

TRANSPORTATION CONCURRENCY POLICY REVIEW: CONSIDERATION OF THE PLANNING POLICY COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION TO IMPLEMENT A NEW CONCURRENCY SYSTEM BASED ON "ENHANCED DELAY"	Proposed Council Action: Authorize Administration
---	---

DEPARTMENT OF	Planning, (Mark Hinthorne, Director)
COUNCIL COMMITTEE LIAISON	John Rittenhouse
OTHER COUNCIL MEETINGS	March 5, 2007
EXHIBITS	A. Report: Evaluation of Transportation Concurrency Policy, January 26, 2007 B. February 8, 2007 Planning Policy Commission Minutes
<i>Note: Exhibits A & B were previously distributed.</i>	

Comp Plan Policy Nos.	Transportation Goals B & D Land Use Policy 9.1.4
Consistent	Yes
Explanation Provided	Page 2
Other Policies	n/a

Expenditure Required	
\$	75,000
Amount Budgeted	
\$	75,000

SUMMARY STATEMENT

BACKGROUND

The Planning Department's 2006 Work Plan included a comprehensive review of several transportation concurrency alternatives, including the concurrency systems being used by seven other jurisdictions. After review with the PPC on July 13th and City Council on July 25th, three concurrency systems were selected for further study: the City's existing system using screenpoints and Volume / Planned Capacity (V/PC); Enhanced Delay; and Travel Time. There was also general consensus on several characteristics / values that the ideal transportation concurrency system would have.

Study Findings

The findings of this review are summarized in Exhibit A – An Evaluation of Transportation Concurrency Policy. The report found that the City's *Existing Transportation Concurrency System* is a reasonable alternative if the transportation model is updated, additional screenpoints are added in recently annexed areas, and current screenpoint locations are evaluated and revised. System strengths include: its multimodal approach, use of the travel demand model and a quick turnaround for development analysis.

However, the current system also has several shortfalls: it does not consider the operational effects of intersections, in some cases the mitigation required to achieve concurrency is underestimated, capacity calculations are based on policy rather than standard engineering practice, and it is difficult to understand. In addition, the current concurrency system ranked lowest when the three alternatives were evaluated using the values of the ideal concurrency system.

The *Travel Time* option is easily understood and tools are readily available to predict vehicle and transit travel times. Other advantages include: its multimodal approach, use of the travel demand model, and evaluation of concurrency using a corridor analysis rather than screenpoints.

Two drawbacks are: non-motorized travel times would be estimated rather than measured, and the difficulty and cost to develop and maintain the system. Travel Time ranked higher than the existing concurrency system but lower than Enhanced Delay when all three alternatives were compared.

The *Enhanced Delay* alternative is similar to the City's existing system because it compares roadway volume to capacity, and other modes of transportation can be included to help achieve concurrency.

However, Enhanced Delay differs from Issaquah's current system in several important ways. First, it can be implemented at intersections or corridors or both. Second, this method allows the roadway *level of service* to be reduced if non-motorized or transit alternatives *are* available rather than reducing roadway *capacity* if they are not. Third, because capacity is not reduced, the roadway capacity is based on engineering capacity rather than "planned capacity". This system also uses the travel demand model, is easy to understand, and provides a strong link between development and transportation improvements.

A drawback of this system is that it is difficult to account for and manage the impact of "regional traffic" on city streets (this shortfall is common to the other two alternatives). Enhanced Delay ranked the highest of the three alternatives when evaluated using the values of the ideal concurrency system (see Exhibit A, Appendix A).

PPC Review & Recommendation

PPC discussed the transportation concurrency options on July 13, September 28 and December 14, 2006, and February 8, 2007. At the conclusion of the February 8th meeting, PPC concurred with the Administration's recommendation and moved to recommend the Enhanced Delay option for developing the City's new transportation concurrency system (Exhibit B).

Next Steps

March	5	Refer to LUC
March	22	LUC review and recommendation
April	2	Council action
Through '07		Implementation of preferred alternative including updating the city's transportation concurrency model, establishing technical procedures and preparing related Plan and Code Amendments.

CONSISTENCY WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

The proposal is consistent with the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies:

Transportation Goal B:	Link development and transportation improvements.
Transportation Goal D:	Support alternative modes of transportation.
Land Use Policy 9.1.4	Concurrent transportation facilities (shall be) a requirement of development approval within the City's Urban Growth Area.

ADMINISTRATION'S RECOMMENDATION:

Implement the *Enhanced Delay* alternative including updating the transportation concurrency model, establishing technical procedures & preparing related Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Code Amendments.

UPDATE:

The Land Use Committee reviewed the Transportation Concurrency Policy Alternatives (Exhibit A) on March 22, 2007. The Administration clarified that the City's current transportation concurrency system will remain in effect until a new concurrency system is approved by the City Council. Funding to update the City's transportation concurrency system was included in the Planning Department's 2007 budget.

After discussion, LUC recommended that the Council direct the Administration to prepare a new transportation concurrency system based on "Enhanced Delay". This effort will include updating the transportation concurrency model, establishing technical procedures and methods, and preparing related Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Code Amendments.

ALTERNATIVE(s):

1. ~~Direct the Administration to implement the Enhanced Delay alternative without referral to committee.~~
2. Direct the Administration to implement the Travel Time alternative.
3. Update the city's Existing Transportation Concurrency System but do not change methodology.

RECOMMENDATION

Administration/Planning Director:

~~MOVE TO: Refer AB 5612 to the March 22, 2007 Council Land Use Committee meeting for review and recommendation back to the full Council on April 2, 2007.~~

Council Land Use Committee Chair/John Rittenhouse:

MOVE TO: Authorize the Administration to prepare a new transportation concurrency system based on "Enhanced Delay".