Table 1: Local Area Transportation Review Intersection Congestion Standards by Policy Area

(as of July ~~2002~~ 2004)

Congestion (Critical Lane Volume) Standards	Policy Area	
~~1450~~ 1400	Rural Areas	
~~1500~~1450	Clarksburg Damascus Gaithersburg City Germantown Town Center	Germantown West Germantown East Montgomery Village/Airpark
~~1525~~1475	Cloverly Derwood North Potomac	Olney Potomac R&D Village
~~1550~~1500	Aspen Hill Fairland/White Oak	Rockville City
~~1600~~1550	North Bethesda	
~~1650~~1600	Bethesda/Chevy Chase Kensington/Wheaton	Silver Spring/Takoma Park
1800	Bethesda CBD Friendship Heights CBD Glenmont Grosvenor Shady Grove	Silver Spring CBD Twinbrook Wheaton CBD White Flint

C. Local Area Transportation Review

The *Local Area Transportation Review Guidelines* adopted by the Planning Board are to be used by applicants in the preparation of reports to the Planning Board to determine the requirement for and the scope of a traffic study or review prepared by an applicant for subdivision and mandatory referral cases brought before the Planning Board.

The LATR Guidelines are also recognized as the standard to be used by applicants in the preparation of reports to the Board of Appeals and the Hearing Examiner for special exception and zoning cases brought before these bodies.

The intent of the *Local Area Transportation Review Guidelines* is to establish criteria for determining if development can or cannot proceed. ~~whether staging ceiling is or is not available.~~ Pursuant to the adopted Annual Growth Policy, the Planning Board must not approve a subdivision if it finds that an unacceptable weekday peak-hour level of congestion will result after taking into account existing roads, programmed roads, available or programmed mass transportation and physical improvements or trip mitigation measures to be provided by the applicant. If the subdivision will affect a nearby[1] intersection or roadway link for which

[1] See Section IIIB1, page 12

congestion is already unacceptable, then the subdivision may only be approved if it does not make the situation worse.

In situations where an unacceptable peak-hour level of congestion will exist, the applicant, in consultation with Transportation Planning staff, the Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPWT) and/or the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), should use these procedures to develop recommendations for specific intersection or roadway link improvements, or pedestrian, bicycle or transit ~~improvements~~ enhancements that would mitigate the transportation impact of the development in these areas of local congestion so that the Planning Board or another elected or appointed body could consider granting approval. The procedures outlined in the LATR Guidelines ~~is~~ are intended to provide a near-term "snapshot in time" of estimated future traffic conditions ~~five to six years into the future~~ and to present a reasonable estimate of traffic conditions at the time of development.

~~The LATR Guidelines are also recognized as the standard to be used by applicants in the preparation of reports to the Board of Appeals and the Hearing Examiner for the County Council for special exception and zoning cases, respectively, brought before these bodies.~~

II. Criteria for Screening Cases for Local Area Transportation Review

Applicants will be required in most instances to submit a traffic statement with the development application concerning the need for a Local Area Transportation Review (LATR). Transportation Planning staff will use the following criteria to determine whether and when the applicant needs to submit a traffic study.

~~In policy areas where there is an insufficient number of jobs and/or housing units; i.e., staging ceiling, available to support the application, the applicant will not be required to submit a traffic study with the development application until either staging ceiling capacity becomes available for that project or the applicant chooses to use the special procedures contained in the latest edition of the Annual Growth Policy (see Appendix D).~~

~~For purposes of establishing a queue date as required in the Annual Growth Policy in areas with insufficient ceiling capacity, the traffic statement shall serve as the traffic study until capacity becomes available. The applicant must update the traffic statement to reflect changes in the development plan that may occur before capacity becomes available (i.e., specific proposed use or intensity of the use). When staging ceiling becomes available as a result of increased capacity from a programmed transportation improvement in the state' s and/or county' s capital program or~~

~~some other adjustment in the policy area analysis, a traffic study must be submitted within six months~~.

~~In policy areas where there is sufficient staging ceiling capacity for the application and~~, In cases where an LATR is required (see II.A below), a traffic study must be filed as a part of the development submittal. Transportation Planning staff will review the traffic statement and/or traffic study and notify the applicant within two weeks of receipt if the statement or traffic study is complete. If Transportation Planning staff determines, by reviewing the traffic statement, that a traffic study is necessary, but one was not submitted with the ~~original~~ filed application, the application will not be considered complete until a ~~complete~~ traffic study is submitted and found to be complete. Figure 1 is an example of a checklist used by staff for determining the completeness of a traffic study. Staff will determine the acceptability of the conclusions and recommendations of a traffic study in consultation with the applicant, DPWT, SHA, and community representatives as part of the review process in preparation for a public hearing.

