. The ratios are compared to the adopted standard for each screenline.
  • Tailoring: Does not address if screenlines are tailored to support growth in centers, Screenlines that cross bodies of water are set higher, allowing more congestion, to reflect limited alternative routes.

Concurrency Test: Concurrency is integrated into the master use permit review process, which allows for early review, and links transportation issues to other permit review issues. Amendments to a permit require a new concurrency determination.
  • Thresholds: Development permits subject to SEPA review are tested.
  • Exemptions: Minor new construction, residential structures up to four dwelling units, commercial structures of up to 4,000 feet, many minor public facilities, remodels and minor additions, short plats or short subdivisions. Annual traffic counts account for cumulative impacts of exempt developments.

Applicants that pass test receive approval for their master use permit. Code does not address certificates, duration of approval, nor transferability.
  • Traffic study: Applicants required to submit trip generation and distribution information with their proposal. Applicants use standard trip generation rates; applicants can submit alternative methods for city review. Distribution uses the City’s forecasting model for trips entering and exiting in the peak hour. These are assigned by City to the arterial network using most likely routes. City determines the applicable screenlines (up to four) that have the highest number of trips from the development.

Applicants that fail test can suggest remedial strategies and city determines adequacy.
  • Mitigation options: Improvements must be completed that allows development to meet standard within six years. Projects or strategies may be funded by the applicant, city, or by others.

TDM and Multimodal: Transit standard set equal to automotive. Rule explains that since transit is stuck in mixed traffic with automobiles, roadway projects benefit transit as well.

III. MISCELLANEOUS
Interjurisdictional Coordination: Not addressed in rule.
I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on travel times along arterial segments, with standards tailored for urban/rural areas, and for transit oriented development areas. Individual developments tested. Some developments have been withdrawn by the applicants when it was clear they could not be deemed concurrent at that point in time.

II. DESCRIPTION
Measurement System: Concurrency determinations based upon a proposed development’s impact on any arterial units in arrears (AUIA), and/or designated ultimate capacity arterial (DUCA) units within the development’s transportation service area (TSA). Measurements are done along segments (which range in length from 1/2 to 2 miles in urban areas and 1 to 10 miles in rural areas).

• Traffic studies: If there are AUIAs or DUCA units in the development’s TSA a traffic analysis is required to see if the development will impact them. In addition, all developments generating more than 50 peak hour trips require a study to evaluate future level-of-service conditions on arterial units.

• Tailoring: Different level-of-service standards set for areas inside and outside the urban growth area (with further refinements based on the transit compatibility of the development and the arterial). The County has six transportation service areas (TSAs).

Concurrency Test: A concurrency determination is made for each application shortly after the initial submittal. If applicant passes test, certificate of concurrency issued. This expires within six years, but County can set shorter dates based upon size and impact. Subdivisions have to be recorded before expiration of concurrency certificate. For other developments, building permits have to be issued before expiration. Certificates cannot be transferred to another development application. Optional pre-application concurrency evaluations are allowed and are valid for 180 days without further review.

• Thresholds: Projects that generate seven or more peak hour trips for residential, and five or more peak hour trips for commercial are tested. If traffic analysis finds that a proposed development will place three or less peak hour trips on any AUIA or DUCA unit, then the development meets concurrency. If there is an AUIA and more than three peak hour trips, development cannot be deemed concurrent. If the impact is to a DUCA unit, development will be required to provide TDM measures above minimum standard.

• Exemptions: For transportation impact fees, low-income housing and other broad public purposes, public funds to backfill, with developer identifying source of funds. Traffic from exempt developments added to the model.

If applicant fails concurrency test, developments can lessen the impact through lowering the density (and fund any needed comprehensive plan amendments), or deferring construction until the public sector, or the developer, have added capacity to an AUIA. If the developer constructs the project, they must identify the project and offer a construction plan and design to County.

• Mitigation decision criteria: County reviews the developer’s project design and determines its adequacy based on numerous factors, including the priority of the project in the capital improvement program, existing conditions as compared to adopted standards, land uses and development densities, availability of transit and sidewalks, the needs of low-income persons, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and more.

TDM: All development in the urban area must provide TDM sufficient to reduce p.m. peak hour trips by 5 percent. This can be accomplished through site design measures, construction or purchase of off-site mitigation, or voluntary payments in lieu of site design. The code finds each peak hour trip removed saves $1,500 in future capital costs.
If new owner of development decides to discontinue an existing program, they must reimburse the County based on trip reduction credits. Program based on goals that recognize that some roads are at ultimate capacity and therefore alternative mitigations may be more cost effective.

**Multimodal:** Arterial standards differentiated based on transit compatibility and service, which includes headway, frequency of service, and presence of walkways to transit, and standards are relaxed slightly for transit compatible development on transit compatible arterials. Developments are allowed to secure additional trip reduction credits for items such as on-site pedestrian facility improvements, vehicle parking design, lighting, secure bicycle facilities, and preferential parking spaces for carpool/vanpools.

**Funding:** All developments mitigate their impacts by paying road system impact fees based on the ADT multiplied against the per trip amount for the specific transportation service area (TSA). In terms of traffic impact fees, each TSA has a residential and commercial per trip impact fee rate. Developments providing an overall trip reduction have no average daily trips assigned for the purpose of determining an impact fee. Credit against the impact fee given for dedication of land, and projects (from the transportation needs report) built as a condition of approval.

**Timing:** Determination of developer obligations is done prior to the preliminary platting or building permit, and is a condition of the permit.

