

# RENTON TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT UPDATE

## Level of Service Options Phase 1 Summary

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Renton is undertaking its Comprehensive Plan Update and desires to update and streamline its Transportation Element. Initiatives to be integrated into the Element include, but are not limited to, the City's Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program, the 2011 Rate Study for Impact Fees that addresses the 2030 horizon and associated projects, and the City's trails and bicycle plans. The City anticipates the Element will reflect the new horizon year of 2035.

In addition to ensuring the Element meets Growth Management Act (GMA) and Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC's) requirements in order to be certified, the Element may address a new level of service (LOS) policy [and concurrency approach](#).

**Current LOS and Challenges:** [The City's current LOS policy is a multimodal travel time index as described in the current Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element. However, implementation of the travel time index is difficult since it requires field measurement to verify the travel times of multiple modes on major routes. As a result, the City has developed a process-oriented concurrency code with LOS measurement details in a director's rule. The code and director's rule endeavor to provide practical application to development projects; the director's rule estimates the number of trips supported by Transportation Element roadway improvements and provides a ratio considering how much the City is investing in the roadway system over time. On top of these measures the City applies its SEPA authority to address specific impacts of development. The net effect is a LOS concurrency system that is: A\) complex and less transparent, since details are in a director's rule or applied on a case by case basis through SEPA, and B\) roadway-oriented rather than multimodal in nature, since the concurrency test addresses vehicular trips and roadway investments only. Thus, the City desires to consider other multimodal LOS and concurrency systems in its 2035 Comprehensive Plan.](#)

**Objectives for an Updated LOS:** [that addresses aTo overcome current challenges, the City desires an updated LOS and concurrency system that is more straightforward and cost effective, while addressing transportation concerns at three levels: A\) citywide, LOS methoddemonstrating the plan as a whole meets the City's desired LOS, B\) subarea LOS standards, reflecting different neighborhood characteristics and growth levels, and C\) project level, conditions \(e.g. providing direction on mitigation and frontage improvements\). Overall, the City's objectives are that the LOS and concurrency system:](#)

- [1. Be defensible and meet requirements of GMA](#)
- [2. Be meaningful to measure transportation system versus development](#)
- [3. Be simple to explain](#)
- [4. Be simple and cost efficient to implement and monitor](#)
- [5. Incorporate other travel modes](#)
- [6. Be receptive to various transportation demand management \(TDM\) and parking strategies](#)
- [7. Consider the potential for different standards for different parts of the City](#)

[8. Help fund/implement multimodal transportation improvements](#)

[9. Provide a basis for interjurisdictional coordination on transportation](#)

Based on the City's new forecasted [2035](#) land use ~~to match 2035~~ projections and PSRC's [growth](#) distribution (VISION 2040), the LOS, transportation projects, and resulting impact fees may change. Further, depending on the level of service policy approaches, the concurrency management system may change.

The purpose of this summary is to identify the City's level of service and concurrency program objectives going forward, document the City's existing LOS approach and test it with the new objectives, and identify options and a framework for a proposed LOS and concurrency program that could improve the City's practices and obtain greater alignment between the City's desired land use plan and supporting transportation plan, as well as be more understandable for the public and efficient to administer.

## 2.0 LEVEL OF SERVICE AND CONCURRENCY PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

One of the first steps in evaluating potential revisions to the City's existing level of service (LOS) standards and transportation concurrency program is to define the program objectives. That is, what does the City want to accomplish with the program? Understanding the desired outcomes of the program are used to help in defining the types of data and analyses that may be required, the travel modes that will be included, the geographic coverage, and the level of staff resources that may be required for implementing the program.

To define the objectives of the LOS/concurrency program, City staff provided input on the overall policy direction for the City's transportation system as well as the City's existing LOS/concurrency program. In addition, concurrency programs and objectives from the other agencies were reviewed with City staff to get input on what elements of those programs might be important to the City of Renton. Based on the issues with the City's existing program and elements of other agency programs, a draft list of program objectives was assembled to guide the review of the City's existing concurrency program and development review processes. The objectives also were used to help guide discussion and development of a framework for revising the City's LOS standards and concurrency program.

[Table-Exhibit 2-1](#) summarizes the resulting draft program objectives which are used in evaluating the City's existing LOS/concurrency program and defining a proposed program for the City. The proposed program would be developed as part of the City's update of the Transportation Element of its Comprehensive Plan. While the draft objectives will likely be refined and possibly prioritized as the proposed program is developed, they provide a framework for discussion and comparing options at this initial stage. This will set the framework for the future work tasks.