Any modifications in the analysis identified by Transportation Planning staff's review are the responsibility of the applicant, after appropriate oral and/or written notice of the issues identified or change(s) required. As long as a traffic study is determined to be complete, staff will consider the date of receipt as the completion date.

Figure 1: Check List for Determining the Completeness of Traffic Studies

Development Name: _____

Development Number: _____

- ☐ Stage of Development Approval: _____ (zoning, special exception, subdivision, mandatory referral)
- ☐ Are the intersections counted for the traffic study acceptable?
- ☐ Are the traffic counts current; i.e., within one year of date of study?
- ☐ Were any traffic counts taken on or near holidays?
- ☐ Are there any "bad" traffic counts? (Compare to other recent counts.)
- ☐ Are peak hours and lane-use configurations on each intersection approach correct?
- ☐ Is assumed background development correct?
- ☐ Do the improvements associated with the development mitigate site traffic and are they feasible? (Applicant should check feasibility of improvements with DPWT and/or SHA staff. Applicant should check the availability of right-of-way if needed for the improvements.)
- ☐ Are pending/concurrent plans that have been filed in accordance with the LATR Guidelines included in "background development"?
- ☐ Is the amount of each background development used in the traffic study acceptable, based on the stage of development approval?
- ☐ Are the trip generation rates used in the traffic study acceptable?
- ☐ Are the assumptions for % new, % diverted, and % pass-by reasonable?
- ☐ Is trip distribution/assignment assumed in the traffic study acceptable?

  Office _____ Residential _____

  Other _____ Retail _____
- ☐ Were the correct lane use factors used?
- ☐ Are the critical lane volumes calculated correctly?
- ☐ Are the congestion standards identified correctly?
- ☐ Is a complete Pedestrian Impact Statement included as part of the traffic study?
- ☐ Were all traffic counts submitted in the accepted standard digital format?

A. Significantly Sized Project

The proposed development must be of sufficient size to have a measurable traffic impact on a specific local area to be considered in a local area transportation review. Measurable traffic impact is defined as a development that generates ~~50~~ 30 or more total (i.e., existing, new, pass-by and diverted) weekday trips during the peak hour of the morning (6:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.) and/or evening (4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.) peak period of adjacent roadway traffic.

The following criteria shall be used to determine if a proposed development will generate ~~50~~ 30 or more weekday peak-hour trips:

1. All peak-hour trips are to be counted even if, as part of the analysis, some of the trips will be classified as pass-by trips or trips diverted to the site from existing traffic.

2. All land at one location within the County, including existing development or land available for development under common ownership or control by an applicant, including that land owned or controlled by separate corporations in which any stockholder (or family of the stockholder) owns ten percent or more of the stock, shall be included.

For any subdivision that would generate 30-49 weekday peak-hour automobile trips, the Planning Board, after receiving a traffic study must require that either:

- all LATR requirements are met, or
- the applicant must make an additional payment equal to 50% of the applicable transportation impact tax before it receives any building permit in the subdivision.

In certain circumstances, Transportation Planning staff may, in consultation with the applicant, require analysis of traffic conditions during a different three-hour weekday peak period; e.g., 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. or 3:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m., to reflect the location or trip-generation characteristics of the site, existing conditions or background development as generators of traffic.

The number of trips shall be calculated using the following sources:

1. For all land uses in the Silver Spring, Bethesda, or Friendship Heights CBD Policy Areas, use the trip generation rates in Appendix C, Tables C-1 or C-2.

2. For all other land uses in parts of the county not included in 1. above,

   a. For general office, retail, residential, fast food restaurant, private school, child day-care center, automobile filling station, senior/elderly

housing, or mini-warehouse, use the formulas provided in Appendix A and the tables provided in Appendix B.

b. For other land uses, use the latest edition of the *Trip Generation Report* published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE).

For some land uses of a specialized nature, appropriate published trip-generation rates may not be available. In such cases, Transportation Planning staff may request that determination of rates for these land uses be a part of the traffic study. If special rates are to be used, Transportation Planning staff must approve them prior to submission of the traffic study.

