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From RFP and TISTWG Meetings #1 - #2:

LATR changes should affect:

- **Analysis** to be more context-sensitive, less auto-centric, and more supportive of County’s growth plans
- **Predictability**, with interests for both increased flexibility and increased process streamlining
- **Implementation** to improve public/private sector coordination

And a reminder that LATR is one leg of the three-legged stool of County policy, with an exaction process generally designed to address local needs not already anticipated in a master plan (White Flint now an exception to the rule).
Few jurisdictions have an explicit purpose statement; those that do are often deferential to other policies or are fairly general, such as:

San Jose: to guide analyses and determinations regarding the overall conformance of a proposed development with the City’s various General Plan multi-modal transportation policies, which together seek to provide a safe, efficient, and environmentally sensitive transportation system for the movement of people and goods.

Pasadena: implement the Mobility Element of the General Plan

Boulder: intended to provide for an integrated transportation system for all transportation modes, including pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and motor vehicle

Los Angeles: promote consistency in reviews and consider sustainability, smart growth, and reduction of GHG in addition to traditional mobility concerns.
Only a few jurisdictions have more explicit purpose statements relating to development review exactions, which usually have to be tracked down through the referenced plans:

- Fairfax County: for Tysons, the priority for addressing congestion is first to add vehicular capacity if possible to do so without degrading the pedestrian environment (local streets preferred), then consider land use changes to reduce demand, and finally consider alternative improvements or payment in lieu.

- San Francisco: has been known as a “transit first” city, shifting now to multimodal improvements offsetting total multimodal impacts, with focus on transit and multimodal solutions
Three basic types of traffic impact study approaches have evolved over time:

Most development review processes originated from an Impact Mitigation perspective, for which the objective was to literally meet standards of adequacy to mitigate environmental or public health concerns.

In more complex contexts (i.e., solving for traffic LOS creates a pedestrian environment inconsistent with comprehensive plan objectives), the process evolved to a Negotiated Exaction wherein the impacts are identified, but used to identify a scale of appropriate mitigation approaches consistent with plan objectives.

In certain communities, this concept has evolved to a Pro-Rata Share approach.

Each subsequent evolution is harder to craft, but then can become simpler to implement (at least from the development review perspective).
The three basic approaches address impacts and solutions differently:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro-rata share</th>
<th>Negotiated Exaction</th>
<th>Impact Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact based on general level of transportation system need, not on performance or adequacy of specific facilities</td>
<td>Impact based on assessment of adequacy of specific facilities</td>
<td>Impact based on assessment of adequacy of specific facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions established in advance based on identification of suite of improvements needed to implement community-wide vision and policy-based assessment of private sector responsibility</td>
<td>Solutions based on facilities/programs that contribute to community-wide vision and have equivalent transportation value to mitigate impacts</td>
<td>Solutions based on addressing direct impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The level of predictability and flexibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro-rata share</th>
<th>Negotiated Exaction</th>
<th>Impact Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant analysis required to establish</td>
<td>Low to moderate levels of analysis for individual development sites depending on jurisdictional guidelines</td>
<td>Low to moderate levels of analysis for individual development sites depending on jurisdictional guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation system demand/supply prior to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishment of district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular monitoring of systemwide performance and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periodic review and possible revision of rules and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of predictability at time of development</td>
<td>High level of flexibility contributes to low levels of</td>
<td>Moderate level of predictability with fairly low level of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application means no need for flexibility</td>
<td>predictability</td>
<td>flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most benchmark jurisdictions fall into the “negotiated exaction” category, with required assessment of at least vehicular traffic impacts (and sometimes other modes) against level of service standards, but with a variety of caveats/guidance to seek multimodal solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro-rata share</th>
<th>Negotiated Exaction</th>
<th>Impact Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Flint STD</td>
<td>Montgomery County (E)</td>
<td>Smaller, more suburban/rural jurisdictions not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissimmee MMTD</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>in benchmark survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland District Plans</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia proffers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(E) = specific **equivalencies** for converting auto impacts to non-auto mitigation
Most jurisdictions that require assessment of impacts from background traffic apply a high level of judgment in defining those background developments compared to Montgomery County. However, many jurisdictions are more conservative in the amount of additional growth beyond approved developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Growth Factor</th>
<th>Background Developments</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County / GRTA (M)</td>
<td>Montgomery County (J)</td>
<td>Los Angeles (J, O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOT 527 (F)</td>
<td>Pasadena (J)</td>
<td>San Jose (J, O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco (J)</td>
<td>Boulder (F, J, O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York City (J)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(F) = more than one future horizon year may be required (i.e., project open, longer term buildout)  
(J) = considerable judgment applied in defining background developments re: location, size, approval status  
(O) = options for cumulative traffic (California term) may include pending plans in addition to approved developments and/or a growth factor  
(M) = travel model data may be used in lieu of historic trendline traffic growth
1993 General Plan Refinement contains high-level guidance for urban, suburban, and agricultural/rural areas.
County’s land use and transit plan with 2040 land use forecasts provides a slightly more detailed version of the General Plan Refinement vision.

The countywide scale is useful for visualizing transit-supportive densities (the map shows Virginia’s new 2013 guidelines).
At the local level, the County has many different definitions of urban, both from a visionary perspective as well as a geographic perspective. The Road Code definition is perhaps the most appropriate starting location for defining areas with the greatest need for multimodal LATR innovations.
PAMR is no longer applicable, but should the priority mitigation approaches described in the 2012 Guidelines be reinstated?

Countywide? In urban areas only?

