# Kimley»»Hor 

To: From: Project: Laura Gurly, Port of Everett Matthew Palmer, PE Mukilteo Landing Parking Lot Subject: Trip Generation \& Mitigation Fees Date:

November 10, 2022


Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. has been retained to provide a trip generation and mitigation memorandum for the Mukilteo Landing parking lot. The site is located in the southeast corner of Mukilteo Speedway at Front Street. A site vicinity map is included in Figure 1.


Figure 1: Site Vicinity Map
The Mukilteo Landing parking lot is proposed to consist of 99 parking spaces. The parking spaces have been delegated to include 13 stalls for employees for surrounding businesses, 23 stalls for monthly parking, and 63 stalls for 72 -hour parking. The site currently has a credit for a 9,354 Square Foot (SF) high-turnover sit-down restaurant and two single-family units previously occupying the site prior to the increase in ferry traffic holding space. When the total proposed parking lot site was used for ferry holding traffic; upwards of 180 passenger cars could fit on the site.

## 1. TRIP GENERATION

Trip generation calculations for the Mukilteo Landing parking lot have been performed using the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition (2021). The average rates for ITE Land Use Code (LUC) 090, Park-and-Ride Lot, ITE LUC 932, High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant, and ITE LUC 210, Single-Family Detached, have been used for the trip generation calculations. A credit for previously approved site uses will be accounted for when calculating total trips. ITE also identifies a passby rate for the previous high-turnover sit-down restaurant use. The pass-by rate accounts for existing vehicles on the roadway that will use the site. A pass-by rate of $43 \%$ for the high-turnover sit-down restaurant has been utilized. The trip generation for the proposed parking lot is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Trip Generation Summary

| Land Use | Size | Average Daily Trips | AM Peak-Hour Trips |  |  | PM Peak-Hour Trips |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| ITE LUC 090 Park-and-Ride Lot (Visitors) | 63 Stalls | 244 | 22 | 6 | 28 | 8.66 | 25.99 | 34.65 |
| ITE LUC 090 Park-and-Ride Lot (Employees) | 13 Stalls | 50 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1.79 | 5.36 | 7.15 |
| ITE LUC 090 Park-and-Ride Lot (Monthly) | 23 Stalls | 89 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 3.16 | 9.49 | 12.65 |
| ITE LUC 932 High-Turnover (SitDown) Restaurant (Credit) | -9.354 K SF | -572 | -28 | -23 | -51 | -29.43 | -18.82 | -48.25 |
| ITE LUC 210 Single-Family Detached (Credit) | -2 Units | -19 | 0 | -1 | -1 | -1.18 | -0.70 | -1.88 |
| TOTAL | --- | -208 | 7 | -15 | -8 | -17.00 | 21.32 | 4.32 |

The Mukilteo Landing parking lot is anticipated to generate -208 new daily trips with -8 AM peak-hour trips and 4.32 new PM peak-hour trips after reductions for the existing land uses on site have been considered. The trip generation calculations are included in the attachments.

## 2. TRIP DISTRIBUTION

The change in use of the site is anticipated to generate only 4.32 new PM peak-hour trips. Therefore, as the city's typical trigger level for off-site analysis is 10 PM peak-hour trips; no distribution or assignment of trips should be necessary at the existing site access point.

## 3. TRAFFIC MITIGATION FEES

The City of Mukilteo has an interlocal agreement with Snohomish Count that provides for the payment of traffic mitigation fees to Snohomish County for City of Mukilteo developments. The City of Mukilteo also has an understanding with WSDOT for the payment of traffic mitigation fees.

### 3.1 City of Mukilteo

The City of Mukilteo traffic mitigation fees have been calculated using the current rate of $\$ 1,875$ per net new PM peak hour trips. The Mukilteo Landing parking lot is anticipated to generate 4.32 new PM peak hour trips, which results in a City of Mukilteo traffic mitigation fee of $\$ 8,100.00$. The development should not be responsible for off-site improvements due to the site not meeting the City of Mukilteo threshold for off-site analysis. It should be noted that if the 13 employee parking spaces which will be utilized by existing developments in the site vicinity are removed from the trip generation as those vehicles are already coming to the site vicinity the proposed parking lot would generate -2 new PM peak-hour trips and would not be responsible for traffic mitigation fees. In addition, with the employee parking included if only 8 of the visitor spaces were allocated to a maximum of 4 hours of parking, the same limit as what is currently for on-street parking, these spaces would most likely be utilized by visitors to the waterfront and the existing establishments in the area and should not be counted as new trips. With these 8 visitor parking spaces as short-term parking the trip generation would be 0 new PM peak-hour trips.

