TRAFFIC STUDY GUIDELINES

January 2012

The scope of the traffic impact analysis (TIA) should follow these guidelines and the requirements of VMC 11.90.020(e) and VMC 11.95, transportation concurrency (attached here in Appendices A & B). The City’s Traffic Engineer may require more or less analysis where warranted.

The TIA shall be prepared and stamped by a Civil Engineer licensed in the State of Washington with appropriate traffic engineering experience. Submittal of the traffic study is a Fully Complete item for project submittal. If the applicant is utilizing the 90 Day Streamline Review Process the traffic study shall be submitted 2 weeks prior to the Pre-Submittal meeting. Submit 3 copies of the report in the application submittal package.
I. Introduction, Project Description, and Methodology

- Table of contents, general description of the project, a description of the contents of the report, and an explanation of the analysis methodology.
- Vicinity map of the project site, surrounding transportation system, and new and existing access points.
- A description of the existing adjacent street system including street names, roadway classifications, number of lanes and lane widths, on-street parking, intersection lane configurations, traffic control systems for all intersections, signalized & unsignalized, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and transit service including routes and headways.

II. Trip Generation and Distribution

- Use the most current edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, and follow the guidelines specified in the most current ITE Trip Generation Handbook.\(^1\) Trip generation and distribution shall be justified by the applicant and approved by the City Traffic Engineer prior to completion of the TIA.
- Approved pass-by trips shall be included at driveways.

A. General TIA Requirements.

- For any development generating 5 or more net new PM Peak Hour trips, Trip generation and distribution is required for project-generated AM & PM peak hour trips at or adjacent to all site accesses.
- When generating fewer than 5 trips only trip generation is required. In this case, the trip generation calculation does not have to be completed by a licensed engineer.
- Additionally, for developments generating 20 or more pm peak hour trips, the analysis shall encompass all intersections specified by the traffic engineer for LOS analysis that fall within the limits identified in 11.90.020(e).\(^2\) The analysis may also include intersections beyond the thresholds listed in 11.90.020(e) where significant traffic hazards would be caused or materially aggravated by the proposed development.
- Trip distribution shall use the Regional Transportation Council select link assignment for the project TAZ. However, if the project generates fewer than 20 net new PM weekday peak hour trips, trip distribution may be based on existing traffic patterns and guidelines in the current ITE Trip Generation Handbook.

B. Transportation Concurrency Requirements.

- For developments generating 5 or more net new PM Peak Trips, the applicant is required to submit trip generation and distribution for the proposed development and to list the number of PM peak trips entering each of the concurrency corridors in table format. See Table 1 below for the list of corridors.
- For developments generating fewer than 5 net new PM Peak Trips, trip distribution is not required. However, for concurrency purposes, all trips shall be assumed to impact the closest concurrency corridor.
- Transportation Concurrency is evaluated according to the Corridor Classification. The Director may require additional information or modeling if an impacted corridor is operating close

---

\(^1\) Use the methodology described in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, June 2004, Section 3.4, Recommended Procedure for Estimating Trip Generation and including Figure 3.1 Recommended Procedure for Selecting Between Trip Generation Average Rates and Equations.

\(^2\) Up to .5 mi. for development generating from 20 to 300 pm peak trips, 1 mi. for 301 to 500 trips, 2 mi. for > 500.
to the adopted level of service. Generally, where a proposed development sends trips to a Category 1 or Category 2 corridor, the Director shall track those trips and presume concurrency between LOS measurements pursuant to VMC 11.95.100.