~~For developments that generate fewer than 50 weekday peak-hour trips, it is assumed that the traffic impact is included in the policy-area-wide aggregate review that constitutes the staging ceiling. In such cases, a traffic study is not required.~~

An applicant shall not avoid the intent of this requirement by submitting piecemeal applications or approval requests for zoning, subdivision, special exception, mandatory referral, ~~plats, preliminary or site development plans,~~ or building permits. However, an applicant may submit a preliminary plan of subdivision for approval for less than ~~50~~ 30 peak-hour trips at any one time provided the applicant agrees in writing that, upon the filing of future applications, the applicant will comply with the requirements of the LATR Guidelines when the total number of site-generated peak-hour trips at one location has reached ~~50~~ 30 or more. Then, a traffic study will be required to evaluate the impact of the total number of site-generated trips in accordance with the LATR Guidelines.

Transportation Planning staff may elect to waive these criteria if the development results in no net increase in weekday peak-hour trips.

B. Congestion Standards

Critical lane volume (CLV) standards for intersections that ~~are~~ were adopted for each policy area in the most-recently adopted Annual Growth Policy are shown in Table 1. Transportation Planning staff maintains an inventory of intersection traffic data based upon traffic counts collected by the Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPWT), the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), and private traffic consultants for purposes of providing applicants with a preliminary assessment of conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development.

Table 2 presents maximum link volumes for various roadway types considered by Transportation Planning staff when reviewing LATR projected link volumes. Transportation Planning staff may request analysis of link volume capacity as part of a traffic study. Acceptable level of service for a roadway link is related directly to the congestion standard for the relevant policy area.

Table 2: Maximum Link Volume / Hour / Lane vs. Policy Area Congestion Standard

Roadway Classification	Congestion Standard (CLV)			
	1400-1450	1475-1550	1600	1800
Major	1,125	1,175	1,275	n/a
Arterial	975	1,025	1,125	n/a

C. Exceptions to the General Guidelines

There are several policy areas where there are exceptions or additions to the general Local Area Transportation Review process:

1. In the Potomac Policy Area, only developments that Transportation Planning staff consider will ~~impacting~~ impact any of the following intersections will be subject to Local Area Transportation Review: a) Montrose Road ~~at~~ and Seven Locks Road, b) Democracy Boulevard ~~at~~ and Seven Locks Road, c) Tuckerman Lane ~~at~~ and Seven Locks Road, d) Bradley Boulevard ~~at~~ and Seven Locks Road, e) Democracy Boulevard ~~at~~ and Westlake Drive, f) Westlake Drive ~~at~~ and Westlake Terrace, ~~and~~ g) Westlake Drive ~~at~~ and Tuckerman Lane, h) River Road and Bradley Boulevard, i) River Road and Piney Meetinghouse Road, and j) River Road and Seven Locks Road.

2a. The following policy areas have been designated Metro Station Policy Areas in the most-recently adopted AGP: Bethesda CBD, Friendship Heights CBD, Glenmont, Grosvenor, Shady Grove, Silver Spring CBD, Twinbrook, Wheaton CBD, and White Flint. This designation means that the congestion standard equals a critical lane volume of 1800 (see Table 1) and that development within the area is eligible for the AGP's Alternative Review Procedure for Metro Station Policy Areas. ~~if a (TMO) exists~~. This procedure allows a developer to meet LATR requirements by 1) agreeing in a contract with the Planning Board and the County Department of Public Works and Transportation to ~~making~~ make a payment as designated in the AGP, 2) ~~joining~~ participate in and ~~supporting~~ support a Transportation Management Organization (TMO) if and when one exists ~~and~~ 3) ~~mitigating~~ mitigate 50% of their total weekday morning and evening peak-hour trips, and 4) conduct a traffic study to identify intersection improvements and/or trip mitigation measures that would have been required. Both residential and non-residential projects are eligible for the procedure.

2b. Development in the ~~Bethesda CBD, Friendship Heights CBD, Glenmont, Grosvenor, Shady Grove, Silver Spring CBD, Twinbrook, Wheaton CBD and White Flint Policy Areas~~above-mentioned Metro Station Policy areas

will be reviewed in accordance with Section V of these guidelines. These procedures provide specifics criteria to satisfy the general guidelines included in the adopted Annual Growth Policy (AGP).

3. Area-specific trip-generation rates have been developed for the Bethesda, Friendship Heights, and Silver Spring CBDs. (See Appendix C.)

