

PRELIMINARY POLICY CONCEPTS - PROS & CONS

		Pros	Cons
Planning	<p>Technical Assistance: Increase technical assistance to cities and counties</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relatively inexpensive - Local governments are seeking information and guidance - Builds on existing GMA framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results not immediate due to comprehensive plan update cycles - Local governments may disregard assistance - Ensuring consistent guidance that is also sensitive to regional considerations is challenging
	<p>WSDOT Plan Review: Increase WSDOT participation in local land use planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relatively inexpensive - Builds on existing GMA framework - Comments address specific local proposals and receive wider public exposure - Sets the stage for state appeals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results not immediate due to comprehensive plan update cycles - Local governments may disregard comments - May lead to more state appeals of local governments decisions
Funding	<p>WSDOT Development Review: Improve WSDOT development review processes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relatively inexpensive - Builds on existing SEPA framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local governments may disregard mitigation requests - Only cost-effective to collect mitigation from larger developments - Mitigation generally less predictable than impact fees - Transportation projects funded tend to be smaller project-related fixes - Total amount collected does not approach the unfunded needs
	<p>State Collects System Charges Amend state law as appropriate to allow WSDOT to establish and collect regional system charges directly from the developer.</p>		
	<p>State Collects Mitigation: Authorize WSDOT to collect SEPA mitigation fees directly from the developer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relieves local governments of the responsibility for collecting mitigation on behalf of the state - More consistent and predictable state mitigation for collection for growth-related transportation needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State mitigation assessments would not be considered in the broader SEPA context that considers and balances all potential impacts - Only cost-effective to collect mitigation for larger developments - Mitigation is generally less predictable for private sector than impact fees - Transportation projects funded through mitigation tend to be smaller project-related fixes - Total amount collected would not approach the unfunded transportation needs - May contribute to sprawl
	<p>State Collects Impact Fees: Authorize WSDOT to collect impact fees directly from the developer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact fees are generally more predictable for private sector than mitigation - Collecting state impact fees would create a more consistent state-wide revenue system - Impact fees are generally more useful for funding area-wide system improvements - Unlike mitigation, impact fees do not require individualized assessments of a project's direct impact - May be designed to incentivize transportation-efficient land use practices through waivers or discounts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Setting up a fair impact fee system is technically challenging and may be costly if frequently appealed - Existing time limitations for expenditure may preclude use of impact fees for some projects - Using existing impact fee tools may result in the inability to collect fees in some cities or counties ineligible for or have chosen not to use certain fees - Total amount collected would not approach unfunded transportation system needs
	<p>Local Incentives: Provide incentives for local governments to adopt best practice planning access management and mitigation strategies by allowing limited concurrency exemptions for lo</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited infill concurrency exemptions may encourage denser urban development and discourage sprawl as well as reward local governments opting to implement best practices - Local governments more likely to implement best practices if incentives are provided - Builds on existing planning and mitigation framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most state transportation funding has been determined for the next 16 years, minimizing incentive - Reprioritizing state funding would reduce resources available for other needs - Total amount available would not approach unfunded transportation system needs
	<p>Mandatory Good Planning Practices: Require local governments to adhere to best practices in planning and access management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensures state transportation resources are protected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction of local flexibility and autonomy in land use planning and access management - Existing enforcement mechanisms are weak - Results not immediate due to 7-year comprehensive plan update cycles
	<p>Mandatory Local Enforcement of State Requested Mitigation: Require local governments to condition development approvals and collect mitigation requests for WSDOT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More consistent and predictable state mitigation collection for growth-related transportation needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local governments may be subjected to costly, more frequent appeals - May not require the state's mitigation requests to be balanced with other SEPA-identified impacts - Only cost-effective to collect mitigation for larger developments - Mitigation generally less predictable than impact fees - Total amount available would not approach unfunded transportation system needs
<p>Expansion of Concurrency to State Highways and Ferry Routes: Expand the transportation concurrency requirement under the GMA to include state highways and ferry routes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires local governments to maintain LOS standards while allowing them some flexibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local governments would not have option of reducing LOS standards (accepting congestion) - May result in moratoriums due to limited transportation funding, or sprawl to avoid congested corridors - Implementation would likely be expensive for local governments - Penalizes communities with high levels of pass-through traffic beyond their control - May lead to prioritization of avoiding traffic congestion above all other state policy goals - Very difficult to establish a fair concurrency system; appeals may be costly 	