### III. MISCELLANEOUS

**Interjurisdictional Coordination:** Level-of-service standards and concurrency on state highways and other jurisdictions roads addressed through interlocal agreements between County and WSDOT or other jurisdictions. Adopted interlocal agreements also include a provision in which a jurisdiction can request mitigation for impacts from large developments in other jurisdictions. State or other jurisdictions review the traffic study and suggest mitigations; County reviews jurisdiction-proposed mitigations and can condition these as part of development approval.

**Joint Developer Actions:** Two or more developers can work together to fund projects. They develop their own agreements, which are reviewed by County. If the project is greater than the proportional share, reimbursement is available, as is the establishment of a road service district. Projects must be under contract or complete at the time of building permit issuance and complete before occupancy.
I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on volume-to-capacity with individual developments tested for impacts on many facility areas. Street design standards are used for roads.

II. DESCRIPTION
Measurement System: A volume-to-capacity ratio is used based on available and planned capacity. Facility areas include water, power, sewer, schools, solid waste, stormwater, library, fire, and more. For roads, level-of-service based on street design standards. Each road assigned a functional classification based on average daily trips and road function.

Standards set for principal arterial (Steilacoom Boulevard), minor arterials, downtown streets, and smaller streets, which includes a classification of the primary function, minimum standards (number of lanes, sidewalks, and possible bicycle lanes), and a list of discretionary improvements. For transit, the standard is service every half hour to regional transit centers during peak hours, and every hour on non-peak hours.

• Tailoring: Not addressed in code.

Concurrency Test: City coordinates concurrency test, but other service area providers make individual capacity determinations. Service providers required to monitor available and planned capacity, and to provide annual report to the City. If the applicant passes, a certificate of concurrency is granted. Certificates specify land uses, densities, intensities, and are not transferable to other properties. Certificate expires with building permit, but includes a three-year expiration if building permit does not proceed.

• Thresholds: Not addressed in code.

• Exemptions: Permits that will cause no additional impact, such as accessory structures, renovations, replacement structures, temporary structures, demolitions and landscaping, conditional use and variances, and permits for single-family homes, duplexes, and accessory dwelling units. Adding traffic from exempt developments into traffic model not addressed in code.

If the applicant fails the test, they can accept the 90-day reservation for those areas that do pass the test, and modify/reduce the proposal to lessen the impact, provide alternative data sources showing unusual circumstances, or arrange for the provision of the additional capacity.

• Mitigation: Comprehensive plan notes that if necessary public facilities do not exist, the applicant may provide them, delay the development until improvements are made, or modify the proposal.

TDM and Multimodal: The comprehensive plan notes support for adding these components to the local transportation system through use of a street design standard approach.

III. MISCELLANEOUS
Interjurisdictional Coordination: Not addressed in code.
City of Tacoma

QUICK FACTS
Year 2000 Population........................................... 193,556
1990-2000 Population Growth....................................9%
Comprehensive Plan Adopted .............................. 6-1993

CONCURRENCY PROGRAM FACTS
Title ............Concurrency Management System (6-1993)
Source ...........TMC 13.15 & 13.16 & Comprehensive Plan – Transportation Plan and Program

I. SUMMARY
Concurrency based on a system-wide analysis that compares and tests the transportation and land use elements of comprehensive plan for concurrence. Individual development review and mitigation done through SEPA.

II. DESCRIPTION
City uses a system-wide concurrency assessment, with concurrency achieved if existing and planned transportation projects will adequately support trips generated from existing and planned land uses. The concurrency assessment, measured by volume-to-capacity ratios, is conducted once a year or as needed.

Measurement System: Land use assumptions for each of the nine planning areas are defined for current and future years. The number of jobs and dwelling units is defined for each transportation analysis zone. Three aggregate groups [principal arterials citywide, Port area arterials and all other arterials citywide] analyzed using a volume-to-capacity ratio to measure level-of-service. For each group, greater than 85 percent of arterial lane miles must operate above the standard, which ranges from “E” to “D.” For principal arterials, system evaluation focuses on maximizing capacity through priority treatment for multimodal travel. For the Port group, system evaluation considers freight issues such as heavy truck volumes, slopes and grades, turning radii, and more.

- **Exemptions and thresholds:** Not applicable since program is focused on system analysis, rather than individual permit analysis.
- **Tailoring:** Uses different standards for groups of roads by functional class in different parts of the jurisdiction.

SUMMARY OF NEW APPROACH
Note: The City has adopted a development-specific concurrency management system [Municipal Code 13.16 – June 2001] and is working on implementation guidelines. This system will complement the current system-wide assessment currently in use, and will be used in addition to SEPA in the review of individual developments. A brief description of this system is presented below.

Measurement: Concurrency determinations required for roads, transit, law enforcement, fire, emergency medical services, schools, parks and libraries (each uses available and planned capacity), as well as potable water, electric utilities, sanitary sewer, solid waste, storm water (which use available capacity only). Determinations made using volume to capacity ratio, with available and planned capacity used for most facility areas, including streets.

City coordinates concurrency test, however, other facility area providers make individual capacity determinations. Service providers required to monitor available and planned capacity, and providing an annual report. If level-of-service can be maintained, pass the test.

- **Tailoring:** Not addressed in code.

Concurrency Test: If the applicant passes, a certificate of concurrency is granted. Certificates specify land uses, densities, intensities, and are non-transferable to other properties. The certificate expires with the building permit, but includes a three-year expiration if the building permit does not proceed.

- **Thresholds:** Not addressed in code.
- **Exemptions:** Permits that will cause no additional impact, vested permits, single-family homes, and accessory dwelling units; service providers required to include the capacity impacts from exempted developments are added to the model for all facility areas.

...continued
If the applicant fails the test, they can accept the 90-day reservation for those areas that do pass the test, and modify/reduce the proposal to lessen the impact, provide alternative data sources showing unusual circumstances, or arrange for the provision of the additional capacity.