III. Method and Preparation of Local Area Transportation Review Traffic Study

A. General Criteria and Analytical Techniques

The following general criteria and analytical techniques are to be used by applicants for subdivision, zoning, special exceptions, and mandatory referrals in submitting information and data to demonstrate the expected impact on ~~public~~ intersections or links of public ~~and~~ roadways by the vehicle trips generated by the proposed development. In addition to the consideration of existing traffic associated with current development, applicants shall include in the analysis potential traffic that will be generated by their development and other nearby approved but unbuilt development (i.e., background). ~~to be included in the analysis~~.

The traffic study for ~~the~~ a proposed development under consideration must include in background traffic all developments approved and not yet built and occupied by the Planning Board or other public body (i.e., the Board of Appeals, the cities of Rockville or Gaithersburg) prior to the submission of an ~~preliminary plan~~ application ~~or complete traffic study, whichever is later~~.

Transportation Planning staff may require that applications in the immediate vicinity of the subject application submitted in accordance with the LATR Guidelines and filed simultaneously or within the same time frame be included in background traffic, even if the Planning Board has not approved them. If ~~preliminary plan~~ an application is approved after a traffic study has been submitted for another project and both require improvements for the same intersection(s) or link(s), then the traffic study for the pending ~~preliminary plan~~application must be updated to account for the traffic and improvements from the approved ~~preliminary plan~~application.

Information and data on approved but unbuilt developments, i.e., background development, nearby intersections for study, trip distribution and traffic assignment guidelines, and other required information will be supplied to the applicant by Transportation Planning staff within 15 working days of receipt of a written request.

The traffic study should be submitted along with the application or within 15 days prior to or after the application's submission date. If a traffic study is submitted at the same time as the application, the applicant will be notified concerning the completeness of the traffic study within 15 working days of the Development Review Committee meeting at which the ~~preliminary plan~~application is to be discussed. If not submitted before the Development Review Committee meeting, Transportation staff has 15 working days after submittal to notify the applicant as to whether or not the traffic study is complete.

For a trip mitigation program or an intersection improvement to be considered for more than one ~~preliminary plan~~ application, the program or improvement must provide enough capacity to allow all the ~~preliminary plans~~application participating in the program or improvement to satisfy the conditions of LATR. An intersection improvement may be used by two or more developments if construction of the improvement has not been completed and open to the public. In order to be considered, the program or improvement must provide sufficient capacity to:

1. result in a calculated CLV in the total traffic condition that is less than the congestion standard for that policy area, or

2. mitigate the traffic impact if the calculated CLV in the total traffic condition exceeds the intersection congestion standard for the applicable policy area. Mitigation is achieved when the CLV in the total traffic condition that includes traffic from each contributing development *with* the improvement is equal to or less than the CLV in the background traffic condition without the improvement.

When development is conditioned upon improvements, those improvements must be bonded, under construction, or under contract for construction prior to the issuance of building permits for new development. Construction of an improvement by one applicant does not relieve other applicants who have been conditioned to make the same improvement of their responsibility to participate in the cost of that improvement.

~~As indicated in the AGP, in policy areas where staging ceiling capacity is available, the applicant has six months from the date of acceptance of his application to obtain preliminary plan approval unless the applicant is granted an extension.~~ If the Planning Board grants an extension to an approved preliminary plan, Transportation Planning staff will determine if the traffic study needs to be updated based on the APF validity period.

B. Scope of Traffic Study

At a meeting or in written correspondence with Transportation Planning staff, the following aspects of the traffic study will be proposed by the applicant and/or provided by staff and agreed upon:

1. intersections and roadway links that are to be included in the traffic study. The number of intersections to be included will be based upon the trips generated by the ~~proposed~~ development under consideration (see Section II.A. for specific criteria). As a general guideline, Table ~~2~~3 indicates the number of significant signalized intersections from the site in each direction to be included in the traffic study, based on the maximum number of weekday peak-hour trips generated by the site, unless Transportation Planning staff finds that special circumstances warrant a more limited study. For large projects, i.e., greater than 750 peak-hour site trips, the number of intersections shall reflect likely future signalized intersections as determined by staff and the applicant.