As shown in [ExhibitTable 2-1](#), the objectives for the City of Renton transportation level of service standards and concurrency program focus on:

- Meeting the intent of GMA to help assure transportation facilities keep pace with development
- Being simple to explain and cost effective to implement
- Reflects the availability of other travel modes and supports the City's land use plan in order to help reduce travel in the City by automobile.

**Exhibit 2-1:  
 Draft LOS/Concurrency Program Objectives**

Program Objective	Description	Discussion
1. Be defensible and meet requirements of GMA	GMA establishes requirements for establishing level of services standards <sup>1</sup> and transportation concurrency that requires denial of development projects if adequate transportation facilities and services are not available within six-years. <sup>2</sup>	As a minimum, the City must set LOS standards and adopt/implement a transportation concurrency management program to comply with state law. GMA does not establish how the standards are set.
2. Be meaningful to measure transportation system versus development	The concurrency program and associated development review process should be able to be used to determine if the transportation system is adequate to accommodate each development applications.	Some communities have developed transportation level of service standards and concurrency programs that effectively result in all new developments being concurrent; these agencies typically rely more heavily on SEPA to mitigate transportation impacts of developments.
3. Be simple to explain	The City wants the community (residents, business owners, property owners, developers, elected officials, etc.) to be readily able to understand how the potential transportation impacts of new developments are being evaluated to reduce confusion.	
4. Be simple and cost efficient to implement and monitor	The City wants to simplify the operation of its concurrency program to improve efficiency, reduce staff time, and make it simpler for a development applicant to determine if it can meet concurrency in advance of preparing and submitting a full application.	<p>Concurrency programs can become very technical and require extensive staff and developer resources to determine if an application passes or not. The City does not want to spend a significant level of staff resources or funds which could otherwise be used to improve the transportation system.</p> <p>Monitoring of the transportation system can help assure that transportation improvements can be funded and constructed to meet the system needs.</p>

Program Objective	Description	Discussion
5. Incorporate other travel modes	The concurrency program and level of service standard should include a range of travel modes. The City would like the concurrency program to help complete its multimodal transportation system to support its land use plans.	The City's Transportation Element and other policies support development of pedestrian, bicycle, transit facilities and services to provide alternatives to automobiles and to support the mixed-use, transit supportive, and higher density land uses per its Comprehensive Plan.
6. Be receptive to various transportation demand management (TDM) and parking strategies	The level of service standards and concurrency program should take into account the ability of a development (and overall community) to reduce the volume of automobile traffic through programs to increase use of ridesharing (carpools, vanpools), parking policies, and other transportation demand management programs (such as flexible work schedules, telecommuting, bicycle racks, locker rooms at employer locations, etc.).	The City has an adopted Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) program and other TDM program policies to reduce the number of single-occupant vehicles on City roadways. The concurrency program should be able to reflect the success (or non-success) of those policies.
7. <a href="#">Consider the p</a> Potential for different standards for different parts of the City	The concurrency program and level of service standards should reflect different types and density of development and availability of transportation services.	Transportation services and land uses are very different in different subareas of the City. The City Center area is targeted for mixed-use, transit oriented development and extensive increases in transit service and pedestrian and bicycle facilities; this compares to the East Hill and Fairwood areas that are more suburban in nature with lower density single-family housing development, neighborhood commercial areas, and lower levels of transit service. The concurrency program should reflect those differences.

Program Objective	Description	Discussion
8. Help fund/implement multimodal transportation improvements	Concurrency can provide a nexus between potential traffic impacts and transportation system facility and service needs. The City desires a concurrency program that can allow developments to help fund the needed multimodal transportation improvements to achieve the community's vision.	Development mitigation programs are typically implemented through GMA Transportation Impact Fee program and SEPA review processes. The programs need to work together to assure that they meet the legal requirements and ensure that the programs do not require mitigation for the same impacts.
9. Provides a basis for interjurisdictional coordination on transportation	The City of Renton has worked with King County and regional partners to define its urban growth area (UGA) and potential annexation areas (PAA). The City would like its concurrency program to provide a basis for coordination and cooperation in defining potential transportation impacts across jurisdictional boundaries.	Transportation facilities and services cross jurisdictional boundaries – traffic due to growth in Renton will impact adjacent cities and unincorporated areas of King County as well as state highways and transit providers. Similarly, growth in other communities can impact transportation facilities and services in Renton. Depending on the LOS standards and programs, the various agencies may be able to agree on how to help address those impacts to help meet the basic tenants of concurrency.

1. RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B)
2. RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b)

### 3.0 CITY'S EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE AND CONCURRENCY PROGRAM

The City of Renton's current level of service and concurrency program includes the following elements:

1. A plan level adopted level of service (LOS) in the Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element (travel time index).
2. A project-level concurrency process in RMC 4-6-070 Transportation Concurrency Requirements and referenced Director's Rule.
3. Use of the SEPA process to determine development impacts and needed mitigation measures based on intersection LOS measures.

#### Adopted Level of Service

The City has adopted a multimodal travel time index which is the sum of the average 30-minute travel distance for single occupancy vehicles (SOV), high occupancy vehicles (HOV), and transit. The City

established the index in its 1995 plan and updated it in 2002. The distance was measured in field on key arterials. The 1995 index was 49 miles. The 2002 index was 42 miles.

A Citywide 2022 Level of Service standard has been developed for the City of Renton. The following demonstrates how Renton’s LOS policy was used to arrive at the 2022 LOS standard.

**Exhibit 2. 2002 Measured Travel Time by Mode**

2002 Average PM peak travel distance in 30-minutes from the City in all directions			
SOV	HOV	2 times Transit (includes access time)	LOS Index
16.6 miles	18.7 miles	6.8 miles	42*

\* Rounded

The LOS index measured in 2002 is the basis for the City’s LOS policy, except that the City’s modal split is weighted more towards transit and less to SOV as shown below. Per the Comprehensive Plan, this standard will require that the travel time of SOV (15) + HOV (17) + 2 T (10) or the sum of these three modes (42) must be maintained in the year 2022 and intervening years.

**Exhibit 3. 2022 Travel Time Index LOS**

2022 Average PM peak travel distance in 30-minutes from the City in all directions			
SOV	HOV	2 times Transit (includes access time)	LOS Standard
15* miles	17* miles	10* miles	42

\* Rounded

**Transportation Concurrency Code**

The City has an adopted transportation concurrency process based on the City’s travel time index.<sup>1</sup> The concurrency test is defined as a review to determine if the system has capacity.

*4-6-070 (B) 8. Transportation Concurrency Test: Technical review of a development activity permit application by the Department to determine if the transportation system has adequate or unused or uncommitted capacity, or will have adequate capacity, to accommodate trips generated by the proposed development, without causing the level of service standards to decline below the adopted standards, at the time of development or within six (6) years*

The test is applied to non-exempt development. Exemptions include development exempt from SEPA and short plats. Because the City cannot practically rerun the travel time index for each development application, the City’s process references rules and procedures established by the Department of Community and Economic Development:

*4-6-070 (D) 1. Test Required: A concurrency test shall be conducted by the Department for each nonexempt development activity. The concurrency test shall determine consistency with the adopted Citywide Level of Service Index and Concurrency*

<sup>1</sup> The code references the original index of 49 miles, though it indicates the reader should consult the Transportation Element for more information.

Management System established in the Transportation Element of the Renton Comprehensive Plan, according to rules and procedures established by the Department. The Department shall issue an initial concurrency test result describing the outcome of the concurrency test.

2. *Written Finding Required: Prior to approval of any nonexempt development activity permit application, a written finding of concurrency shall be made by the City as part of the development permit approval. The finding of concurrency shall be made by the decision maker with the authority to approve the accompanying development permits required for a development activity. A written finding of concurrency shall apply only to the specific land uses, densities, intensities, and development project described in the application and development permit.*

3. *Failure of Test: If no reconsideration is requested, or if upon reconsideration a project fails the concurrency test, the project application shall be denied by the decision maker with the authority to approve the accompanying development activity permit application.*

Based on a long-standing rules and procedures, the concurrency test consists of determining the number of trips supported by the Comprehensive Plan and creating a trip bank to which a project's trips are subtracted, as well as a review of the rate the City is investing in the system to show movement towards the plan. The 2013 summary is presented in the Exhibit below. While the concurrency test is directly related to the transportation plan that was developed based on the City's proposed land use and travel demand model and determining proposals to reduce congestion, the linkage to the multimodal LOS is indirect.