**Table 1: Concurrency Corridors and Current Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arterial Concurrency Corridor</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>LOS Standard Avg. PM Peak Speed (MPH)</th>
<th>2012 Corridor Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mill Plain Blvd.</td>
<td>Fourth Plain to I-5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-5 to Andresen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andresen to I-205</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-205 to 136th Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136th Ave. to 164th Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164th Ave. to 192nd Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns / Ft. Van Way</td>
<td>Mill Plain to 63rd St.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Plain Blvd.</td>
<td>Mill Plain to I-5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-5 to Andresen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andresen to I-205</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-205 to 162nd Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andesen Road</td>
<td>Mill Plain to SR500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR500 to 78th St.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112th Avenue</td>
<td>Mill Plain to 28th St.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28th St. to 51st St.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164th/162nd Avenue</td>
<td>SR14 to SE 1st St.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE 1st St. to Fourth Plain</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Road / 28th Street</td>
<td>18th St. to 112th Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112th Ave. to 138th Ave.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138th Ave. to 162nd Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th Street</td>
<td>112th Ave. to 138th Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138th Ave. to 164th Ave.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136th/137th Avenue</td>
<td>Mill Plain to 28th St.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28th St. to Fourth Plain</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192nd Avenue</td>
<td>SR14 to NE 18th St.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monitoring fees of $44.48 per trip shall be charged for trips sent to every corridor, up to a maximum monitoring fee of $1500 for any single development (VMC 20.180.070).

**III. Traffic Safety and Circulation**

**A. Collision Analysis.**

- Provide a five year collision history and crash rate per Million Entering Vehicles (MEV) at intersections adjacent to the development or as specified by the City Traffic Engineer. Provide proposed mitigations for intersections with crash rate exceeding 1.0 per MEV. Copies of the collision reports shall be included in an appendix to the TIA.

- Wherever collision rates are equal to or greater than 1.0 per MEV, a detailed collision site analysis and recommended mitigation will be required. The site analysis will include at a minimum the following:
  - Collision Diagrams with Vehicle-type symbols, Movement symbols, Severity symbols, and Accident-type symbols.
  - Condition Diagrams which describe all physical and environmental conditions at the site including all geometric features, signs, signal, markings, lighting, and all relevant features of the roadside environment.
Interpretation of results and recommended mitigation(s).

Provide safety analysis for proposed offset centerline of driveway/street.

B. Access Management and Circulation Analysis

- Include proposed locations of all access points to the public roadway.
- Include proposed distances between new access points and existing adjacent driveways and intersections.
- Provide safety analysis for proposed offset centerline of driveway/street.
- Include an adequate street cross circulation layout and connection plan that accounts for future development build out of the vicinity.
- Median Breaks requests shall meet the criteria outlined in VMC 11.90.087.

C. Sight Distance Analysis (VMC 11.90.060)

- Provide sight distance analysis for a) each proposed access point to a public street and b) each proposed new roadway approach. Intersection sight distance analysis will be done per the most current version of A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (AASHTO), and the City of Vancouver Transportation Standard Plans.
- Planning requirements for Vision Clearance Triangles can be found in VMC 20.985.020.

D. Pedestrian, Bike, and Transit Facilities

- Identify and analyze safety associated with pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities (existing and proposed) which provide circulation and connection onsite and offsite.

IV. Traffic Impact Analysis

A. Existing Conditions

- A turning movement count diagram for each intersection identified by the traffic engineer and the date collected. Traffic counts older than two years will not be accepted for traffic operations analysis.
- For driveways and intersections adjacent to the development and intersections impacted by 20 or more project generated peak hour trips (or as indicated in table A above), complete an AM and PM peak hour delay, LOS, and queuing analysis for the intersection, each approach, and all turning movements. The analysis shall be based on signal timing and coordination as it exists in the field. Optimized signal timing/coordination will not be accepted. Contact Bill Gilchrist at william.gilchrist@cityofvancouver.us or 360-487-7717 for signal timing data.
- Use the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) delay criteria (Exhibits 16-2, 17-2, and 17-22) for intersection, intersection approach, and turning movement level of service. Unless otherwise approved, the current version of Synchro software shall be used for all LOS and queuing analysis at signalized intersections. Use the Synchro Intersection: Lanes, Volumes, Timings report; NOT the HCM Signals report.
- Summarize Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs) in table format and describe key findings from the delay, LOS, and queuing analysis.
- Include output from the traffic analysis software in an appendix and submit an electronic copy of the traffic analysis file (e.g., the *.syn file from Synchro).
B. Year of Opening Baseline Conditions Analysis (may be required by traffic engineer)

- To the existing condition traffic volumes, add background and in-process development(s) traffic to the year of opening. A compounded 2% annual growth rate shall be used to account for traffic from both background and in-process developments for the 164th/162nd Ave. corridor and all corridors east of that corridor. For all other areas of the City, a 1.5% compounded rate shall be applied. The City’s Traffic Engineer must approve alternative rates.
- Using the parameters and reporting requirements described above in the Existing Conditions analysis instructions, complete an analysis of year of opening conditions.
- A turn movement forecast diagram for each intersection identified by the traffic engineer.