Table 3: Signalized Intersections from Site in Each Direction to Be Included in a Traffic Study

Maximum Weekday Peak-Hour Site Trips	**Maximum Number of Signalized Intersections in Each Direction**
~~50~~30 – 250	1
250 – ~~750~~749	2
750 – 1,249	3
1,250 – 1,750	4
>1,750	5

Transportation Planning staff, in cooperation with the applicant, will use judgment and experience in deciding the significant intersections and links to be studied. Interchanges (future) will be afforded special considerations, including ramps/termini being treated as signalized intersections. The urban areas of the county, including Central Business Districts and Metrorail Station policy areas, have more closely-spaced intersections, suggesting that the major intersections be studied. Roadway links are more likely to only be studied in areas where signalized intersections are not closely spaced (i.e., more than one mile apart).

Other factors, including geographic boundaries (e.g., parks, interstate routes, railroads) contiguous land under common ownership, the type of trip generated (i.e., new, diverted or by-pass), and the functional classification of roadways, will be considered by Transportation Planning staff in reaching a decision on the number of intersections to be included in the traffic study.

2a. approved but unbuilt (i.e., background) development to be included in the traffic study. As a general guideline, background development to be

included in the traffic study will be in the same geographic area as the intersections to be studied, as discussed in 1) above.

2b. active trip mitigation programs, or physical improvements not completed, that have been required of other developments included in background traffic.

3. the adequacy of existing turning movement counts and need for additional data. Generally, traffic counts less than one year old when the traffic study is submitted are acceptable. Traffic counts should not be conducted on a Monday or a Friday, during summer months when public schools are not in session, on federal and/or state and/or county holidays, on the day before or after federal holidays, during the last two weeks of December and the first week of January, or when weather or other conditions have disrupted normal daily traffic.

4. factors, e.g., ~~diurnal distribution~~ the specific trip pattern of development, to be used to compute the trip generation of the proposed development and developments included as background

5. the directional distribution and assignment of trips generated by the proposed development and developments included as background, in accordance with the latest publication of "Trip Distribution and Traffic Assignment Guidelines" by Transportation Planning staff (see Appendix E)

6. mode split assumptions, if the traffic study is to include reductions in trips generated using vehicle-based trip factors

7. transportation projects fully funded for construction within ~~five~~ four years in the County's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), ~~or~~ the State's Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP), or any municipal capital improvements program that are to be included in the analysis, along with techniques for estimating traffic diversion to major new programmed facilities.

8. traffic circulation and/or safety concerns related to site access (generally applied to public or private facilities with 800 or more seats or which can otherwise accommodate 800 or more people during an event)

9. a feasible range of types of traffic engineering improvements or trip mitigation measures associated with implementing the development

10. the number, size, and use of buildings or types of ~~dwelling~~ residential units on the site

11. queuing analysis, if required (see Section V)

12. a pedestrian impact statement to assure safe pedestrian access and circulation to and within the site, including:

    a. pedestrian and/or bicycle counts at intersections
    b. existing and/or proposed sidewalks and/or bikeways adjacent to the site and/or off-site of sufficient width, offset from the curb per county standards
    c. lead-in sidewalks to the site and connectivity to the local area
    d. existing and/or proposed bus stops, shelters and benches, including real time transit information
    e. pedestrian accommodations at nearby intersections; e.g. crosswalks, pedestrian signals, push buttons, median refuges, ADA-compoatible ramps
    f. sufficient bicycle racks and/or lockers on site.

For a zoning case, Transportation Planning staff may initiate a meeting with the applicant, the Hearing Examiner and interested groups or individuals to establish the scope of the traffic analysis.

IV. Findings for Inadequate Facilities

The Transportation Planning staff report to the Planning Board will present findings for each of the categories identified below and make recommendations relating to the adequacy of the transportation facilities. The Planning Board will use these findings and recommendations, as well as comments and recommendations from the public, the Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation, the Maryland State Highway Administration, and/or incorporated cities/towns within the County as appropriate, to make its overall findings as to adequacy of public facilities for the proposed development.

A. Transportation Solutions

If the applicant's traffic study identifies a local area condition that exceeds the congestion standard for that policy area, Transportation Planning staff will notify the applicant, ~~the Division of Traffic and Parking Services of~~ the Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPWT) and/or the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) of the condition so that they can work together to develop a feasible solution to mitigate the impact. The Planning Board may select either trip mitigation agreements, non-automobile transportation amenities, or physical road improvements (or a combination thereof) as the required means to relieve local congestion. Priority will be given to non-physical improvements in Metro Station and CBD policy areas. (See Section VI.)