**Exhibit 4. 2014 Trip Availability**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Year	Estimated Trips: Comp. Plan	Actual Trips Added this Year	Actual Trips, Running Total	Ratio A: Actual Trips/Planned Trips	Estimated Required Expenditure	Total Est. Expenditure	Actual (Planned) Expenditure	Total Actual Expenditure	Ratio B: Actual Expd./Planned Expd.	Ratio B exceeds Ratio A?
1997	500,292	(baseyear)	500,292	1.00	7,178,882	7,178,882	9,130,933	9,130,933	1.27	Y
1998	510,698	13,310	513,602	1.01	7,466,037	14,644,919	9,710,995	18,841,928	1.29	Y
1999	521,321	8,609	522,211	1.00	7,764,679	22,409,598	6,339,498	25,181,426	1.12	Y
2000	532,164	8,871	531,082	1.00	8,075,266	30,484,864	5,207,795	30,389,221	1.00	Y
2001	543,233	5,712	536,794	0.99	8,398,277	38,883,141	8,352,610	38,741,831	1.00	Y
2002	554,532	10,555	547,349	0.99	8,734,208	47,617,348	4,779,559	43,521,390	0.91	N
2003	566,067	5,331	552,680	0.98	9,083,576	56,700,924	4,262,358	47,783,748	0.84	N
2004	577,841	14,430	567,110	0.98	9,446,919	66,147,843	5,280,288	53,064,036	0.80	N
2005	589,860	6,984	574,094	0.97	9,824,796	75,972,639	7,300,791	60,364,827	0.79	N
2006	602,129	6,683	580,777	0.96	10,217,788	86,190,427	17,810,470	78,175,297	0.91	N
2007	614,653	13,918	594,695	0.97	10,626,499	96,816,926	20,973,591	99,148,888	1.02	Y
2008	627,438	7,480	602,175	0.96	11,051,559	107,868,485	29,828,671	128,977,559	1.20	Y
2009	640,489	2,542	604,717	0.94	11,493,621	119,362,107	21,610,826	150,588,385	1.26	Y
2010	653,811	2,018	606,735	0.93	11,953,366	131,315,473	16,804,513	167,392,898	1.27	Y
2011	667,410	2,207	608,942	0.91	12,431,501	143,746,974	13,266,725	180,659,623	1.26	Y
2012	681,292	1,062	610,004	0.90	12,928,761	156,675,735	12,824,800	193,484,423	1.23	Y
2013	695,463	2,927	612,931	0.88	13,445,911	170,121,646	27,333,300	220,817,723	1.30	Y
2014	709,929									
<b>2014 Trip Availability</b>			<b>96,998</b>							

Column Description

- 1 Year of Consideration.
- 2 Estimated trips for the year of consideration, based on current Comp. Plan.
- 3 Tracked trips for the year of consideration
- 4 Running total of baseline year trips + tracked trips since baseline year.
- 5 Ratio of column 4 to column 2, showing % of trips accounted for in Comp. Plan which have been realized.
- 6 Estimated expenditures for 20 year transportation program (Comp. Plan & Mitigation Document).
- 7 Running total of planned expenditures since base year.

- 8 Actual tracked (or predicted) transportation expenditures.
- 9 Running total of actual expenditures since base year.
- 10 Ratio of column 9 to column 7, showing % of planned expenditures to date which have been realized.
- 11 Annual test result. Yes=Pass.

## SEPA – Based LOS Measures

The plan level LOS helps formulate the long-term 20-year transportation plan and promotes a transition to greater use of multiple modes. The project-level concurrency process ensures that development will be consistent with the long-term plan. The City has found a gap in these two processes in terms of determining local operational impacts and mitigation, and therefore has relied on the SEPA process to fill that gap. Practically speaking the City has used intersection LOS D for most of the City in defining impacts (e.g. Renton Sunset), and LOS E in the more developed centers of the City (Downtown-Urban Center, Southport). The purpose of this is explained in the excerpt from the Renton Sunset Area Planned Action EIS (2011):

*The City does not apply a letter-grade LOS threshold standard to individual intersection operations. Instead, the City uses a complex travel-time index system to assess traffic operations. This travel-time system measures the distance (in miles) that various modes can travel in 30 minutes within and through the city. Travel distances for single-occupant vehicles, high-occupancy vehicles, and transit are summed when developing the travel-time index. Transit distances are given double weighting to recognize the passenger-capacity advantages.*

*... Corridors or routes not expected to meet this travel-distance index could then be considered for mitigation or improvement.*

*Travel routes between study intersections are short (less than 1 mile), and would not produce travel times that could be compared with the City's current LOS methodology.*

*Therefore, a mobility standard for local study intersections (that are not located on NE Sunset Boulevard) was developed through discussions with the City for the purposes of this Draft EIS. For urban core areas, where congestion or long delays are common, an LOS E threshold is appropriate. Because the traffic study area is typically represented by lower volumes and less congestion than an urban core, an LOS D threshold is appropriate.*

The City reviews projects subject to SEPA with either a LOS D or E intersection threshold and defines improvements necessitated by the development that are not in the City's transportation plan, nor accommodated by impact fees.

