



## Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** 2007-0364      **Version:** 3  
**Type:** Motion                      **Status:** Passed  
**File created:** 6/25/2007              **In control:** Transportation Committee  
**On agenda:** 9/17/2007              **Final action:** 9/17/2007  
**Enactment date:**                      **Enactment #:** 12575

**Title:** A MOTION directing the independent expert review panel for transportation concurrency to review the current practice of excluding highways of statewide significance from transportation concurrency calculations and to recommend whether such practice should continue or be changed, to review the current practice of requiring short subdivisions in the rural area to meet a level of service standard B and to recommend to the council the appropriateness of countywide level of service standards, and to evaluate how proposed changes to the concurrency model diverge from recommendations by the auditor's consultant.

**Sponsors:** Larry Phillips, Julia Patterson, Bob Ferguson

**Indexes:** Transportation

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** 1. 12575.pdf, 2. 2007-0364 REVISED Staff Report Concurrency Motion 8-22-2007 Final.doc, 3. 2007-0364 Staff Report Concurrency Motion 8-22-2007 Final.doc

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
9/17/2007	2	Metropolitan King County Council	Passed as Amended	Pass
9/10/2007	2	Metropolitan King County Council	Deferred	
9/4/2007	2	Metropolitan King County Council	Deferred	
8/22/2007	2	Transportation Committee	Recommended Do Pass Substitute	Pass
6/25/2007	1	Metropolitan King County Council	Introduced and Referred	

A MOTION directing the independent expert review panel for transportation concurrency to review the current practice of excluding highways of statewide significance from transportation concurrency calculations and to recommend whether such practice should continue or be changed, to review the current practice of requiring short subdivisions in the rural area to meet a level of service standard B and to recommend to the council the appropriateness of countywide level of service standards, and to evaluate how proposed changes to the concurrency model diverge from recommendations by the auditor's consultant.

WHEREAS, a 2006 consultant report for the King County auditor's office assessed the validity of the

transportation modeling practices used by the road services division, evaluated the impacts of policy changes to the concurrency program adopted by the King County council in 2004, and suggested eleven recommendations to improve modeling practices, reduce complexity and enhance quality control of the concurrency program, and

WHEREAS, the King County council recently adopted Ordinance 15839 updating the Residential Transportation Concurrency Map and Ordinance 15840 authorizing the formation of an independent expert review panel to provide oversight of the county's transportation concurrency program, and

WHEREAS, an issue was voiced during the council's deliberation of Ordinance 15839 concerning the King County road services division's practice of excluding highways of statewide significance from transportation concurrency calculations, and

WHEREAS, the road services division's practice of excluding highways of statewide significance from transportation concurrency calculations was implemented based on a 2000 King County Comprehensive Plan ("KCCP") policy that was subsequently deleted in the 2004 Update of the KCCP and which read as follows:

"**T-212** Consistent with RCW 36.70A.070(6)(C), the concurrency requirements of King County's Concurrency Management system program do not apply to transportation facilities designated as "highways of statewide significance,"" and

WHEREAS, the King County prosecuting attorney has determined that RCW 36.70A.070(6)(C) requires certain island counties to include highways of statewide significance in their calculations for transportation concurrency, but gives other counties the discretion whether or not to exclude highways of statewide significance from transportation concurrency calculations, and

WHEREAS, the King County Code does not mandate the exclusion of highways of statewide significance from transportation concurrency calculations and the KCCP does not contain exclusionary language on the issue, and

WHEREAS, the King County council passed Ordinance 15030 in 2004 which added K.C.C. 14.70.285 to the King County code requiring short subdivisions within the urban growth area to meet a level of service F,

and

WHEREAS, a 2006 consultant's report for the King County auditor's office notes that short subdivisions in the urban growth area must meet a level of service F while short subdivisions in the rural area remain subject to the high rural standard of level of service B, and

WHEREAS, short subdivisions in the rural area that would otherwise comply with zoning requirements cannot receive concurrency permits as a result of the high standard of level of service B, and

WHEREAS, the recently-created independent expert review panel has been tasked to "a) review the annual report on the concurrency model update; and b) evaluate proposed changes to the transportation concurrency process and model developed by the road services division," and

WHEREAS, the practice of excluding highways of statewide significance from transportation concurrency calculations and the use of high standards for level of service for short subdivisions in the rural area are key components of the transportation concurrency process and model, a review of these practices and a vigorous policy discussion about whether or not the practices should continue, is well within the scope of the work program outlined for the independent expert review panel;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

The independent expert review panel on concurrency, in their initial evaluation of the transportation concurrency process and model, shall address the following issues of interest to the council:

A. An evaluation of the level of service impacts to local roadways resulting from the practice of excluding highways of statewide significance from transportation concurrency calculations, together with a recommendation to the council as to whether or not the practice should be changed;

B. An evaluation of the requirement that short subdivisions in the rural area must meet level of service B, together with a recommendation to the council as to the appropriateness of countywide level of service standards; and

C. An evaluation of how the proposed concurrency model diverges from the

eleven recommendations suggested in the 2006 consultant report for the King County auditor's office.