**TDM and Multimodal:** Not addressed in code, but Comprehensive Plan includes multimodal and TDM strategies, processes, and commute trip reduction surveying and reports [Code section 13.15].

**III. MISCELLANEOUS**

**Interjurisdictional Coordination:** Not addressed in code. The comprehensive plan includes that the City shares a travel demand model with Pierce County. This means the same zones, road network, and land use information is used.
IV. Findings and Innovations

This chapter combines key findings from the case study examinations of selected local transportation concurrency programs and observations from the focus group sessions. Perhaps the most important finding of this phase of work is that no two programs analyzed are identical and that, in fact, very different approaches are being used. This points to the flexibility afforded to local governments to design programs that most closely support their growth management and other goals.12

The diversity of approaches is an outgrowth of state law providing very little prescriptive guidance for how concurrency is to be implemented. The law provides the simplest of legislative intents and the administrative guidance only suggests “features” that should make up a program. In this context, jurisdictions have developed programs that attempt to meet the intent of the law, and are compatible with their own transportation, land use, and other goals.

The variety of approaches also underscore the significant challenges that exist to jurisdictions working collaboratively. Jurisdictions’ measurement systems vary, tailoring and exemptions vary, the mitigation criteria vary, and so on. Perhaps more importantly, jurisdictions’ philosophical concept of what concurrency is supposed to accomplish also vary – some see it as a funding tool, while others see it as a growth management tool.

On the funding side, the focus groups revealed that few jurisdictions believe they can require new growth to pay its full cost share. The respondents seemed to indicate that to remain competitive, jurisdictions couldn’t charge much more than their neighbors, regardless of their needs. Anecdotally, jurisdictions seem to rarely collect even half of the rate they calculate it will cost to serve new development; the focus group attendees saw this as compounding the growing problem of existing transportation system deficiencies for almost every mode.

12 The Growth Management Hearings Boards have affirmed local authority and flexibility in a number of cases. “Local governments have the authority to adjust any of those three elements (LOS, needs and/or funding) to fit local circumstances as long as the ultimate decision concerning those elements are consistent with each other, based upon facts established in the record, including consistent measuring methodologies, and are not based upon artificial standards designed to avoid the concurrency requirements …” Achen v. Clark County. No. 95-2-0067. November 16, 2000.

In another case, the ruling is similar: “Under the GMA, setting the desired level of service standard is a policy decision left to the discretion of local elected officials. Citizen dissatisfaction with the City’s LOS methodology or its LOS standards may be expressed through the City’s legislative process and the ballot box…” West Seattle Defense Fund v. City of Seattle. No. 94-3-0016. April 4, 1995.
On the growth management side, the focus groups revealed that concurrency has substantial potential to affect development (both the uses and the locations), but that most jurisdictions were not being very aggressive and so were not really focusing growth effectively.

Interestingly, the focus groups also revealed that jurisdictions believe their programs are sufficient, but few think that concurrency is being used to its fullest potential, whether for funding or for growth management. This was especially true in relation to addressing cross-jurisdiction impacts.

The additional findings below are organized by the different facets of local governments’ concurrency programs. Relevant Growth Management Hearings Boards cases are cited to provide some legal context. Since not all of the approaches have been tested legally, the best assumption is that when approaches are applied fairly and consistently, and when they are based in well documented planning processes they are likely legally defensible.

**Tailoring**

The market is the primary determinant of whether development will occur. However, when the market demands development, a carefully considered tailoring of concurrency can supplement the comprehensive plan and zoning to foster growth precisely in those locations where the jurisdiction wants growth to occur and at the time when the jurisdiction can accommodate it.

As noted in previous chapters, Destination 2030 calls for a strategic, subarea approach to concurrency to foster development in targeted locations. To a certain extent, this implies a weighting of growth management goals to concentrate development over other considerations, including traffic mobility (although the two may not be mutually exclusive). Some jurisdictions have taken this approach:

- **Everett** has reduced traffic impact fees and requirements for traffic studies in its urban center.
- **Bainbridge Island** sets a higher standard in its downtown, which allows for more congestion, than in other areas of the city.

Many other tailoring methods are used by jurisdictions:

- **Redmond** and **Bellevue** use zonal approaches where each zone has a unique standard based on local land uses (for example, residential versus commercial) and other community objectives. The presence of alternative modes of transportation is also a factor in setting each zone’s standard.
- **Issaquah** defines “regional links” in its transportation system, and allows for 20 percent higher levels of congestion on these links to reflect regional traffic on its local streets, which is beyond its local control.
- **Counties** by definition tailor their standards to urban and rural areas, but some go further. **Snohomish County** for example, further tailors urban and rural standards to reflect whether an area includes transit compatible development and infrastructure.

The different tailoring methods make it clear that jurisdictions can use concurrency to influence the

---

13 The Hearings Boards clearly state that jurisdictions’ must be ready to “show their work” and that proper planning processes must be used. In one case, Lewis County used two different level-of-service measuring methods— one for development review and one for budgetary planning. The Hearings Board ruled that “The use of two different LOS methodology systems for budgetary and concurrency decisions does not comply with the Act ... [and] It is clear from the record that the sole purpose of adopting this methodology was to avoid the concurrency requirements of the GMA ... [and that] there is a point at which the desire to avoid GMA consequences becomes, in fact, a decision to evade GMA requirements.” Butler v. Lewis County. No. 99-2-0027c. June 30, 2000.
location and timing of development.\textsuperscript{14} The following sections that describe exemptions make it clear that jurisdiction’s can also foster the uses they wish to attract.