A subarea-level version of this has occurred through the preparation of Planned Action Environmental impact Statements that study neighborhoods or master planned sites, estimates future growth, identifies needed subarea transportation improvements, develops a trip bank, and allows future development consistent with the Planned Action Ordinance to avoid additional analysis if they are within the trip bank and other parameters of the ordinance. A similar process has been applied to three planned actions: Southport, Boeing Landing, and Renton Sunset Area. Below is the example trip bank from the Renton Sunset Planned Action Ordinance – based on a review of the transportation system and a LOS D threshold some additional growth was tested and improvements identified assuming this level of net trips on the system:

*Transportation - Trip Ranges and Thresholds. The number of new PM Peak Hour Trips anticipated in the Planned Action area and reviewed in the EIS are as follows:*

<i>Alternative/Period</i>	<i>PM Peak Hour Trips*</i>
2006	2,082 trips
2030 Alternative 3 / Reevaluation Alternative	5,555 trips
2030 Preferred Alt	5,386 trips
Net increase from 2006 -> 2030 Alternative 3 / Reevaluation Alternative	3,473 trips
Net increase from 2006 -> 2030 Preferred Alternative	3,304 trips

*\*all P.M. peak hour trips with at least one end (origin, destination, or both) in TAZs containing the study area*

*Uses or activities that would exceed the range of maximum trip levels will require additional SEPA review.*

We would interpret that all applicable regulations apply and that the planned action trip bank would be met in addition to the citywide concurrency test.

### Existing System and Concurrency Program Objectives

The current system is evaluated based on the objectives below:

1. Be defensible and meet requirements of GMA: The City has adopted a LOS and a concurrency process.
2. Be meaningful to measure transportation system versus development: The City’s plan level based concurrency does not lend itself to measuring individual developments. City also has to rely on a practical trip bank and expenditure measure for a concurrency test which is not readily connected to its multimodal travel index defined for concurrency, as well as SEPA to mitigate transportation impacts of developments at a finer scale.
3. Be simple to explain: The City’s three-part process – plan, project, and SEPA based approach is complex. The City’s LOS requires complex field-measured travel time index, and has only been accomplished twice. The concurrency code relies on a director’s rule to establish project concurrency procedures and is not transparent. The relationship to impact fees is also relatively weak.
4. Be simple and cost effective to implement and monitor: See #3. The multimodal travel time index has only been completed twice – originally in 1995 and updated in 2002. This is largely due to the data requirements, field intensive nature of the travel time testing, and relative level of staff resources to update the index. [Confirm with City.]
5. Incorporate other travel modes: The City’s travel time index is multimodal and weights transit more heavily. The existing multimodal system does not include pedestrian and bicycle facilities, or relative level of transit service (frequency). Furthermore, the City’s project level concurrency test and SEPA-based intersection LOS are based on vehicular trips.

6. Be receptive to various transportation demand management (TDM) and parking strategies: See #5. The current concurrency system does provide for some adjustments to reduce trip generation from a development to reflect TDM program commitments.
7. [Consider the p](#)Potential for different standards for different parts of the City: The City's travel time index is citywide. The City has tried to adapt a subarea level approach in the planned actions but this is not an intentional LOS and concurrency system for neighborhoods.
8. Help fund/implement multimodal transportation improvements: Though the City's travel time index is multimodal, implementing concurrency regulations, SEPA-based impact and mitigation approach, and impact fee systems are not. The City's impact fees are based on planned roadway improvements and development trips accommodated with them. Non-motorized improvements are not directly addressed.
9. Provides a basis for interjurisdictional coordination on transportation. The existing concurrency system relies on transit service providers and state highways in measuring the multimodal travel time index. However, it does not directly show how the City supports other agency transportation needs and vice versa.

[In sum, the City's present system meets a couple of objectives in that it is multimodal \(at the policy level\) and provides framework for concurrency under GMA. However, the LOS and associated concurrency system are difficult to administer. The policy level travel time index is not simple or cost-effective to measure, and nonmotorized and transit modes are not well represented in the practical concurrency test that focuses on road capacity and SOV trips. The system is not transparent due to the use of a detailed director's rule supporting a broad code-based process. The LOS approach is focused at a citywide scale, and is less effective at a neighborhood and development project scale – the City has improvised with SEPA based LOS standards on an area by area basis \(e.g. Landing, Sunset areas\). The system also does not advance interjurisdictional coordination directly.](#)

## 4.0 OPTIONS AND FRAMEWORK FOR PROPOSED LEVEL OF SERVICE AND CONCURRENCY PROGRAM

### Overview of review of other agency programs

As a result of our initial review with City staff of other agencies' program objectives, LOS standards, concurrency programs, and mitigation fees we focused our review on the programs of Bellingham, Issaquah, Shoreline and Redmond. Each of these cities has one or more program components that could help Renton accomplish its objectives for transportation LOS, concurrency, and mitigation.

