

Multi-Modal Concurrency

Aug 30, 2006

Multimodal Concurrency Advisory Group

TRAC-UW

Department of Urban Design and Planning

Evans School

Puget Sound Regional Council



Concurrency:

- “[L]ocal jurisdictions must adopt and enforce ordinances which prohibit development approval if the development causes the level of service on a locally owned transportation facility to decline below the standards adopted in the transportation element of the comprehensive plan, unless transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development are made concurrent with the development.”
- RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b)

Local Discretion

- Timing
 - What part of the development process?
- Level of Service measurement
 - What transportation methods are measured?
 - What facilities matter?
- Level of Service standard
 - How much delay is acceptable?
- Transportation Improvements
 - Turn lanes? Buses?

Funding Options

- SEPA (RCW 43.21C)
 - Can also stop development
 - Early in the development process
- Transportation Impact Fees (RCW 39.92)
 - Must be based on a six-year plan
- System Improvement Fees (RCW 82.02)
 - Capital facility plan
 - “Public streets and roads”

Concurrency Fee

- Note that there is NO “Concurrency Fee”
- It is considered a “voluntary contribution” by a developer
- There is a concern (because of 82.02.020) that these contributions are not always legally allowed

“New” Key Phrases

- “Reasonably necessary as a direct result of the proposed development” RCW 39.92.040, 82.02.020
- “Reasonably related” and a “proportionate share” RCW 82.02.050
- “Mitigate significant adverse impacts” and “reasonable and capable of being accomplished” RCW 43.21C.060

SEPA / System Improvements

- SEPA mitigation for the development's impact upon others in the existing environment
- System improvements are for benefit of the jurisdiction and all new development

Three Prongs, Three Fees

- Concurrency Decisions
 - What to measure
 - What to accept
 - How to improve
- Fees
 - SEPA
 - Transportation Impact Fees
 - System Improvements

Concurrency Objectives

PSRC

TRAC-UW

Department of Urban Design and Planning

Evans School



Concurrency Objectives

- “Everyone” agrees on the basic goal of concurrency:

“Ensure that public infrastructure supports development as it occurs”

- But this goal supports many competing objectives

Concurrency Objectives

- Primary Objectives:
 - Control timing of development
 - Support transportation system funding
 - Focus development in desired geographic areas
 - Provide financial tool to focus that development

Concurrency Objectives

- Multi-Modal Objectives
 - Channel development to increase system efficiency
 - Support TDM strategies
 - Expand travel options through development incentives

Concurrency Objectives

- Regional and Local Objectives
 - Local control
 - Regional system performance

Concurrency Objectives

- Secondary objectives^{*}
 - Limit the cost of the concurrency process
 - To the private sector
 - To the public sector
 - A transparent process to the public
 - A credible process with the public
- ^{*} Not issues of “outcome” but factors in the selection of the “best” process

Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria

- “Best” approach is a function of the relative value you place on achieving different objectives
- Project will describe strengths / weaknesses of different approaches for ~13 criteria
 - Some criteria are unimportant for some approaches

Evaluation Criteria

- Politically acceptable
- Intelligible and credible
- Predictable
- Compatible with regulatory structure
- Relevant to GMA

Evaluation Criteria

- Expands transportation options
- Sustainable
 - Financially
 - Legally,
 - Structurally
- Cost to the private sector
- Funding it might generate

Evaluation Criteria

- Uses data from current planning process
- Applicable scale of analysis
 - geographic
 - temporal
- Sensitive to local needs / conditions

Evaluation Criteria

- Versatile (the approach benefits different development conditions)
 - Urban
 - Suburban
 - Rural




Alternative Approaches to Concurrency

Alternatives

- We are still inventing / refining alternatives
- We are open to suggestions / ideas / approaches
- The following are ways we are categorizing alternatives

Alternatives

- Multiple ways to approach concurrency
 - Degree of local/regional control
 - Measuring plans, facility performance, or a combination
 - Regulating behavior with/without incentives

Category	Strategy Continuum	Example Alternatives
Scale	Local  Regional	1) Regional targets set; local jurisdictions meet them. 2) Locals set own standards
Measure	Infrastructure  Performance	1) Design MM capacity in terms of infrastructure; individual choice determines level of congestion. 2) Setting and meeting targets for time, congestion, proximity, hours of service 3) Targets are set as average VMT per person in the jurisdiction
System	Regulation  Incentive	1) Area that exceeds concurrency standard requires double impact fees. Areas in exclusion zone pay no impact fees 2) Area that exceeds concurrency standard may not develop

Measurements

- Plan deployment
 - Infrastructure construction based
 - Define a desired set of infrastructure
 - Set a proportion that must be completed for a given level of trip generation
 - Delay new construction until funding permits that level of infrastructure completion

Measurements

- Facility Performance
 - Transportation system performance criteria are selected
 - Use (volume) and/or delay
 - Vehicles and/or people
 - Improvements must be made to the system if performance falls below standard
 - No limit on what improvements are required
 - But they must result in meeting the performance criteria

Degree of Local/Regional Control

- Current systems are aimed at local control
 - Matches where land use decision making occurs
 - Can result in adverse regional effects
- A more regional system might be better for regional, multi-modal outcomes
- Could be a two tiered system
 - Nice upside – but may require legal change

Regulations and Incentives

- Current law is written as regulation:
 - Can issue develop permit only if LOS is met
 - Up / down decision
 - Creates artificial boundary conditions
 - Difficult to set boundaries
 - Because it is hard to estimate the effects of external impacts
 - Because it is hard to predict future political decisions
 - Often hard to change adopted standards as conditions change

Regulations and Incentives

- Incentive system might produce more politically acceptable results
 - e.g., impact fees would go up in areas where development is less desirable
 - Other mechanisms might be adopted to shift the incentives for building in low density areas with poor alternatives to SOVs

Regulations and Incentives

- Incentive system is likely to require legal changes
 - May conflict with current law on impact fees (82.02.020) because of the inability to charge two separate transportation fees

Importance of Measurement Units

- Previous studies point out:

What gets measured is what gets addressed

- So: the measurement unit drives the outcome of the concurrency process

Measurement Units

- Are measurements “targets” or “absolutes?”
 - V/C ratios
 - to be directly measured and indirectly estimates
 - means the outcome is roadway construction
 - VMT measures (e.g., VMT per person)
 - Used as an incentive system input
 - Less objective (less direct measurement)
 - People and/or vehicles

Measurement Units

- Existence of infrastructure
 - Lanes to be built
 - Park and ride spaces
 - Existence of multiple entrances to state roadway
 - Existence of roadway
- Existence of services
 - Revenue hours of service
 - Seat capacity passing a screenline

Measurement Unit

- Performance indicators
 - LOS
 - Travel time
 - Delay
 - Mode split