For both PAMR and LATR studies, applicants proposing any mitigating action other than weekday peak period vehicle trip reduction must include a statement describing their consideration of each of the higher-priority mitigation approaches and a rationale for selecting the mitigation approach or approaches proposed. The Planning Board will consider and accept mitigation approaches on a case-by-case basis, using these Guidelines.
LATR Approach Types

Pro-rata share
- Where do we know exactly what we want to build?
- Is TPAR needed for funding distant improvements?
- Apply special districts

Negotiated Exaction
- Where do we want to emphasize ped, bike, transit?
- Apply equivalent mitigation approaches

Impact Mitigation
- Where do we want to achieve L/QOS standards (for any or all modes)?
- Apply modal tests
Montgomery County currently has a variety of LATR tools. Since the ability to exchange vehicle trip impacts to non-auto facilities is Countywide, the County falls primarily into the category of negotiated exaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro-rata share</th>
<th>Negotiated Exaction MSPAs and CBDs</th>
<th>Negotiated Exaction Countywide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Flint STD</td>
<td>ARP – 50% trips w/TMAg Vehicle tripgen rates Emphasize non-auto</td>
<td>$12K / vehicle trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Tools Countywide

- Vehicle trip threshold triggers for study type/size
- CLVs with HCM operations > 1600
- Context-sensitive CLV thresholds by policy area
- 5 CLV rule for second-level improvement
Initial LATR Concept changes to the current types are highlighted below and summarized on the following pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro-rata share</th>
<th>Negotiated Exaction MSPAs, CBDs, Urban/BRT</th>
<th>Negotiated Exaction Countywide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Flint STD Any other locations?</td>
<td>ARP – 50% trips w/TMAg Ped-bike logical/termini Emphasize non-auto</td>
<td>$12K / vehicle trip Emphasize non-auto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Tools Countywide

- Development size threshold triggers for study type/size by policy area
- CLVs with HCM operations > 1600, or closely spaced + documented delays
- Context-sensitive CLV thresholds by policy area
- Percent existing traffic rule for all intersections
- Person-trip generation by mode estimates
- Protected intersections
Effect on:

**Analysis:** improves ped/bike safety/connectivity

**Predictability:** if payment-in-lieu of construction

**Implementation:** may foster quicker completion of gaps

Per DDOT, where substantial bike/ped generation exists in urban areas, gaps exacerbate safety; seek logical terminus to connect to (bus stop, other sidewalk, etc.)
Effect on:

Analysis: M-NCPPC sets context-sensitive GSF/DU thresholds

Predictability: Reduces analysis/uncertainty for applicants

Implementation: N/A

Per NYC, DC, others; setting context-sensitive unit thresholds furthers multimodal policy objectives for larger thresholds in smarter growth areas.
Effect on:

Analysis: Consider multimodal operations

Predictability: Dependent on details

Implementation: Better identification of candidate solutions

In addition to CLV value, presence of closely spaced intersections and previously documented delay inconsistent with CLV (Mobility Analysis Report, etc.) should trigger operational analysis. More coordination needed on tools.
**Effect on:**

**Analysis:** Reduced analysis / better info for scoping  
**Predictability:** Improved for scoping  
**Implementation:** N/A

Several jurisdictions like Seattle use trips through an intersection (rather than CLV) as a quick check of significant impact. Whereas Seattle does use future LOS, GRTA uses existing traffic for DRI thresholds.

---

14.80.030 Significant adverse impacts. For the purposes of SEPA and this chapter, a significant adverse impact is defined as any traffic condition directly caused by proposed development that would reasonably result in one or more of the following conditions at the time any part of the development is completed and able to generate traffic:

A. A roadway intersection that provides access to a proposed development, and that will function at a level of service worse than "E", and that will carry thirty (30) or more added vehicles in any one hour period as a direct impact of the proposed development, and that will be impacted by at least twenty (20) percent of the new traffic generated from the proposed development in that same one hour period; or

B. A roadway intersection or approach lane where the director determines that a hazard to safety could reasonably result. (Ord. 11617 § 60, 1994).
Effect on:

**Analysis:** address and promote multimodalism

**Predictability:** MNCPPC to provide conversion rates

**Implementation:** N/A

ITE already headed in this direction. Current M-NCPCC study developing new rates.

Current LATR vehicle tripgen rates not always much different from ITE (see chart).
Effect on:

**Analysis:** - understand, but don’t solve, traffic

**Predictability:** - remove scoping angst

**Implementation** – up to public sector to define solutions

Key is in how to select and designate countywide.

**Promising:** (Georgia/Colesville)
- Urban area by any measure
- Many alternate paths

**Unlikely:** (MD 355/Gude)
- No alternate paths
- No urban designation
- Master planned interchange
- But, a BRT station....
Currently, the County has:

- a pro-rata share approach in White Flint
- Alternative Review Procedures and guidance for preferential bike/ped/transit approaches in the other MSPAs / CBDs, and
- $12K/vehicle trip for non-auto solutions countywide (greater value downcounty)

MSPAs/CBDs may be the first places to think about implementing new LATR tools.
In CBDs like Bethesda, pro-rata share approaches should be considered, but only in conjunction with the areawide public/private investment conversations associated with master planning. New Special Taxing Districts, however, are not necessarily needed.
The new tools should also be considered for the County’s remaining urban areas.
Other fixed guideway station areas should be added to the Urban Area construct. The CCT and Purple Line stations are ready for such consideration.

Over time, some or all of the other BRT network stations could be added in subsequent Staging Policies once specific locations are confirmed in a master plan, and additional pro-rata share locations may emerge.
Next Steps

For December 3 meeting
• Remaining questions from Literature Review
• Submit completed draft Literature Review
• Develop next-step conceptual details on Initial LATR Concepts of general interest
• Follow-up on other Initial LATR Concepts from today’s conversation
• Coordinate with SHA on state TIS approaches
• Respond to Planning Board questions at 11/6 discussion