### Overview of framework for Proposed Program

The program proposed for Renton's transportation LOS, concurrency and mitigation fees builds on, but takes some different approaches to the City's commitment to multimodal transportation, the use of a trip bank for concurrency, and traffic impact fees. The proposed program has the following components and attributes [as shown in Exhibit 4](#):

**Exhibit 5:  
 Proposed LOS/Concurrency Program**

<b>Program Component or Characteristic</b>	<b>Attributes</b>
Person Trips	<p>Person trips are the number of persons making the same trip in the same mode of travel. Bicycle and pedestrian trips typically involve one person, thus one person trip. But motor vehicles often have more than one occupant. For example, if the average vehicle occupancy was 1.3, and a concurrency service area (like a community planning area) had 1,000 p.m. peak vehicle trips, the person trips would be 1,300. Similarly, if a transit vehicle carries 65 passengers, there would be 65 person trips. Using person trips provides a common metric for use in concurrency and also impact or mitigation fees.</p>
Multimodal Levels of Service	<p>Levels of service will be developed for the following modes of travel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• motor vehicles (single- and multi- occupancy)</li> <li>• transit</li> <li>• nonmotorized (bicycle and pedestrian)</li> </ul> <p>Specific LOS metrics will be selected based on data that is readily available, easy to collect and analyze, and easy to understand.</p>
Multiple Service Areas	<p>The LOS and trip bank components of the LOS/Concurrency Program could be scaled and tailored to specific service areas, such as Community Planning Areas, that reflect differences in transportation opportunities, needs and capacities, as well as differences in existing and future land uses. The impact and mitigation fee components may remain citywide in order to preserve the City’s flexibility to prioritize projects, and to avoid creating smaller accounts that do not collect enough to fund a project before the deadlines to spend the money or refund it. The deadline for impact fees is 10 years, and the deadline for SEPA mitigation fees is 5 years.</p>
Trip Calculator, Fee Calculator, Trip Bank	<p>Applicants will provide the type(s) of land uses they will develop, and the number of units they propose for each type (i.e., # of apartments, or # of square feet of retail, office, etc.). The Trip Calculator will convert the applicant’s data to the number of person trips in their service area using trip generation rates we will develop for each mode. The trip calculator results will be used for concurrency by comparing the applicant’s person trips to the balance available in the trip bank for each mode. The trip calculator results will be used for fee calculations by multiplying the applicant’s person trips for each mode times the fee per trip for each mode.</p>
Multimodal Mitigation Fees	<p>Renton’s existing transportation impact fee will be aligned with the LOS/Concurrency Program to ensure that the impact fees are based on the intersection and roadway projects needed to maintain the motor vehicle portion of the LOS. A separate SEPA-based mitigation fee schedule will collect each applicant’s proportionate share of their direct impact on the other modes of travel.</p> <p>Strategies such as TDM and parking can earn credits that reduce the mitigation fees.</p>

Program Component or Characteristic	Attributes
Safety, Operations and Local Access Analysis	Applicants for development that will generate more person trips than a threshold we will develop will be required to submit an analysis of the effect on their proposed development on safety, operations and local access.

The proposed program for Renton’s transportation LOS, concurrency and mitigation accomplishes the City’s objectives.

## Proposed System and Concurrency Program Objectives

The proposed system is evaluated based on the objectives below:

