
TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT CONSISTENCY REVIEW PROCESS

Skagit-Island Regional Transportation Planning Organization
(SIRTPO)

Draft



INTRODUCTION

This document describes a process that allows Skagit-Island Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SIRTPO) to certify the consistency of transportation elements of local comprehensive plans. This certification is based on the Growth Management Act (GMA) requirements adopted in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and the Washington Administrative Code (WAC).

BACKGROUND

Section 47.80.023 of the RCW requires all transportation elements of local comprehensive plans undergo a consistency review to ensure that they conform to the requirements of the GMA. The GMA states that this process is to be developed and administered by Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs). SCOG has been designated as the lead planning agency for the Skagit-Island Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SIRTPO).

The WAC's procedural criteria for adopting comprehensive plans (Chapter 365-195 WAC) reiterates sections of the RCWs and recommends further steps to meet the requirements.

The GMA requires SIRTPO to review the transportation elements in local comprehensive plans for conformity with the GMA.

CONFORMITY WITH THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT

The GMA conformity requirement directs RTPOs to certify that the transportation elements of comprehensive plans

conform to the appropriate requirements of RCW 36.70A.070, and recommends steps to meet the RCW requirements in WAC 365-195-325.

THE REVISED CODE OF WASHINGTON

Required transportation-related elements listed in Section 36.70A.070 of the RCW are:

- I. Land use assumptions used in estimating travel
- II. Estimated traffic impacts to state-owned transportation facilities and services
- III. Facilities and services needs
 - a. Inventory of transportation facilities and services
 - b. Level of service standards
 - c. Compliance with level of service standards
 - d. Specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance locally owned transportation facilities or services that are below and established LOS standard
 - e. Ten year traffic forecast
 - f. Identification of system needs to meet current and future demands
- IV. Finance
 - a. Analysis of funding capability
 - b. Multi-year finance plan basis for six year program
 - c. Funding shortfalls
- V. Intergovernmental coordination
- VI. Demand management strategies
- VII. Pedestrian and bicycle planning

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Font: 8 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar

Deleted: P:\Transportation\MPO-RTPO\RTPO MPO Documents\Transportation Element Consistency Review Process.docx

WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE RECOMMENDATIONS

The WAC 365-195-325 recommends further steps to meet the above requirements.

1. Incorporate a discussion concerning regional development strategies which promote the regional transportation plan and an efficient transportation system.
2. Jurisdictions should assess the impacts of their transportation and land use decisions on adjacent jurisdictions. Impacts of those decisions should be identified and discussion of strategies to address inconsistencies should be included.
3. Traffic forecasts should be based on adopted regional growth strategies, the regional transportation plan, and comprehensive plans within the region to ensure consistency between jurisdictions. The forecast of at least ten years of travel demand should include vehicular, transit and non-motorized modes of transportation.

PROCESS FOR CERTIFICATION

The consistency review will be completed by SIRTPO staff and representatives of member jurisdictions through the Skagit and Island Sub-RTPO Technical Advisory Committees (TAC). The TACs will recommend approval of certification to the SIRTPO Policy Board. If the plan is consistent, a certification letter from the Policy Board Chair will be sent to the local jurisdiction.

A checklist will be used to determine where there is consistency and where

there is not. There is a comment section for each checklist item to help clarify what is inconsistent or to provide positive feedback about supportive efforts.

A four-step certification review of local transportation elements is proposed:

1. Preliminary review will be performed by SIRTPO staff. The checklist will be used as an aid in conducting the preliminary certification review. Any inconsistencies or potential problems across jurisdictional boundaries would be noted at this time.
2. SIRTPO staff will prepare an overall certification report that addresses all of the individual elements from a checklist. The staff certification report will then be reviewed by the Skagit or Island Sub-RTPO TAC.
3. Following the review by the TAC, the final report will be sent to the SIRTPO Policy Board and a recommendation will be presented for action.
4. After action by the SIRTPO Policy Board, a copy of the final report will be forwarded to the jurisdiction.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

If inconsistencies and/or problems are identified, discussions will first occur between SIRTPO staff and the jurisdictions' staff. If issues cannot be resolved at this level, the discussion will next take place with the TAC. Any unresolved issues from the TAC level will then be discussed by the SIRTPO Policy Board who will ultimately make the decision on certification.

The review process will be accomplished within sixty days. Once the local transportation elements are certified,

Formatted: Font: 8 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar

Deleted: P:\Transportation\MPO-RTPO\RTPO MPO Documents\Transportation Element Consistency Review Process.docx

they remain certified until they are amended or updated. Revised transportation elements would require recertification.

Draft

Formatted: Font: 8 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar

Deleted: P:\Transportation\MPO-RTPO\RTPO MPO Documents\Transportation Element Consistency Review Process.docx

TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT CONSISTENCY REVIEW CHECKLIST

This checklist is used to evaluate local plans' transportation elements for conformity with state law. It is based primarily on requirements of the GMA as delineated in RCW 36.70A.070. Additional appropriate factors have been drawn from the Washington State Department of Transportation checklist, and the WAC Procedural Criteria.

For each element, check **YES** if the element is **consistent** with the statement to the right. Check **NO** for each element that is **not consistent** with the statement to the right.

1. Yes No Were land use assumptions used in estimating travel?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

2. Yes No Does the inventory of transportation facilities and services include all transportation moves?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

3. Yes No Have LOS standards been established for all arterials (including the state highways and transit routes?)

- Yes No Are LOS standards regionally coordinated and consistent with adjacent jurisdictions?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

4. Yes No Is a deficiency analysis and an action strategy to address the identified deficiencies included in the plan?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

5. Yes No Does the plan contain a multi-year financial plan, based on the needs identified which will serve as the basis of the six year street, road or transit plan?

- Yes No If yes, are the financial plans interjurisdictionally consistent?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

6. Yes No Does the plan contain goal statements to ensure mitigation of development impacts so affected facilities meet concurrency requirements?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Formatted: Font: 8 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar

Deleted: P:\Transportation\MPO-RTPO\RTPO MPO Documents\Transportation Element Consistency Review Process.docx

7. Yes No Is the 10-year traffic forecast consistent with the adopted land use plan?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

8. Yes No Are goal statements incorporated into the plan to accommodate the impacts related to development?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

9. Yes No Does the plan address coordination with adjacent jurisdictions to determine land uses within the adjacent jurisdictions that would affect local traffic patterns?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

10. Yes No Does the plan address current and future coordination with state, regional, and local interests as part of the planning efforts?

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Draft

Formatted: Font: 8 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar

Deleted: P:\Transportation\MPO-RTPO\RTPO MPO Documents\Transportation Element Consistency Review Process.docx

MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF CONSISTENCY REVIEW CHECKLIST

THE SKAGIT RTPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FINDS THAT THE (CITY/TOWN) OF _____'S TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT IS IN SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONSISTENCY REQUIREMENTS OF THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT. IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT ANY PARTICULAR PART OF THE PLAN THAT HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED TO NOT BE IN COMPLIANCE WILL BE ADDRESSED IN THE NEXT UPDATE OF THE PLAN.

Draft

Formatted: Font: 8 pt, Do not check spelling or grammar

Deleted: P:\Transportation\MPO-RTPO\RTPO MPO Documents\Transportation Element Consistency Review Process.docx