

**DISCUSSION
GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION CONCURRENCY
OCTOBER 18, 2016**

AGENDA

WELCOME!

PURPOSE OF MEETING:

Moving towards a Regional Concurrency system whereby jurisdictional seams are eliminated.

INTRODUCTIONS: (around the table)

PROBLEM STATEMENT:

The Growth Management Act (GMA) relies on each city to determine its growth targets, but does not require it evaluate growth impacts on neighboring cities or unincorporated areas. This can cause a silo effect where cities work against each other and leave impacted unincorporated areas (UAs) without recourse. According to the 2010 census King County's UA population (325,000) is about one-sixth of the County's (1,931,000), yet unincorporated areas have little voice regarding impacts suffered due to traffic congestion on County roads caused, in large part, by Urban Area residents.

DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS:

The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) is governed by Boards, etc. populated with elected officials with decision-making authority. Staff management and subject matter experts know the details and implement policy, as directed. PSRC primarily influence is through Countywide Planning Policies and Certification of local Comprehensive Plans.

QUESTION #1: a) How does PSRC develop conditions for those cities proposing to exceed their agreed upon Growth Targets? b) Are Growth Targets both a minimum and a maximum?

The GMA, Revised Code of Washington (RCWs), and PSRC's VISION 2040 and TRANSPORTATION 2040 all contain the elements necessary to help achieve our Vision, but Concurrency Testing is vested with the local jurisdictions, thus promoting "*jurisdictional silos*" and effectively ignoring any "*regional*" perspective."

As the four-county Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO), PSRC has certain duties. For example, RCW 47.80.023 Duty (8) states: "*Review level of service methodologies used by*

cities and counties planning under chapter 36.70A RCW to promote a consistent regional evaluation of transportation facilities and corridors." In addition, one of 37 "concepts" in VISION 2040 is: "Concurrency to Support Regional Growth Strategy." It appears these words provide PSRC a valuable tool to help move towards our vision where Regional Concurrency is a reality in practice.

QUESTION #2: How does PSRC coordinate concurrency programs established by local jurisdictions to address regional cross-jurisdictional impacts of development?

To respond to development impacts, State law requires concurrency to ensure Level of Service (LOS) commitments are met within 6 years, thus introducing a lag for improvements to be in place. Often, local jurisdiction "financial commitments" are based on not-as-yet-secured Grant monies. Jurisdictions use various techniques to evaluate concurrency, creating jurisdictional "seams." Jurisdictions sometimes greatly exceed growth targets. Finally, there is no concurrency enforcement mechanism. The GMA provided Concurrency to serve as a powerful tool to manage growth, but its application in practice is wanting. We offer several potential solution paths for discussion.

QUESTION #3: a) Can and does PSRC require jurisdictions perform regional traffic impact analyses before certification of their Comprehensive Plans and/or any requested changes in their growth targets? b) If not, would more specificity in the RCWs allow same?

In reviewing the PSRC "Rural Transportation Study" now underway as part of the TRANSPORTATION 2040 Update (<http://www.psrc.org/assets/10545/T2040Update2014AppendixR.pdf>) it appears unincorporated organizations, such as Unincorporated Area Councils, Associations, etc., are not consulted (see "stakeholder" list on p. 2). Also, we believe a key issue which directly impacts Rural Area residents has not been identified: Commuters from cities within the UGA are overburdening many key County Rural Area road corridors.

QUESTION #4: Can all affected entities be involved in the Rural Transportation Study?

ADDITIONAL REFERENCE MATERIALS:

Presentation: "The Growth Management Act: Transportation and Concurrency," Mark Hellenberg, University of Washington, December 2009 (http://wstc.wa.gov/Meetings/AgendasMinutes/agendas/2009/Dec15/20091215_BP05_GMA_MEH_121109.pdf). Excerpt: "Constraints" and "Recommendations."

"Transportation Concurrency Update Report," KCDOT/RSD, July 2016 (<http://www.kingcounty.gov/~media/depts/transportation/roads/transportation-planning/concurrency/Revised-Concurrency-Report.ashx?la=en>). Excerpt: p. 5, "Failing Route Segments by Travel Shed" Table.

"The GMA Concurrency Goal and the State Transportation System," WSDOT/Policy Development and Regional Coordination, December 2006 (<https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/E8C033B7-1A51-4759-BE32-5AD317BB155E/0/GMAConcurrencyGoalandtheState.pdf>). Excerpts: p. 53: "Legal framework for State, regional, and Local Transportation Planning, Concurrency, and Mitigation" Chart and pp. 54-57: "Gaps in Coordination: Planning, Funding, and Governance."