C. Year of Opening With Project Conditions (may be required by traffic engineer)

- Using the parameters and reporting described above in the Year of Opening Baseline Conditions Analysis instructions, analyze future conditions with project-generated traffic.
- Optimized signal timings are allowed. Traffic signal cycle lengths are not to exceed 120 sec/cycle. At new or existing intersections located on a corridor with coordinated signal timing plans, the cycle length shall not be less than what currently exists.
- Provide traffic signal / turn lane warrants as defined by the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) for any existing and proposed intersections.
- Describe potential mitigation strategies for any identified impact.

D. Future 5-Year Build Out Conditions

- Using the parameters and reporting described above in the Year of Opening With Project Conditions Analysis instructions, analyze future conditions with five (5) years of background and in-process development(s) traffic growth from the year of opening. Note that if the year of opening is several years from the date of the development application, the compounded growth rate would be applied to 5 years plus the number of years between the year of application and the year of opening.
- Describe potential mitigation strategies for any identified impact.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

- Provide a comprehensive summary of all study results, conclusions and recommendations of the engineer, including proposed mitigations. Conclusions and recommendations should follow the same format and address each section of the traffic study.

VI. Proportionate Share Contributions

- Where an impact is identified, an applicant may participate in the cost of roadway or traffic signal modifications at one or more of the following intersections. Proportionate share participation is calculated based on the PM peak hour distribution of project generated trips as demonstrated in the approved traffic study. Proportionate share payments are due prior to civil plan approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
<th>COST PER TRIP</th>
<th>CITY PRJ #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE 7th St &amp; 136th Ave</td>
<td>$772</td>
<td>71230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 20th St &amp; SE 176th Ave</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>71227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiser/St Helens/McArthur (future)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>71244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

VMC Section 11.90.020(e) Developments—Traffic Conditions

1) Required Traffic Impact Analysis. The City shall limit required traffic impact analysis as follows:
   a) No off-site traffic impact analysis shall be required for developments generating fewer than 20 net new weekday PM peak hour trips.
   b) Traffic impacts shall only be evaluated at intersections identified by the Director to a maximum distance from the proposed development as follows.
      i) For developments generating 20 to 300 net new weekday PM peak hour trips, 0.5 miles from each property line;
      ii) For developments generating 301 to 500 net new weekday PM peak hour trips, 1 mile from each property line;
   c) For developments generating greater than 500 net new weekday PM peak hour trips, 2 miles from each property line. Analysis of significant traffic hazards that would be caused or materially aggravated by the proposed development may be required, even if no traffic condition analysis is required under this section.

2) A proposed development that adds at least five (5) net new peak hour trips to a failing intersection approach within the required traffic impact analysis area may be denied based upon any of the following.
   a) For signalized intersections, when off-site intersection conditions are at a level of service “F”;
   b) For signalized intersections, when the level of service is “E” and the volume to capacity ratio is greater than 0.95;
   c) For unsignalized intersections, when the volume to capacity ratio for any lane on any approach is greater than 0.95.
   d) When significant traffic hazards would be caused or materially aggravated by the proposed development.
   e) Notwithstanding a through d of this subsection, traffic impacts to intersections on Corridors Built to Ultimate Capacity shall be evaluated against the level of service standards identified in an adopted Corridor Management Plan.