**Measurement Systems**

The choice of a measurement method\textsuperscript{15} has wide reaching implications that can affect how much growth can be accommodated, which mitigations are found necessary, how one jurisdiction might coordinate with their neighbors, and which modes of transportation are promoted. Similarly, jurisdictions facing concurrency challenges have many options on how to change the technical components of the system — which are in essence policy decisions as much as they are administrative ones — to alter capacity calculations and allow either more or less development.

Examples of such changes include lessening the amount of time mitigations are given for completion (which can increase or decrease the amount of development that will occur as this affects the amount of upfront funds a developer needs to have available if mitigations are to be funded immediately); redefining the travel-shed distances used in traffic impact studies (which can increase or decrease the scope of mitigation “needs”); using generic or specific pass-through traffic inflation rates (which can overcount or undercount pass-through traffic which could affect the amount of capacity available for local developments); or changing the number of hours in the peak travel measurement period (which can affect the level of congestion that is measured).

The Phase 1 Report found that few jurisdictions used the same method as their neighbors. The case studies strengthen the original finding — even those jurisdictions that have similar approaches use slightly different periods or account for capacity in a different way:

- **Bellevue** uses a two-hour p.m. peak period to measure congestion. This reflects the conditions drivers face since a person’s commute time may be flexible and does not always happen at the exact same time each day; it also accepts more congestion. Bellevue also includes a congestion allowance in its measurement zones — this recognizes that a zone may function well even though specific spots are very badly congested since that alternate routes may exist.
- **Everett** uses an impact fee based concurrency program with the rationale that the city will consider itself concurrent if it builds the projects it can afford to build (supplemented by development contributions). This approach accepts congestion as a tolerable outcome given the goals of promoting transportation demand management (TDM) and non-single-occupant vehicle use and basing decisions on financial constraints.
- **Issaquah** uses a “planned capacity” measurement, which lowers the standard engineering capacity in its transportation modeling if a road is missing shoulders, sidewalks, bike lanes, turn lanes, and so on. This approach is meant to portray capacity more accurately, and has potential to support adding components to each sub-standard road.
- **King County** uses a zonal system that includes a “critical links” test where key routes to a proposed development are analyzed for capacity if the link is above the capacity ratio and if it carries more than 30 percent of a proposed development’s trips. This approach is meant to clearly indicate where major

\textsuperscript{15} Concurrency is clearly an acceptable component of the land use planning process. The Hearings Boards ruled that a County could factor in the presence of infrastructure in land use decisions and zoning. Achen v. Clark County. No. 95-2-0067. November 16, 2000.

Congestion points will occur, but also lead to a large number of zones not meeting the standard. King County also uses different methodology for commercial versus residential developments, which provides the potential for more closely guiding the different types of development.

- **Mill Creek** uses a different standard for the peak hour versus non-peak hours. This is meant to balance transportation projects so that they are not exclusively focused on peak hour problems.
- **Renton** measures the distance one can travel from the City within 30 minutes by single-occupant vehicles, high-occupant vehicles, and transit. These distances are weighted and combined to create a “travel distance index.” The City plans to maintain this index over time, but to shift the relative components such that transit would be able to go further in the future, while accepting that single-occupant vehicles will not travel as far due to increases in congestion in the region. This is meant to reflect a traveler’s experience — being able to get where they want to go in a given amount of time — and provides an explicit preference for non-single-occupant vehicle travel.
- **Seattle** uses a “screenline” approach, with a measurement point crossing a series of parallel roads. This method measures travel along a corridor rather than a single facility, which is meant to reflect the ability a driver has to use alternative routes.
- **Steilacoom** uses street design standards for roads, which reference the street’s primary function, the number of lanes, the presence of sidewalks and bicycle lanes, and a description of potential future improvements. This approach has the potential to support adding multimodal components.
- **Tacoma** analyzes concurrency at the system level by comparing the transportation and land use elements of its comprehensive plan. The analysis tests if planning area dwelling units are within 20 percentage points of forecasts, and reviews the roads to see if greater than 85 percent are meeting the adopted standard. Given the ample capacity of the city’s road network, this approach decreases barriers for developments, allows for some road failings since alternate routes exist, but still attempts to ensure that overall performance does not deteriorate too much.

The diversity of approaches being used, and the mismatches that they imply for almost every facet of the program, points to the challenges that will be faced when jurisdictions try to work together.

### Exemptions

As noted previously, the granting of exemptions from concurrency testing allows a jurisdiction to promote those uses that are important to them. For example, some jurisdictions give public services (for example, non-profit day cares, libraries, or transit stations) a competitive boost through an exemption from concurrency review or through a lessening of traffic study requirements or impact fees. This is especially important in areas facing level-of-service failures. Rather than stop all development, jurisdictions can exempt those uses that are either missing or are determined to be of highest value, treating the impact on the standard as the lesser issue.

---

16 During the focus group discussions, some questioned the legality of granting exemptions from concurrency review. Since concurrency is integrally related to level of service and is often the basis of impact fees – both which allow exemptions – a solid legal rationale for granting exemptions seems to be implied. Two Hearings Board cases address this topic – in both, the exemptions were not found invalid. In the first, the Board found that exempting small developments from traffic study requirements and thereby not including the trips from these developments in the capacity calculations “would lead to an incomplete assessment of cumulative impact on LOS.” The Board ordered that “the cumulative effects on the operating level” be included in capacity calculations, but did not strike the exemption itself. Progress Clark County v. City of Vancouver. No. 99-2-0038c. May 27, 2000.

