2016 Subdivision Staging Policy

Draft LATR Slides for MCPB Worksession #2 on 6/16/16
Local Area Transportation Test

• Public Hearing Draft recommendations

• Possible modifications in response to testimony
Overall objectives of the LATR section:

More efficient implementation of traffic study requirements. May result in fewer studies, but those that are conducted will provide more detailed, multimodal information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed 2016 SSP Element</th>
<th>Change from current SSP?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LATR study required in 3 of 4 policy area categories</td>
<td>Remove LATR study requirement from the MSPAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATR study threshold based on 50 person trips</td>
<td>Current LATR study threshold based on 30 vehicle trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATR quantitative analysis of peds, bikes, and transit</td>
<td>Requires additional analyses if modal trip generation triggers are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATR mitigation expands areas for payment in lieu of construction</td>
<td>Payment in lieu of construction as first option for Urban Road Code Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of intersections studied</td>
<td>No change, except exempt those where site trips are &lt; 1% of existing volume and &lt; 5% of total site trip generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLV standards</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Review Procedure</td>
<td>Remove, based on MSPA exemption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed application in different geographies, adjusted to reflect Board direction on policy area classification regarding Metro Station Policy Areas (MSPA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All MSPA (red)</td>
<td>No LATR study (but biennial public sector monitoring to inform CIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in an MSPA but in an Urban Road Code Area</td>
<td>LATR study with applicant payment in lieu of implementing mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other areas</td>
<td>LATR study and applicant implements mitigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation #1a- scoping for need to test:

Update vehicle trip rates for the County, and replace the 30 peak hour vehicle trip threshold with a 50 person trips per hour threshold.

Removed reference to 75 person trips in MSPAs – now in red category and do not require local area transportation review.

Recommendation may result in slightly fewer LATR studies as 50 person trips are generally equivalent to about 30 to 45 vehicle trips depending on the specific type of use and Policy Area.

The default mode split by policy area is provided as part of the LATR Guidelines; the applicant can adjust it based on proximity to Metrorail/LRT/BRT, parking reduction, or a “hard” Traffic Mitigation Agreement.
Recommendation #1b – scoping for type of analysis:

If the proposed development exceeds the 50 person trip threshold:

- An auto analysis is required.
- If the proposed development exceeds 50 transit trips a transit analysis is required.
- If the proposed development exceeds 100 pedestrian trips (including walking to transit):
  - a pedestrian analysis is required, and
  - a bicycle analysis is required for projects within ¼ mile of bicycle trip generators such as existing or planned bikeshare stations and schools.

Person trips and multi-modal analyses added to address criticism of current LATR as only auto-focused.
Recommendation #1 – scoping:

Update vehicle trip rates for the County, and replace the 30 peak hour vehicle trip threshold with a 50 person trips per hour threshold.

If the proposed development exceeds the 50 person trip threshold elsewhere:

- An auto analysis is required.
- If the proposed development exceeds 50 transit trips a transit analysis is required.
- If the proposed development exceeds 100 pedestrian trips (including walking to transit):
  - a pedestrian analysis is required, and
  - a bicycle analysis is required for projects near bicycle trip generators such as planned bikeshare stations and schools.

Testimony:

No testimony requesting a specific modification to the testing threshold.

Received several letters in support of the switch from vehicle trips to person trips.

Comment that LATR remains too auto focused requiring an auto analysis for all projects exceeding the 50 person trip threshold.

Options:

- Increase the person trip threshold from 50 person trips to 75 person trips. 50 person trips is equivalent to 30-45 vehicle trips.
- Could set a vehicle trip threshold equal to 50 vehicle trips.
- Could eliminate auto analysis in orange category.
Recommendation #2 - exemptions:

Exempt the White Flint Metro Station Policy Area from the local area test in recognition of the Special Taxing District process in that area, and retain the elimination of LATR in White Oak in favor of the recently established “pro rata share” district process in that area.
Recommendation #2 - exemptions:

Exempt the White Flint Metro Station Policy Area from the local area test in recognition of the Special Taxing District process in that area, and retain the elimination of LATR in White Oak in favor of the recently established “pro rata share” district process in that area.

Received testimony in support of this recommendation. No modification proposed.
Recommendation #3 – testing:
Retain CLV only as a screening tool to be applied outside the MSPAs. Employ more detailed, delay-based transportation analysis tools in these areas as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When is an operational analysis, including travel delay, performed:</td>
<td>None required. Public sector monitoring replaces private sector studies.</td>
<td>When a proposed development increases the intersection demand by 10 CLV and total future CLV is greater than 1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is a network analysis, using Synchro-type evaluation tool, performed:</td>
<td>When an intersection has a total future CLV greater than 1600, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When an intersection has a total future CLV greater than 1450, and the proposed development increases intersection demand by 10 CLV and either:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) the intersection is on a congested arterial with a travel time index greater than 2.0 as documented by monitoring reports, or (b) the intersection is within 600' of another traffic signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation #3 – testing continued:

Retain CLV only as a screening tool to be applied outside the MSPAs. Employ more detailed, delay-based transportation analysis tools.

Currently, operational analysis only required for CLVs above 1600. Given concerns regarding the potential for significant congestion even if CLV is less than the current standard, draft proposes a “1350 + 10 CLV” standard for triggering operational or network analysis.

Purpose of “+10” is to only require operational analysis when an intersection between 1350 and 1600 CLV is being substantially affected by the applicant’s traffic. 10 additional CLV is not equivalent to 10 trips.
Recommendation #3 – testing continued:

Retain CLV only as a screening tool to be applied outside the MSPAs. Employ more detailed, delay-based transportation analysis tools.