3) A proposed development that is subject to denial pursuant to this section may be approved subject to conditions of approval that address the impact of traffic generated by the proposed development. Proposed developments shall not be required to address an impact unless that impact causes the volume to capacity ratio on a lane of a failing intersection approach to exceed 0.95.
APPENDIX B

VMC Chapter 11.95 Transportation Concurrency

11.95.010 Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to establish a transportation concurrency management program to monitor and manage the impact of growth and development on Vancouver’s transportation system so that it continues to serve the community at adopted levels of service.

Section 11.95.020 Applicability.

A. This chapter applies to development under Titles 17 and 20 of the Vancouver Municipal Code unless exempt under subsection B.

B. The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to development which does not create net new average weekday PM peak hour trips.

Section 11.95.030 Integration with Other Authority.

A. The provisions of this chapter are not intended to limit the application of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW Ch. 43.21C) to development approvals. Each development application subject to review under the provisions of this chapter and under the provisions of SEPA may be conditioned or denied pursuant to SEPA, with respect to transportation related impacts and traffic safety impacts, independently from the provisions of this chapter. Environmental review under SEPA may rely upon compliance with this chapter to adequately mitigate identified adverse environmental impacts.

B. Each development application subject to review under the provisions of this chapter and under the provisions of Chapter 11.90 may be conditioned or denied pursuant to Chapter 11.90, with respect to transportation related impacts and traffic safety impacts, independently from the provisions of this chapter.

C. Each development application subject to review under the provisions of this chapter and under the provisions of Title 20 may be conditioned or denied pursuant to Title 20, with respect to transportation related impacts and traffic safety impacts, independently from the provisions of this chapter.

Section 11.95.040 Definitions.

Unless a different definition is provided below, the definitions in VMC Titles 11, 17, and 20 shall apply in this chapter.

“Average PM Peak Hour Corridor Travel Speed” means the critical direction average corridor speed established by the Director through sampling of the time it takes to drive the length of a corridor divided by corridor length.

“Concurrency Corridor” means a principal or minor arterial roadway extent identified in the Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element to which this Chapter applies.

“Concurrency Corridor Built to Ultimate Capacity” means a Concurrency Corridor designated by City Council ordinance as a Concurrency Corridor Built to Ultimate Capacity.
“Concurrent” means that transportation improvements or strategies necessary to address the transportation impacts of the development are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years.

“Corridor Management Plan” means an access management, demand management, and multimodal mobility plan adopted by the City pursuant to VMC 11.95.080.

“Development” means any humanmade change to improved or unimproved real estate including but not limited to: mining, dredging, filling, drilling, grading, paving, or excavation, storage of equipment or materials; any subdivision or short platting of land; the construction or re-construction of residential, commercial, industrial, public or any other building or building space. Development also includes the change in use of a building or land if approval is required pursuant to the Vancouver Municipal Code, Title 17 (Building Code). As related to the Tree Conservation Ordinance, development shall mean the division of a parcel of land into two or more parcels; the construction, reconstruction, conversion, structural alteration, relocation, or enlargement of any structure; any mining, excavation, landfill, clearing or land disturbance.

“Director” means the Director of Public Works or designee.

“Existing level of service” means the level of service on a transportation concurrency corridor as determined by the Director pursuant to the requirements of this chapter.

“ITE Manual” means the most recent Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation, An ITE Informational Report and the most recent Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Handbook, An ITE Proposed Recommended Practice.

"Level of service" means an established minimum capacity of public facilities or services that must be provided per unit of demand or other appropriate measure of need. Level of service standards are synonymous with locally established minimum standards.

“Level of Service Standard” means concurrency corridor standards adopted by Vancouver City Council in the Comprehensive Plan.

“Manual” or “Administrative Manual” means the document published by the Director pursuant to VMC 11.95.050.

“Net New Trips” means trip generation calculated using ITE Manual methods for the proposed use less net pre-existing site trips as approved by the Director.

“Net Pre-existing Site Trips” means trip generation calculated using ITE Manual methods for a pre-existing site use as approved by the Director.

“PM Peak Hour” means the weekday PM hour with the highest hourly volume of traffic on the City’s streets adjusted for the day of the week and the month of the year, as determined by the Director.