In the second case, the Board found that while the GMA does not explicitly authorize exemptions that no case was made that the exemptions would “prevent the County from prohibiting development approval of those developments that will cause the level of service to decline below the County’s adopted level …” While the Board did not strike the exemption, the County did choose to amend its plan and remove the exemptions. Island County Citizen’s Growth Management Coalition v. Island County. No. 98-2-0023c. June 2, 1999.
While a few jurisdictions do not grant any exemptions, the case studies indicate that most jurisdictions do grant them, and carefully choose the exemptions. In almost every case, jurisdictions require that traffic from the exempt developments be calculated and included in the traffic model for an accurate representation of capacity (see previous footnote). Some inclusive programs include:

- **Bellevue** exempts child-care, transit facilities, park facilities, not-for-profit social service facilities, affordable housing, libraries, public schools, hospitals, and some neighborhood shopping center redevelopments.  

- **King County** exempts short subdivisions inside the urban growth area, single-family structure permits, residential structures with 8 dwelling units or less, minor farming structures, minor office/commercial or recreational facilities, new public elementary, middle or junior high schools, a new high school in the urban growth area or the modification of a high school regardless of location with the requirement for a TDM plan (new high schools outside the urban growth area are not exempt), and parks.

- **Kirkland** exempts a few unique permit types, such as accessory dwelling units, outdoor café permits, street vacations, and design review. These show a clear indication of uses and actions that are important to the City.

Other innovative concepts include:

- **Issaquah** sets a cap of 100 peak hour trips on the cumulative total of all exemptions that can be granted.

- **Redmond** includes policy language that exempt uses that achieve “public policy objectives by the nature of the use or location when the benefits outweigh the short-term impacts.” This broad policy provides flexibility but requires careful legal implementation.

- **Sammamish** exempts public housing and private non-profit housing developers from its mitigation payment system, but require that the developments remain available to low-income individuals for a minimum of fifteen years.

The Hearings Boards cases seem to affirm that exemptions are permissible if the local government includes the demand on capacity in its concurrency accounting and addresses paying for any needed improvements.

**Concurrency Testing**

Using their adopted measurement systems, jurisdictions that conduct concurrency tests on individual developments seem to have very straightforward methods. Similar to including volumes from exempted and “pipeline” developments, most include capacity from projects in their transportation or capital improvement programs that have committed funding in their transportation modeling.

There is a wide range of testing thresholds, from 50 peak hour trips for a proposed development in **Bainbridge Island** to three peak hour trips in **Issaquah**. Most jurisdictions set the threshold level in ways that match other processes such as their State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) or design review thresholds.

To some extent, higher thresholds provide a preference to small developments by allowing them to escape review. This reduces barriers for those smaller developers who would be least able to cope.

---

17 The neighborhood shopping center exemption was ruled invalid. Contact City of Bellevue staff for additional information.
with them. This may be the appropriate strategy in urban areas that are experiencing mostly infill
development. Conversely, low thresholds have the benefit of allowing the jurisdiction to account for all trips more accurately and potentially allows for more comprehensive mitigation of impacts.

Most jurisdictions issue certificates of capacity that are linked to the parcel (and building permit), reference specific densities and intensities, and are not transferable to other parcels or developments. The certificates usually remain valid for a moderate period to allow the developer to complete the rest of the building permit application process. Some provide more options in how they reserve capacity:

- **Kirkland** issues a test notice valid for one year (but can be extended for an additional year) to give the applicant time to pursue the building permit. This formalizes the temporary nature of the certificate.
- **Renton** allows developers to inquire if capacity exists before submitting a permit application. This recognizes that capacity determination can be critical to a development decision and saves applicants the time it takes to go through the permit process given that they may not meet concurrency.
- **Incorporations and annexations present ongoing challenges for the counties. **Kitsap County** issues certificates that can remain valid if there is an annexation, but only if the area is subject to an adopted interlocal agreement. This is an important issue because an annexation may cause an area that is in a development moratorium to be now available for development, or the reverse.

**Mitigations**

Every jurisdiction, to varying degrees, addresses the options applicants have if they fail a concurrency test. Usually the options include accepting the denial, appealing, reducing the size of the development, waiting until capacity is provided (perhaps phasing their development), or mitigating the impacts of the proposed development. Jurisdictions have included other interesting elements in their programs:

- **Bellevue** allows development to occur in zones that already exceed the standard as long as mitigation keeps the level-of-service from decreasing further.
- **Everett** uses a citywide approach that includes a small amount of funds for non-project specific transit improvements in its impact fee program. This makes funds available for transit even though the exact project is not identified.
- **Pierce County** includes a “pay and go” option when the development is not the sole cause of the need for the project – developers pay a fair share contribution and receive a final building permit. ([Other jurisdictions do the same.](#))
- **Redmond** allows developers who cannot meet the adopted standard to select and build a project from its unfunded project list if it allows the standard to be met.
- **Snohomish County** identifies those arterials determined to be at full buildout. The mitigation of impacts on these facilities from a proposed development requires the provision of demand management measures above the County’s minimum demand management requirement. The County also requires developers to pay the cost of processing a rezone if a concurrency test is failed and mitigation necessitates changing the density of the parcel.

---

18 The Hearings Board determined that the law allows a jurisdiction to declare a facility to be at ultimate capacity, but ruled that this should not preclude development from meeting concurrency requirements – meaning other improvements would be imposed. The Board noted: “New development must provide mitigation for the impacts of further development, regardless of the status of the affected service or facility; expansion or other improvements to roads is but one of many means to deal with impacts.” Subsequent to the ruling, the County amended their process to require mitigation on built-out facilities. Sky Valley v. Snohomish County. No 93-3-68c. March 12, 1996.
The variety of mitigation approaches points to the ability to carefully mold and tailor this feature of a concurrency program. The Everett approach indicates that system improvements can be collected citywide rather than in smaller subareas, and that some non-project specific funds may be acceptable (although these funds are for capital improvement, not for operations and maintenance). The Snohomish County approach indicates that even on facilities that are in built out (meaning, the facility has reached its ultimate capacity design and cannot be widened or reconfigured) for one mode, general-purpose traffic, mitigations can be collected for other modes, TDM and multimodal.