If physical improvements are to be considered in Metro Station and Central Business District (CBD) policy areas, priority consideration will be given to improving the most congested intersections, even though they may not be in the specific local area included in a given traffic study. Efforts will be made to combine the resources of two or more developers to improve the most congested intersections.

Once the applicant, Transportation staff, and staff of DPWT and/or SHA have identified and agreed that there are feasible transportation solutions to obtain adequate local transportation capacity, these solutions will be incorporated as conditions of approval in the Transportation Planning staff report. These solutions could include additional traffic engineering or operations changes beyond those currently programmed, or non-programmed transit or ridesharing activities that would make the overall transportation system adequate.

If an applicant is participating in a traffic mitigation program and/or one or more intersection improvements to satisfy Local Area Transportation Review requirements, that applicant shall be considered to have met Local Area Transportation Review for any other intersection where the volume of trips generated is less than five Critical Lane Movements.

In the case of developments that elect to use one of the special procedures in the Annual Growth Policy (AGP) described in Appendix D, the solutions must be identified and agreed to as above but will not be made conditions of approval. ~~(See Appendix D)~~

B. Degree of Local Congestion

Transportation Planning staff will identify the degree of intersection congestion calculated for the peak hour of both weekday morning and evening ~~weekday~~ peak periods using the Critical Lane Volume method and the congestion standards by policy area listed in Table 1. For intersections that straddle policy area boundaries, the higher congestion standard shall be used. In establishing the LATR congestion standards, an approximately equivalent transportation level of service that balances transit availability with roadway congestion in all policy areas of the County is assumed. In areas where greater transit accessibility and use exist, greater traffic congestion is permitted. Table 1, which shows the Critical Lane Volume congestion standard adopted by the County Council for each policy area, is based on this concept.

Intersections typically are the constraint in urbanized areas, but links between intersections may become the constraint under some circumstances (see Table 2).

Transportation Planning staff will present findings comparing the calculated CLVs with the congestion standard(s) of the nearby intersections. If the congestion standard is exceeded under background conditions, an applicant may be required to

provide a traffic mitigation program or construct intersection improvements that would result in equal or improved operating conditions (as measured by CLV) than those that would occur without the applicant's ~~project~~development. Under these conditions, local congestion will be considered less severe even though the calculated CLV may still exceed the congestion standard for the policy area in which the development is located.

C. Unavoidable Congestion

Transportation Planning staff will identify the degree to which alternate routes to serve the trips associated with the proposed development can be considered. (See Section VII. F. Trip Assignment.) If there are no appropriate alternate routes for the traffic to use to avoid the congestion, then it must be assumed that trips from the proposed development will increase the local area congestion. It is not appropriate to anticipate that the trips associated with the development would use local streets other than for site access unless such streets have been functionally classified as being suitable for handling background and site-generated trips, e.g., arterial, business district, or higher classifications.

D. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies

Transportation Planning staff, in coordination with staff from DPWT, will identify the degree to which transit (i.e., bus service, proximity to a Metrorail station), ridesharing or other TDM activities can be considered to mitigate vehicle trips generated by ~~the proposed~~a development. If there is sufficient potential for serving the proposed development and/or immediate area with transit or ridesharing services, then ~~it is possible that~~priority will be given to developing a transit alternative or trip mitigation program ~~could be developed for modifying~~to mitigate the ~~demand contributing to the~~development's local traffic ~~congestion~~impact. If it is physically or fiscally ineffective for the public agencies to provide transit or ridesharing services, then it must be assumed that trips from the proposed development will increase the local area congestion.

E. Project-Related Traffic

Transportation Planning staff will identify the degree to which local traffic congestion is directly attributable to the proposed development. Traffic from three sources will be measured: 1) existing traffic, 2) trips generated by the sum total of all nearby approved but unbuilt developments (i.e., background development), and 3) total trips generated by the proposed development. The more ~~that~~ trips ~~from~~ the proposed development contributes to local traffic congestion, the greater the assumed severity of ~~the~~ local impact.