1. Be defensible and meet requirements of GMA: The City will adopt revised LOS and concurrency process that comply with GMA and are legally defensible.
2. Be meaningful to measure transportation system versus development: The proposed trip calculator and trip bank compare the person trips generated by individual developments to the City’s capacity for additional person trips for each mode of travel.
3. Be simple to explain: Applicants will provide the type(s) of land uses they will develop, and the number of units they propose for each type (i.e., # of apartments, or # of square feet of retail, office, etc.). The Trip Calculator will convert the applicant’s data to the number of person trips they will generate. The results will be compared to the balance available in the City’s trip bank. If there are enough trips in the City’s trip bank, the applicant passes concurrency, and pays the mitigation fees for the number of trips it generates. Developments generating trips over a defined threshold would also need to analyze safety, operations and local access through SEPA and City street standards.
4. Be simple to implement and monitor: See #3.
5. Incorporate other travel modes: Each mode of travel will have its own LOS, person trip generation, trip bank, and mitigation fee.
6. Be receptive to various transportation demand management (TDM) and parking strategies: Mitigation credits can be earned for specified, enforceable, and durable strategies like TDM and parking.
7. [Consider the potential](#) for different standards for different parts of the City: LOS standards and trip banks could be established for multiple service areas, such as Community Planning Areas.
8. Help fund/implement multimodal transportation improvements: Mitigation fees will be developed for each mode of travel.
9. Provides a basis for interjurisdictional coordination on transportation. [Discuss. This objective will be further advanced in the next phase of LOS and concurrency process development. Preliminarily, to address interjurisdictional coordination, t](#)This may mean including other agency transportation plans, especially in the PAA. It may mean a City-County agreement recognizing the City’s LOS under SEPA and a reciprocal impact fee agreement.

## 5.0 NEXT STEPS

This Phase 1 summary is intended to be presented to the Planning Commission and appropriate City Council committees. Following that review, the City staff and Consultant team will:

1. Affirm the desired LOS approach to begin implementing policy changes into the Comprehensive Plan Update,
2. Determine subareas of interest if an area-specific LOS approach is pursued (e.g. consolidation of some community plan areas or all areas),
3. Update the City's current travel demand model to test future growth and provide information for person trips,
4. Finalize the Transportation Element for adoption with the Comprehensive Plan Update,
5. Develop multimodal LOS and concurrency tools (e.g. trip calculator, SEPA mitigation approach, etc.), and
6. Develop an updated rate study.

The meetings with advisory bodies and committees and affirmation of the approach and subareas of interest in Steps 1 and 2 are anticipated to occur ~~by the close of December 2014 or in~~ January or early February 2015.

The travel demand model update, and finalization of the Transportation Element document with the benefit of the model results would be conducted in the first quarter of 2015 to allow for public review and adoption by the second quarter of 2015 (i.e. June 30, 2015). Steps 5 and 6 would implement the Transportation Element and could occur over the second, third, and fourth quarters of 2015.

## APPENDIX. LEVEL OF SERVICE OPTIONS

### Renton Transportation Element Update

#### OVERVIEW

The City of Renton is updating its Transportation Element as part of its 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update. A key policy choice relates to levels of service (LOS) for multiple modes. The City desires to review LOS options at citywide, subarea, and project levels.

The City and consultant team have discussed a variety of measures including: defining person trips, mobility units, mode split goals, and others. Other points of discussion included ensuring a system that is easy and cost-effective to administer and that can be the basis for interjurisdictional cooperation with King County for the Renton Potential Annexation Areas. A number of additional objectives based on a review of the Bellingham LOS approach were also considered.

This document transmits a summary matrix (page 3+) of example measures reviewed in developing the proposed LOS approach.

DRAFT

## Example Multimodal LOS Measures

LOS Measure	Scale	Example Jurisdictions	Ease of Implementation: Concurrency
<b>ALL-MODES:</b>			
Mode Split	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systemwide (Kirkland, TE Goal/Policy)</li> <li>• Subarea (PSRC Regional Centers; Issaquah)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kirkland: <a href="#">65% SOV/35% Alt Mode</a>, also exploring <a href="#">other options</a>.</li> <li>• PSRC <a href="#">Regional Growth Centers/MIC Requirement</a>.</li> <li>• Issaquah (<a href="#">Central Issaquah Plan: 17% of trips will be transit and non-motorized</a>).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate to develop transportation plan and test system as a whole.</li> <li>• Not necessarily measurable at an individual development concurrency review.</li> </ul>
Person Capacity/ Trips “Mobility unit” = person miles traveled (Redmond) “Person Trips Available” in each Sub-area (Bellingham) Person Trips by Mode (Issaquah person trips by motorized and non-motorized modes, citywide; Seattle Southlake Union, person trips by mode for subarea)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citywide (Redmond, Issaquah)</li> <li>• Subarea (Bellingham, Portland, Seattle)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redmond (<a href="#">Transportation Master Plan, Appendix C</a>)</li> <li>• Bellingham (<a href="#">FAQ, Municipal Code</a>) Bellingham is considering adding “quality of service” for pedestrian and bicycle facilities.</li> <li>• Portland (<a href="#">Innovation Quadrant</a>), Seattle (South Lake Union) and Issaquah (Simplified Concurrency) all have person trips.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These systems are “plan-based” which requires the City to evaluate regularly. Data from transit “seat” and use needs to be coordinated with transit providers – should be readily available.</li> <li>• Pedestrian and bicycle “capacity” in Bellingham is simply the percent complete in subareas. The quality of service measures would require much more data and evaluation.</li> <li>• Uses a “checkbook” tracking system so it is easy to implement at project level.</li> <li>• Some models calculate person trips. For models that do not, the Portland or Issaquah approaches could be used.</li> </ul>