Mitigation Decision Criteria. The level of detail jurisdictions provide related to how they will determine if the level of mitigation is acceptable varies widely. This information may be provided in other documents but in the concurrency-related documents provided to Regional Council staff some jurisdictions seem to provide no guidance on how they will determine what level of mitigation is acceptable – others provided exhaustive decision criteria. Two thorough lists are shown below:

- Kent considers whether the mitigation is consistent with the comprehensive plan and contributes to system performance; whether it shifts traffic to residential area, another failing intersection, or another jurisdictions that would not allow them to meet their standard; whether it would result in loss of another transportation objective; whether environmental impacts can be addressed; and whether it conforms to engineering standards. The City also has set up a mitigation denial appeals process.

- Bellevue includes a similar list of criteria, which include consistency with the comprehensive plan; contributes to system performance; restrictions on shifting traffic to other areas that are not equipped or do not have the necessary capacity; prohibition on negatively impacting other transportation objectives (including high-occupant vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians); not harming the environment; and not violating traffic standards.

Timing. Almost every jurisdiction uses some form of the six-year window described in state law; however, one jurisdiction sets shorter timeframes for their smaller streets. The law states that concurrent with development means that the improvements are completed, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvement within six years.\(^\text{19}\) This may imply that shorter timeframes are at the jurisdiction’s discretion.\(^\text{20}\)

- Issaquah uses an “adequacy time frame” based on functional class, meaning mitigations on principal arterials are given six years for completion, commercial and residential collector street mitigations are given two years, and local non-residential and residential street mitigations require immediate completion.

Funding

Jurisdictions are charging new developments for their impacts to the local transportation system. A comparable number use Growth Management Act [GMA]-based fees versus those using SEPA-based

\(^{19}\) Comprehensive Plans-Mandatory Elements: Transportation Elements [RCW 36.70A.070 (6)(b)]
\(^{20}\) The “available public facilities” definition in the administrative code [WAC 365-195-210] gives a slightly different slant stating that for transportation, “the specified time is six years from the time of development.” However, the Hearings Board seems to have clarified this issue, noting that less than six-year periods are acceptable. “We conclude that local governments have discretion within the confines of the Act to determine the proper phasing of concurrency and the timing of either immediate occupancy and use or a period of time during which a firm financial commitment is in place in order to "ensure" that the public facilities and services are adequate.” Taxpayers for Responsible Government v. City of Oak Harbor. No. 95-2-0002. July 16, 1996.
fees, and some use both. Some jurisdictions implement their concurrency programs wholly through impact fees. This approach has a benefit of raising funds through a clear, upfront assessment as to which projects are necessary for development to continue. SEPA either replaces, or is complementary to, this method and has the advantage of providing a great deal of flexibility to address case-by-case issues. However, implementing mitigations solely through SEPA runs the risk of piecemeal improvements that may not link well to long-range planning. As noted previously in the discussion of concurrency testing thresholds, the threshold the jurisdiction uses for SEPA may tend to favor smaller developments.

It remains unclear how aggressively jurisdictions are pursuing these funding sources. Jurisdictions that are exceeding their adopted standards seem to be setting their fee levels higher than jurisdictions meeting their standards. Others have widely varying fees that link to specific projects for different subareas.

One thing that is clear from the focus groups is that few jurisdictions are requiring new growth to pay its full share, and none seem to be collecting more than half of the rate they calculate it will cost to serve new development. There may be good reasons for this, but since public funds for transportation improvements are scarce, jurisdictions are being less successful in raising needed funds. Jurisdictions also do not seem to be very aggressive in negotiating developer agreements (and setting up latecomer agreements) to get projects built.

Being more aggressive does not necessarily solve jurisdictions’ concurrency difficulties since participants were clear that existing deficiencies, public resistance, and the time it takes to build projects will continue to make meeting adopted standards more challenging. Further research will be necessary to better understand the current situation and what future approach jurisdictions may already be considering.

**Transportation Demand Management and Multimodal Issues**

Federal transportation legislation and state law requires a multimodal approach and a balanced transportation system. Concurrency requirements, established in GMA, are clearly meant to support these goals. The Phase 1 Report surveyed jurisdictions on the areas of transportation that were addressed in their programs. Half indicated only automobiles, but the other half indicated that transit, nonmotorized, or TDM were considered.

The Phase 2 work makes it clear though that even jurisdictions that include TDM or multiple modes in their programs are still primarily focused on concurrency of infrastructure for automobile use. While jurisdictions sometimes include multimodal components in their programs, they are usually in the form of a minor trip reduction credit, or a partial mitigation option. Rarely do jurisdictions fully embrace the potential for concurrency to support alternative modes.

One reason for this may be that jurisdictions almost exclusively use volume-to-capacity ratios as the basis of their measurement system. This can strongly influence the mitigations that likely to then be required; meaning, projects that increase the capacity side of the equation. A second reason may be that most fees do not allow for collecting on-going operational funding. This means that programmatic approaches (such as increasing transit hours) are not sustainable without other funding sources.