“Regional Industry” means an industrial or commercial land use which provides significant community-wide or regional economic benefit through the creation of new economic growth and employment opportunity.

“Regional Public Facility” means a land use which is designed to serve the needs of the community or region affected by the impact(s) of development. Regional Public Facilities include: airports, colleges, hospitals, and regional parks or community centers.

Section 11.95.050 Establishment of Administrative Manual.
A. The Director shall publish a manual setting forth the methodology and criteria to measure level of service and administer concurrency review under this chapter.
B. The manual shall be consistent with and implement the provisions of this chapter and the comprehensive plan.

Section 11.95.060 Transportation Concurrency Required.
A. No development application may be approved by the Development Review Authority unless transportation concurrency is established in compliance with this chapter.
B. Transportation facility improvements, strategies, or other measures which are to be provided by an applicant in order to establish transportation concurrency shall be made a condition of development approval.
C. A voluntary agreement pursuant to RCW 82.02.020 between the City of Vancouver and an applicant, in which the applicant agrees to make a payment in lieu of an identified transportation measure necessary to meet a direct impact of development in order to establish transportation concurrency, shall be made a condition of development approval.

Section 11.95.070 Application.
A. A development application shall include the information required by the Director to make a finding of transportation concurrency. The application shall include, at a minimum:
   1. The location and type of the development based upon classification categories as set forth in the ITE Manual;
   2. An estimate of the projected net new average weekday PM peak hour trips that will be generated by the development prepared as set forth in the ITE Manual;
   3. A trip distribution for project-generated average net new weekday PM peak hour trips, prepared in compliance with generally-accepted traffic engineering methods.
B. The Director may require submission of additional information prior to making a finding of transportation concurrency.

Section 11.95.080 Level of Service Standards.
A. Level of service standards shall be adopted in the Comprehensive Plan.
B. Level of service standards shall be reviewed periodically by the City Council upon recommendation of the Planning Commission, as follows:
   1. Not less than biennially, the Director shall make a report to the Planning Commission on the existing level of service on Concurrency Corridors.
      a. The report shall account for previously approved trips and those reserved by development agreement, planned and funded capital improvement projects and other factors the Director finds relevant to the review of level of service standards; and
      b. The report shall include a recommendation on concurrency corridor levels of service based on information contained in the report.
      c. The report shall include the policy response memorandum developed pursuant to 11.95.090(D) for each Category 3 Corridor.
   2. The Planning Commission shall consider the Director’s report and recommendation through the comprehensive plan amendment process and may make a recommendation to the City Council.
C. The procedures for review of level of service standards set forth in Subsection B above shall be followed in designating a corridor built to ultimate capacity. The following additional criteria and procedures shall also apply when the Director recommends designation of a corridor built to ultimate capacity.
   1. Upon a finding that construction to expand peak hour motor vehicle capacity on a concurrency corridor would build the corridor’s transportation facilities in excess of the requirements of adopted city roadway construction standards consistent with the comprehensive plan, the Director may recommend to the Planning Commission to designate that corridor as a Concurrency Corridor Built to Ultimate Capacity.
      a. Any Category of Concurrency Corridor in which the transportation facilities meet the requirements of adopted city roadway construction standards consistent with the comprehensive plan may be designated a Concurrency Corridor Built to Ultimate Capacity. Concurrency Corridors are not required to proceed sequentially from Category 1 through Category 3 before being considered for Category 4 designation.
      2. The City Council may by ordinance designate a concurrency corridor as a Concurrency Corridor Built to Ultimate Capacity upon making findings that:
         a. The corridor’s transportation facilities are built to adopted city roadway construction standards consistent with the comprehensive plan; and
         b. The designation as a Concurrency Corridor Built to Ultimate Capacity will support specific growth management and comprehensive plan objectives.
3. Upon with the designation of a concurrency corridor as a Concurrency Corridor Built to Ultimate Capacity, the City Council shall also adopt by ordinance a Corridor Management Plan that addresses, at a minimum, access management, demand management, and multimodal mobility standards for the corridor.
   a. The Corridor Management Plan shall identify strategies, programs and standards to evaluate and manage transportation concurrency on Category 4 Corridors. The strategies may include voluntary payments in lieu pursuant to VMC 11.95.060.C.

