

Island County Transportation Concurrency Management Program Options

PAC Meeting #4 July 8, 2014



Purpose of today's meeting



- Transportation Element update status
- Concurrency Program options
- Direction for moving forward



Where are we in the project?





PAC: Project Advisory Commitee **BICC**: Board of Island County Commissioners



TE Update – Open House #2



- Present existing and future transportation conditions
- Gather input on ideas for project list
- Open house dates
 - July 15th 4:00 6:00 p.m. at Camano Center
 - July 22th 1:00 3:00 p.m. at Freeland Library
 5:30 7:30 p.m. at Oak Harbor Library



Where are we at in the concurrency program development process?







What are our broad objectives for developing the program?



- 1. Passes the legal test
- 2. Supports land use vision and planning goals
- 3. Able to fund improvements
- 4. Can implement with limited resources
- 5. Easy to understand and communicate

Any changes or additions to the above objectives?



How do we measure success?



•What you measure defines what you will get!

- Facilities
 - Roadway corridors
 - Roadway segments
 - Intersections
 - Multi-modal
 - Groups of facilities
- Time periods
 - Daily
 - Peak hour
 - Other







Is one standard or method appropriate Countywide?

- Urban/Rural
- Subareas
- State highways
- County roadways
- Ferries
- Transit service



What LOS methodology will we apply?



- How will it be measured?
 - Roadway volume-to-capacity (v/c)
 - Intersection delay
 - Corridor travel time
 - Vehicle miles travel
 - Other
- Each method measures "success" differently



What are the potential concurrency program components?



- A. Facility Based Standard
- B. Trip Impact Threshold and Monitoring Program
- C. Subarea Composite / Average Intersection Delay
- D. Arterial Travel Time (or Speed)
- E. LOS Standard Multimodal Adjustment
- F. Person Trips Capacity

Components are not exclusive. The ultimate program may be a combination of multiple components.





Applies a LOS standard by facility type using the roadway functional classification system.

- Focused on auto mode
- Federal functional classification system
- Define LOS standard by facility type



B. Trip Impact Threshold and Monitoring Program



Sets a minimum trip generation threshold for testing new developments, while establishing a monitoring program to periodically assess the cumulative impacts of developments under threshold.

- Only developments exceeding the trip generation minimum threshold are tested
- Combine with monitoring program to measure cumulative impacts of smaller developments



C. Subarea Composite / Average Intersection Delay



Evaluates the total delays or average delays at key intersections in the county or within a subarea to determine if a development project's traffic impacts can be accommodated by the transportation system.

- Measures delay of group of intersections
- Maximum average delay standard is set by roadway segment or subarea





Evaluates travel speeds along selected corridors or roadways based on methodologies in *Highway Capacity Manual*.

- Corridors can be divided into defined segments
- Accounts for total travel time along a roadway segment, including delays at intersections



E. LOS Standard Multimodal Adjustment



Provides credit when other modes are available. Standards would be set allowing lower LOS for areas served by other modes.

- County designates corridors and assigns LOS to each
- Adjust LOS when transit and/or non-motorized service/facilities are available





Accounts for auto, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle modes to estimate the person trips capacity that can be accommodated.

- Measure all modal facilities capacity in person trips or (person miles)
- Combine multimodal capacity in total capacity for motorized and non-motorized modes





Concurrency Component

Broad Program
Objectives

Is the component more or less consistent with the broad program objectives?



How do we compare the different components?



	A. Functional Classification Based Standard	B. Trip Impact Threshold and Monitoring Program	C. Subarea Composite/ Avg Intersection Delay	D. Arterial Travel Time (or Speed)	E. LOS Standard Multimodal Adjustment	F. Person Trips Capacity
1. Passes the legal test	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
2. Supports land use vision and planning goals	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
3. Ability to fund improvements	Needs to be tied to reasonable standards	Needs to be regularly maintained	Needs to be tied to reasonable standards	Needs to be tied to reasonable standards	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
4. Can implement with limited resources	\bigcirc	Requires periodic monitoring program	\bigcirc	Requires periodic monitoring program	\bigcirc	0
5. Easy to understand and communicate	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
	full circle = more consistency half circle = consistent					

empty circle = less consistency



How do we select an approach?



- Choose an approach that fits overall planning goals and is based on concurrency program objectives
- Determine the appropriate application and where it should be applied
- Choose standards that fit within the context of the transportation system



What's an example of combining components?



Do not test developments with fewer than 10 peak hour trips

Implement a monitoring program to ensure several small developments do not accumulate into a large impact





Where do we go from here?



- Summary of input from County staff and PAC
 - Do concurrency program objectives fit County's goals?
 - What type of application is appropriate for the County?
 - How should methodologies and standards be applied?
 - Who is responsible for implementing the program?
 - What are the parameters for making changes to the MOU, State and County?
- Next steps Develop framework and test scenarios



Questions?



Project Website:

http://www.islandcounty.net/publicworks/TEUpdate.htm

Doug Cox, Transportation Planner Island County Public Works

- (360) 678-7959
- D.Cox@co.island.wa.us

Consultant Team

- Patrick Lynch, Patrick.Lynch@transpogroup.com
- Michael Houston, Michael.Houston@transpogroup.com
- Larry Toedtli, Larry.Toedtli@transpogroup.com