Nonetheless, a few jurisdictions consider the presence of transit and other multimodal facilities in setting standards. This approach may allow more congestion in areas where transit exists, which does not necessarily favor transit but does seem to favor increasing development where the service exists.
For the most part, these issues are considered in the mitigation process, especially for TDM. Other areas where the issues were addressed include:

- **Bellevue** grants an exemption for transit facilities. This reflects the benefits of having transit facilities in the city and accepts, in the concurrency program, the local traffic impacts.
- **Kent** requires traffic impact analyses and specifies that the analysis consider the impact on non-motorized facilities, in addition to arterials and intersections.
- **Issaquah** requires that the TDM mitigations become a legal condition of the permit, which is then required for future owners of property. (Other jurisdictions use this approach)
- **Mountlake Terrace** indicates that there is sufficient revenue to maintain its standards in the forecast year, but nonetheless includes a policy that emphasizes TDM and other non-structural solutions to address capacity problems should they occur.
- **Renton** explicitly prioritizes better transit service over improvements for single-occupant vehicles.
- **Snohomish County** requires all major developments in the urban areas to provide TDM sufficient to reduce p.m. peak hour trips by five percent. This can include site design measures, purchasing off-site mitigations, or voluntary “in-lieu-of” payments. Snohomish County also slightly relaxes the standard for transit compatible developments on transit compatible arterials

While the case studies find that a number of jurisdictions are considering other modes of transportation beyond automobiles, many of the approaches are piecemeal, and do not address multimodal issues throughout their analysis and mitigation processes. This perhaps indicates that more guidance, structure, or perhaps funding changes are necessary to ensure that the GMA’s multimodal goals are implemented through local concurrency programs.

**Interjurisdictional Coordination**

Interjurisdictional coordination is another component of transportation planning that is promoted in federal and state law, however, jurisdictions are not coordinating with each other to any great extent. This may be a product, in part, of the law providing limited guidance as to how jurisdictions should work together, and difficulty of working together.

The section of the GMA that describes the concurrency requirement simply states that transportation elements must include an assessment of the impacts of their transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions. The section of the Washington Administrative Code related to concurrency provides even less direction, stating that programs could address “provisions for interjurisdictional coordination.”

The Phase 1 Report found that only a limited amount of coordination was occurring among jurisdictions regarding concurrency. The survey results indicated that while a number of jurisdictions do provide information on developments in their jurisdiction to other jurisdictions (primarily through SEPA), few
incorporated this information in their modeling to account for developments outside their jurisdiction. Even fewer coordinated standards, modeling, or measurement methods.

The focus group respondents repeatedly indicated that pass-through traffic was a key issue and that greater attention should be paid to mitigating interjurisdictional impacts, coordinating modeling, and the setting of consistent standards. In looking for solutions, a number of respondents indicated that a role exists for regional and perhaps state agencies to help address cross-boundary issues and mitigations.

At the same time, the case study reviews found very few references to interjurisdictional coordination in jurisdictions’ codes; frequently, no reference was made at all. When the issue was addressed, very broad and generic statements were usually given but no clear guidance was included. Among those addressing the topic, a few innovative programs are noted:

- **Kirkland** includes a traffic growth factor in its traffic model to account for regional growth.
- **Mill Creek** uses a split peak standard to address pass-through traffic; this balances traffic projects so they focus on issues other than just than peak hour traffic.
- **Mountlake Terrace** uses a two-tiered standard that distinguishes intra-city (inner ring and the majority of the community) and inter-city (outer ring) travel. The outer ring standard is set no higher than the adjacent jurisdiction’s standard, meaning the standard is the same as adjacent jurisdictions on both sides of the City.
- **Redmond** and **Bellevue** use a joint computer model for their joint planning areas, but the cities do not factor all new and proposed developments occurring in the other jurisdiction into their programs.
- **Snohomish County** includes a provision in its adopted interlocal agreements, which has the potential to help address traffic impacts across jurisdiction boundaries. This provision creates a framework for a jurisdiction to request mitigation for impacts from a large development in another jurisdiction.

The Phase 2 work clarifies that local jurisdictions’ programs focus almost exclusively on the local impacts of development and, therefore, all impacts that occur geographically distant from a proposed development are excluded from concurrency review and mitigation. Together, these imply that conditions on all roads with significant amounts of pass-through traffic can get worse without a funding mechanism to respond.

Also, the different philosophical approaches mentioned in the beginning of this chapter are also a factor that hinders coordination – each jurisdiction views their neighbor’s actions in light of their own intentions. Thus, it will be challenging for those who use concurrency as a growth management tool to work well with those who use it to fund desired projects. It will also be challenging for those who use concurrency as a mechanism for helping achieve mode split targets to work with those who use concurrency as a funding (and perhaps road capacity building) tool.

**State Facilities.** State facilities carry both regional and local traffic – especially in suburban and rural areas where few alternate routes exist. Since major state routes are exempt from concurrency requirements, congestion “failures” on these routes do not outright force local governments to deny development. Nonetheless, congestion on the state routes does cause traffic shifts that can greatly affect local streets. At the same time, development that occurs in local jurisdictions affects state routes – but existing concurrency practices means that funding does not follow the trips from local jurisdictions onto state routes.
The case study reviews found that jurisdictions’ concurrency codes and ordinances do not address state facilities. While jurisdictions are required to address state facilities in their comprehensive plans, there is little link to their actual concurrency program. While most focus group participants indicated that state facility problems have yet to lead to denying development, they did indicate that this might occur in the near future. This area will require more work and partnership between the state, region, and local jurisdictions.

Other Items of Interest

A few additional items were found in the reviewed codes that were worthy of note:

- **Public information:** Many jurisdictions provide information to the public and a number include annual reporting programs. One example of very clearly presenting what capacity exists comes from King County where they update and provide a map every year showing the status of each concurrency zone. Zones that are nearing their capacity also show the number of additional trips allowed without Council action. This provides an easily understandable early indication of which areas may soon exceed capacity.