Testimony:

Some commenters want all intersections to have an operational analysis in response to dissatisfaction with CLV.

Some commenters want an operational analysis to be required only if CLV exceeds the Policy Area Standard between 1350 and 1600.

If an operational analysis is triggered by the Policy Area CLV standard and the +10 CLV impact, then intersections under the +10 CLV impact would not be tested or require mitigation.
Recommendation #3 – testing:

Retain CLV only as a screening tool to be applied outside the MSPAs. Employ more detailed, delay-based transportation analysis tools as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing:</th>
<th>None required. Public sector monitoring replaces private sector studies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When is an operational analysis, including travel delay, performed:</td>
<td>When a proposed development increases the intersection demand by 10 CLV and total future CLV is greater than 1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is a network analysis, using Synchro-type evaluation tool, performed:</td>
<td>When an intersection has a total future CLV greater than 1600, or When an intersection has a total future CLV greater than 1450, and the proposed development increases intersection demand by 10 CLV and either:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) the intersection is on a congested arterial with a travel time index greater than 2.0 as documented by monitoring reports, or (b) the intersection is within 600' of another traffic signal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testimony –

One comment received was that the intersection need not be on an *arterial* roadway if a published monitoring report includes other roadway classifications.

Staff agrees it is not necessary to specify an arterial roadway.
Recommendation #4 - mitigation:

For LATR mitigation, require payment-in-lieu of construction in Urban Road Code Areas.

Payment-in-lieu in these areas helps address the need for physical improvements in areas where they are more complicated to undertake.

Non-Urban Road Code Areas allow for implementation of mitigation actions.
Recommendation #4 - mitigation:
For LATR mitigation, require payment-in-lieu of construction in Urban Road Code Areas.
Non-Urban Road Code Areas allow for implementation of mitigation actions.

Testimony:
Commenter requests that projects located in Bicycle/Pedestrian Priority Areas also be allowed to make a payment in lieu of mitigation.

MCDOT commented on the increase in coordination and implementation of facilities that would result from the payment in lieu proposed for the Urban Road Code Areas.

Staff feels extending the payment-in-lieu to the Urban Road Code Areas is an important first step. The payment-in-lieu areas can be reevaluated during the next SSP update.
Recommendation #4 - mitigation:
For LATR mitigation, require payment-in-lieu of construction in Urban Road Code Areas.

Testimony:
Commenter requests clarification of when mitigation is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If Policy Area CLV Standard Is…</th>
<th>….Then Intersection or Network Vehicle Delay Standard Is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1350-1425</td>
<td>35 seconds per vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450-1550</td>
<td>55 seconds per vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>80 seconds per vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>120 seconds per vehicle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum pedestrian crossing speed currently has to be 3.5 fps (in LATR today) for current operational analyses.

Draft LATR guidelines propose that if you are in an urban road code area any mitigation cannot increase average pedestrian delays (requires not only crossing speed but wait time and volumes by crosswalk) from what they are in the background condition.
Recommendation #4 - mitigation:

For LATR mitigation, require payment-in-lieu of construction in Urban Road Code Areas.

Testimony:

Commenter requests clarify of mitigation requirement based on location of site vs intersection.

LATR adequacy defined based on the intersection location regardless of the development site boundaries.

Under current rules, the applicant must mitigate any impacts at both locations A (to achieve 1475 CLV) and B (to achieve 1600 CLV).

As proposed:
- Applicant would only mitigate for location A and would pay for County to improve location B

As suggested:
- Applicant should also only pay for County to improve location A, based on intent to streamline development in desired Urban Road Code Areas location.

Staff agrees.
Recommendation #4 – mitigation continued:

For LATR mitigation, require payment-in-lieu of construction in Urban Road Code Areas.

Testimony:

Commenter concerned that auto analysis for all projects will result in a disproportionate amount of roadway facility mitigation.

Staff suggests re-instatement of mitigation priorities from pre-2012 Guidelines, with a modification in priorities to:

1. Peak hour vehicle trip reduction
2. Provision of ped/bike facilities
3. Provision of transit facilities/services
4. Intersection improvements
5. Roadway improvements

Require applicants to attempt to mitigate trips in priority order, and demonstrate to the Board why a higher level mitigation priority cannot be attained.
Recommendation #5:
Eliminate an LATR study requirement for the Alternative Review Procedure in MSPAs (red category)

This procedure would be irrelevant given the recommendation to eliminate local area traffic impact studies in the MSPAs.

Recommendation #6:
Remove the provisional APF provision from the LATR/TPAR Guidelines as there are other regulatory tools in place that accomplish the same function.

Recommendation #7:
Continue the production of the Mobility Assessment Report on a biennial schedule as a key travel monitoring element of the SSP.
Recommendation #5:
Eliminate an LATR study requirement for the Alternative Review Procedure in MSPAs (red category)

This procedure would be irrelevant given the recommendation to eliminate local area traffic impact studies in the MSPAs.

Recommendation #6:
Remove the provisional APF provision from the LATR/TPAR Guidelines as there are other regulatory tools in place that accomplish the same function.

Recommendation #7:
Continue the production of the Mobility Assessment Report on a biennial schedule as a key travel monitoring element of the SSP.

Testimony received in support of these recommendations.

No modifications recommended.
RECAP

What are the Board’s options?

- Retain the current LATR test
- Move forward with the Public Hearing Draft recommendations
- Modify the Public Hearing Draft recommendations
- Recommend Pro Rata Share (White Oak) or Special Taxing Districts (White Flint) be established over the next few years
- Eliminate the Local Area Transportation Review test countywide; increase impact taxes