LOS Measure	Scale	Example Jurisdictions	Ease of Implementation: Concurrency
Trip Bank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Citywide</li> <li>Subarea</li> </ul>	<p><b>Citywide:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Shoreline</a> Shoreline developed Trip Calculator for Applicants: Comparison – Trips available based on TMP versus Trips produced</li> <li>Issaquah</li> </ul> <p><b>Subarea:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Numerous Planned Actions for subareas, e.g. Renton Sunset Area most recently</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Straightforward accounting.</li> <li>Need to exclude external trips because the City does not conduct concurrency for those trips, nor can the city collect impact fees from external trips.</li> <li>Trips can potentially be reserved for specific types of land uses.</li> </ul>
<b>MODE-SPECIFIC:</b>			
Roadway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Citywide</li> <li>Subarea</li> <li>Corridor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Segment: Numerous examples, e.g. Kitsap and Whatcom Counties</li> <li>Intersection: Numerous</li> <li>Corridor: Kent, Bothell, <a href="#">Vancouver</a>, Clark County, others</li> <li>Subarea: <a href="#">Kent Downtown; King County uses travel sheds for roadways in subareas – no forecasting</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well established methods.</li> <li>Commonly applied to consider local impacts of development.</li> <li>Defining what is an impact for concurrency has been questioned.</li> <li>Forecasting and tracking can be challenging (challenged) –King County, Bellevue – many use a model.</li> <li>Vancouver’s system has required lots of data, but City has new guidelines defining when updates are needed (they also are looking at major changes to the system).</li> </ul>

LOS Measure	Scale	Example Jurisdictions	Ease of Implementation: Concurrency
<p>Pedestrian: Measure facilities for degree of completion against planned facilities. If over 50% complete, award person trip credit for each 1% over. Then combine with bike, transit, and automobile to establish overall "Person Trips Available" in subarea. Define Priority Areas. Provide sidewalks or upgrades based on scores according to Pedestrian Priority Index (PPI). Cost to complete estimated and per trip fee charged.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citywide (Bellingham)</li> <li>• Subarea (Kent)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bellingham (<a href="#">FAQ</a>, <a href="#">Municipal Code</a>)</li> <li>• Kent, Citywide and Downtown per TMP. See application of measure in <a href="#">Kent Downtown</a>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portland, Seattle, and Issaquah use mode splits to apportion person trips to non-motorized mode.</li> <li>• GIS-based analyses based on "core non-motorized system" – pretty straight forward.</li> <li>• Harder to add in "quality of service" elements.</li> <li>• Calculation of volume / capacity of non-motorized modes is not simple except at a specific corridor level.</li> </ul>
<p>Bicycle: Same as pedestrian above.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citywide (Bellingham)</li> <li>• Subarea (Kent)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bellingham (<a href="#">FAQ</a>, <a href="#">Municipal Code</a>)</li> <li>• Kent, Citywide and Downtown per TMP. See application of measure in <a href="#">Kent Downtown</a>.</li> </ul>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>Transit: Compare current transit ridership to capacity within sub-area to determine available transit person trips. (Bellingham) Ratings of Availability, Frequency, Speed, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citywide (Bellingham)</li> <li>• Subarea (Seattle, Portland)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bellingham (<a href="#">FAQ</a>, <a href="#">Municipal Code</a>),</li> <li>• Seattle</li> <li>• Portland</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portland and Seattle use mode splits to apportion person trips to transit mode.</li> <li>• Pretty simple to get the data from Metro and Sound Transit – defining weights is a discussion items (e.g. how important is transit compared to roadways, pedestrians, bicycles).</li> </ul>

LOS Measure	Scale	Example Jurisdictions	Ease of Implementation: Concurrency
Ranking non-motorized transportation projects by criteria and priority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connectivity</li> <li>• Safety/Security</li> <li>• Potential conflict with other modes</li> <li>• Near mixed-use, schools, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citywide</li> <li>• Subarea</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issaquah</li> <li>• Seattle</li> <li>• Portland</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issaquah's criteria are more detailed than Portland's or Seattle's.</li> <li>• Several jurisdictions have looked into safety (transportation) as part of an index.</li> </ul>

DRAFT