- **Built out areas:** Not many jurisdictions address the issue of facilities being at their maximum build-out. Some measurement systems, such as zonal or citywide, could by definition preclude this. However, when capacity increases are counter to a jurisdiction’s interest for a given facility, some clearly indicate how impacts are to be mitigated. Bainbridge Island states that, from its perspective, before State Route 305 is widened, the level-of-service standard must be lowered. Snohomish County also addresses roads that are at ultimate capacity and clearly states that TDM is the mitigation option.

- **Monitoring:** Few jurisdictions addressed monitoring in their programs; those that did took different approaches. Everett ties the review of its concurrency program to the five-year comprehensive plan review. Kent specifies that improvements may be required if a rezone creates additional demand and the need for a project. Kitsap County notes that if a development that is consistent with the comprehensive plan is denied, a feedback loop to the underlying zoning and the feasibility of providing increased capacity should exist.

Conclusions

The findings above provide a foundation for developing recommendations that address the core challenges jurisdictions face as they develop and refine their concurrency programs. The findings also provide a framework for considering where regional policy and/or state law can be enhanced to provide more clarity and direction.

Some findings are useful as best practices for local governments and some more clearly relate to regional and state agencies. At the regional level, at least a minimum role seems to exist for providing

---

23 The issue of integrating state facilities into local concurrency programs has not been thoroughly addressed by the Hearings Boards. However, one case includes an indirect reference to the issue. In this case, a number of arterials could not meet the local jurisdiction’s adopted standards, and the County argued that “LOS deficiencies on these roads are due to congestion on state highways…[that] the County’s GMA concurrency requirements do not apply to transportation facilities and services of state-wide significance…” and further argued that the congestion on the state route could not be cured by means of a funded County project. The Hearings Board stated that it “reluctantly agrees and finds that the County is correct on the law, but Petitioner is correct that the County is not helpless in this situation and the County’s hands are not tied. The County has options it should pursue to address this problem…”, suggesting options such as TDM, working with the State, or lowering the standard. Jody McVitie v. Snohomish County. No. 00-3-0006c. September 11, 2000.
regularly updated data so that all jurisdictions use a similar baseline for traffic counts. Perhaps a larger role is needed to help jurisdictions coordinate better, and to address the cross-jurisdiction impacts of development. More work will need to be done to better understand the issues around state facilities.
Appendix 1. List of Researched Jurisdictions

The following jurisdictions were selected for analysis in the Phase 2 work: Bainbridge Island, Bellevue, Everett, Issaquah, Kent*, King County, Kirkland, Kitsap County, Lakewood**, Mill Creek, Monroe, Mountlake Terrace, Pierce County, Redmond, Renton, Sammamish, Seattle, Snohomish County, Steilacoom, and Tacoma.

* City of Kent staff could not attend the focus group meetings, but the City is included in the case studies.
** City of Lakewood staff participated in the focus group meetings, but they are not included in the case studies because they do not yet have a formal concurrency program.
Appendix 2. Focus Group Questions

The following ten questions were posed to participants of the focus groups, and written answers were solicited.

1. What are the goals and objectives of your concurrency program as it relates to (1) managing growth and development and (2) accessibility and mobility? How effective has your program been in meeting your goals?

2. To what degree is your jurisdiction taking advantage of mitigation fees (including SEPA & impact fees) that you are authorized to collect? What gaps still exist to adequately finance development-related improvements and services (funded through these fees)? What types of mitigation have taken place?

3. Further describe interjurisdictional relationships and issues — including how impacts from — and on — other jurisdictions are addressed. Has pass-through traffic — emanating from new development in adjacent jurisdictions — created level-of-service conditions that limit your jurisdiction’s ability to permit desired urban growth?

4. Has traffic from state facilities — especially pass-through travel — created level-of-service conditions that limit your jurisdiction’s ability to permit desired urban development? Are there specific examples of “spillover impacts” that state facilities have had on your local facilities? How have you worked with the state in addressing impacts?

5. How are “multimodal” issues addressed in the various aspects of your concurrency program?

6. If you are “tailoring” your program to reflect subarea planning, how is this done? Has it been effective in meeting your overall objectives for managing growth and facilities — e.g., focusing growth in compact communities (and/or discouraging growth where it is not desired)?

7. Why has your concurrency program either had or not had any significant impacts on development? Does this have to do with thresholds, the nature of the development reviewed to date, or level-of-service standards?

8. Discuss the public awareness in your community concerning concurrency and growth management.

9. Where funding was committed to provide needed facilities within six-years of new development coming on line, what has been happening as you reach that six-year mark? Are the identified facilities being built within that timeframe? Partially built? If they have not been built, what is happening with the money that was committed?

10. Have there been any major legal issues that have impacted development or projects going forward under your concurrency provisions?
Appendix 3. Glossary of Terms

The following terms and acronyms are used throughout this report:

AUJA..............Arterial Unit In Arrears. Term specifically used in Snohomish County for roads that do not meet the existing level-of-service standard.

DUCA..............Designated Ultimate Capacity Arterial. Term specifically used in Snohomish County for roads that are at fully built out and are at ultimate capacity.

GMA..............Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A)

HOV..............High-Occupant Vehicle

RCW..............Revised Code of Washington

SEPA..............State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21c)

SOV..............Single-Occupant Vehicle

TDM..............Transportation Demand Management

TIP..............Transportation Improvement Program. Normally a component of a Capital Improvement Program or a Capital Facilities Program.

WAC..............Washington Administrative Code

WSDOT.......Washington State Department of Transportation