Section 11.95.090 Measurement of Existing Level of Service; Corridor Classification.
The Director shall determine existing transportation levels of service, and shall classify concurrency corridors, as follows:
A. The Director shall determine the existing level of service for each concurrency corridor according to:
   1. Measured average PM peak hour corridor travel speed; and
   2. The projected impact on level of service of any reserved capacity or previously approved but un-built development; and
   3. The impact on level of service of any revisions, amendments, or alterations to the capital facilities plan, including the Six Year Transportation Improvement Program, which have occurred since the establishment of the most recent existing level of service ; and
   4. Other factors determined by the Director to have a significant impact upon the existing level of service.
   5. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Director shall evaluate Category 4 Corridors for consistency with the adopted Corridor Management Plan.
B. The Director shall classify concurrency corridors into four categories:
   1. Category 1 Corridors are those corridors operating at speeds greater than 30% over the adopted level of service,
   2. Category 2 Corridors are those corridors operating at speeds between 10% and 30% over the adopted level of service.
   3. Category 3 Corridors are those corridors operating at speeds less than 10% above or below the adopted level of service.
   4. Category 4 Corridors are those corridors built to ultimate capacity, when so designated by ordinance.
C. The Director shall publish and update the concurrency corridor classification as necessary.
D. Upon initial designation of a corridor as a Category 3 Corridor, the Director shall produce a policy response memorandum to address, at a minimum,
   1. Whether the corridor is a candidate for Category 4 Classification;
   2. Strategies to keep the corridor operating at or above adopted level or service standards; and
   3. The methods the director will use to evaluate development impacts for transportation concurrency.

Section 11.95.100 Concurrency Finding.
A. The Director may make a finding of transportation concurrency, upon review of development impacts of an identified development, as follows:
   1. Category 1 Corridors shall be presumed to operate at or above the adopted level of service between measurements.
   2. Category 2 Corridors shall be presumed to operate at or above the adopted level of service between annual measurements when a three year forecast based on measured corridor speed establishes that corridor speed will not fall below the adopted level of service.
   3. Category 3 Corridors shall be monitored for transportation concurrency impacts according to methods and procedures established by the Director which may include detailed corridor modeling for which an applicant may be charged a fee.
   4. Category 4 Corridors, corridors built to ultimate capacity, shall be monitored and managed for compliance with the adopted Corridor Management Plan. Compliance with an adopted Corridor Management Plan and consistency with the built out corridor total person trip capacity shall demonstrate transportation concurrency for a development that sends net new trips to a corridor built to ultimate capacity, and shall serve as the basis for the Director’s finding of transportation concurrency.
B. The Director shall issue a finding of transportation concurrency to the Development Review Authority when the Director determines that the proposed development’s projected impacts to a concurrency corridor will not cause the level of service to drop below the level of service standard and, when a development impacts a corridor built to ultimate capacity, the proposed development will comply with the Corridor Management Plan.

C. In determining whether a development’s projected impact upon concurrency corridor will cause the level of service to drop below the level of service standard, the Director shall consider:
   1. Transportation improvements or strategies that will address the failing condition, when the financial commitment is in place to complete the improvement or strategy within six years of the development; and
   2. Transportation improvements, strategies, or other measures proposed by the applicant which will be completed or implemented at the same time as the development and made a condition of development approval; and
   3. A voluntary payment-in-lieu pursuant to VMC 11.95.060.C.

Section 11.95.110 Reservation of Capacity.
A. The City Council may reserve capacity prior to approval of a development application by the Development Review Authority through the approval of a development agreement authorized and executed under the provisions of RCW Chapter 36.70B.
B. When the City Council finds that there is a significant public interest in a potential regional industry or regional public facility, the council may, by ordinance, reserve the transportation capacity necessary to accommodate such regional industry or regional public facility.