V. Procedures for Application in the Central Business District (CBD) and Metro Station Policy Areas

Except where noted, the technical definitions and procedures applied in Central Business District (CBD) and Metro Station Policy Areas will be consistent with those defined elsewhere in these guidelines. ~~In reviewing the adequacy of traffic flows, the following criteria will be applied. The conditions will be applied to total traffic volumes (i.e., existing plus background plus site traffic) in the peak hour of both the morning and evening weekday peak periods~~. In reviewing CBD and Metro Station Policy Area applications, the following criteria will be used:

A. Adequacy of Traffic Flows

1. Any intersection with a CLV of 1,800 or less will, in most cases, be considered acceptable with no further analysis required. However, Transportation Planning staff may require the queuing analysis noted in 2 below if they believe that abnormally long queuing might be present due to unusual conditions even at intersections with a CLV below 1,800. Transportation Planning staff shall define those intersections for which special analysis is required in writing to the applicant as early in the review process as possible, and no later than official written notification of a complete traffic study. The CLV will be calculated in accordance with the procedures defined in these guidelines.

2. If the CLV is over 1,800, a queuing analysis shall be performed. Existing queues shall be measured by the applicant and total traffic (i.e., existing, background and site) and planned roadway and circulation changes shall be taken into account. The average queue length in the weekday peak hour should not extend more than 80 percent of the distance to an adjacent signalized intersection, provided the adjacent signalized intersections are greater than 300 feet apart. The 80 percent standard provides a margin of safety for peaking. If adjacent signalized

intersections are closer together than 300 feet, the average queue length in the weekday peak hour should not extend more than 90 percent of the distance to the adjacent signalized intersection. The signal timing assumed for this analysis must be consistent with the crossing time required for pedestrians in paragraph ~~V.D~~B.2.b. of ~~these guidelines~~this section.

If ~~these~~ adequate conditions cannot be achieved, and no mitigating measures are programmed that would result in an acceptable CLV, the transportation system in the CBD or Metro Station Policy Area may not be deemed adequate to support the development.

B. Access and Pedestrian Safety

In addition to the traffic flow analysis, applicants must demonstrate that the following guidelines are not violated by their site development:

1. Access points for site parking and loading must be located so that their use will not interfere with traffic flows on the adjacent streets or with access points to neighboring buildings or transit terminal areas. Access directly onto the major roads should be avoided, but if proposed it will be considered in the context of the application.

2. Pedestrian safety shall be assessed based on the following characteristics:

   a) Conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles of all types accessing the site shall be minimized. Actions shall be taken to ensure pedestrian safety on and adjacent to the site.

   b) The applicant must provide evidence from the DPWT that the pedestrian phase of the traffic signal cycle for each approach at the adjacent and critical intersections will provide at all times at least enough time for pedestrians to completely cross the street walking at a speed of 3.0 feet per second. Where possible, enough time should be provided to completely cross while walking at 2.5 feet per second. The intent of this requirement is to provide enough time for people who tend to walk slower to be able to cross at 3.0 feet per second if they leave the curb the moment the walk indication for that movement is displayed. People who are able to walk at 4.0 feet per second or faster will be able to start crossing any time the walk indication appears and complete the crossing during the flashing don't walk pedestrian clearance period.

   These aspects must be documented in the traffic study submitted as part of the development application. In the analysis, all pedestrian movements are assumed to be made at the street level.

C. Other Criteria

1. Total traffic is defined as the existing traffic, plus trips from approved but unbuilt developments, plus the trips from the proposed development during the peak hour of the weekday morning and evening peak periods.

2. Critical intersections are those within the CBD or Metro Station Policy Area, defined by Transportation Planning staff, generally adjacent to the site, or allowing site traffic to enter an arterial or major road. In some cases, where site volumes are large, additional intersections within or contiguous to the CBD or Metro Station Policy Area may be identified by Transportation Planning staff for inclusion in the traffic study.

3. Vehicles can be assigned to parking garages encountered on their trip into the CBD or Metro Station Policy Area. The capacity of parking garages must be accounted for based on guidance from the Transportation Planning staff and consultation with DPWT staff.

4. Trip generation rates for background and site development traffic are contained in Appendices A, B, and C.

D. Information Provided by Staff

The following information will be ~~gathered~~ provided to the applicant by Transportation Planning and DPWT staffs for use in the traffic study.

1. Existing traffic counts at selected locations. The applicant shall be required to update these data if the application is submitted more than one year after the data were initially gathered.

2. Trip generation rates

3. Directional distribution(s) (See Appendix E.)

4. Parking garage capacity information and locations of future public parking garages

5. A listing of background developments.

E. Traffic Mitigation Agreement

Each applicant should have a proposed traffic mitigation agreement outlining a participation plan for trip reduction measures, prepared in conjunction with the area's Transportation Management District, if applicable, and Transportation Planning staff.