### 3.2 Snohomish County

The interlocal agreement between Snohomish County and the City of Mukilteo allows Snohomish County to request traffic mitigation fees from any new developments in the City of Mukilteo. Based on the low trip generation the development is not anticipated to impact any Snohomish County roadways on the Transportation Needs Report (TNR) with 3 directional PM peak-hour trips and should therefore not be required to pay traffic mitigation fees to Snohomish County.

### 3.3 Washington State Department of Transportation

Per the Transportation Concurrency Evaluation and Determination of Transportation Impact Fees for the City of Mukilteo, the development does not reach the threshold of 10 or more PM peak-hour trips at the intersection of $88^{\text {th }}$ Street SW and Highway 525. Payment of WSDOT traffic mitigation fees should therefore not be a condition of the Mukilteo Landing parking lot.

## Attachments

$\begin{aligned} \text { Trip Generation for: } & \text { Development Peak Weekday } \\ \text { (a.k.a.): } & \text { Average Weekday Daily Trips (AWDT) }\end{aligned}$

|  |  |  | Gross Trips |  |  |  | $\underbrace{}_{\substack{\text { Internal } \\ \text { Crossover }}}$ |  |  |  |  |  | DIRECTIONAL ASSIISNMENTS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | total | PASSSY |  | ${ }^{\text {New }}$ |  |  | PAss-BY |  | NEW |  |
| Land uses | variable | (1E |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \substack{\text { Trip } \\ \text { Rate }} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \% \\ & \text { in } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \% \\ \text { out } \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { an+out } \\ & \text { (Total } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n+out } \\ & \text { (Total }) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\left.\\| \begin{array}{l} \text { n+out } \\ \text { (Total } \end{array}\right)$ | ${ }^{\text {In }}$ | out | ${ }^{\text {In }}$ | out |
| Prak.an-R.Re Lot (Vsitios) | $\frac{63 \text { Stals }}{13 \text { Sals }}$ | ${ }_{9}^{90}$ | ${ }^{3.88}$ | 50\% | $\frac{50 \%}{50 \%}$ | ${ }_{\text {244 }}^{24}$ | - | 0 | $\frac{244}{50}$ | - | 0 | $\frac{244}{50}$ | 0 | 0 | $\frac{122}{25}$ | $\frac{122}{25}$ |
| Palkand-Ride Lot (Emploee | ${ }^{13 \text { Stalis }}$ | 0 | ${ }^{\frac{3}{3} 88}$ | 50\% | 㖪5\%\% |  | - | $\bigcirc$ |  | - | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ |  | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ |  | 25 <br> 48 <br> 28 <br> 8 |
|  | ${ }_{-0.354 \mathrm{~K} \text { SF }}$ | ${ }^{932}$ | ${ }_{0}^{10720}$ | 50\% | 5 |  | \% | 0 | ${ }_{\text {-1.003 }}^{-19}$ | $\frac{43 \%}{0 \%}$ | ${ }_{43}{ }^{4}$ | ${ }_{\text {- }}^{\text {- } 572}$ | ${ }_{-216}$ | -215 | $\underline{0}$ | 286 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{-639}$ |  | 0 | ${ }_{\text {-639 }}$ |  | ${ }^{-431}$ | ${ }^{-208}$ | -216 | -215 | -104 | -104 |

Trip Generation for: Development Peak Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour between 7 and 9 AM

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | NET | ETERN | TRIPS | TYP |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOTH | IRECTIO |  |  | TION | SSIG | NTS |
|  |  |  |  |  | s Trip |  | ${ }_{\text {Cros }}^{\text {Int }}$ | rnal sover | TOTAL |  | S-BY | NEW |  |  |  |  |
| LAND USES | VARIABLE | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { ITE } \\ \text { LU } \\ \text { code } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trip } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \% \\ & \text { IN } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { OUT } \end{gathered}$ | (Total) <br> In+Out (Total) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { Gross } \\ \text { Trips } \end{gathered}$ | Trips <br> In+Out <br> (Total) | In+Out <br> (Total) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { Ext. } \\ \text { Trips } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In+Out } \\ & \text { (Total) } \end{aligned}$ | In+Out <br> (Total) | In | Out | In | Out |
| Park-and-Ride Lot (Visitors) | 63 Stalls | 90 | 0.44 | 80\% | 20\% | 28 | 0\% | 0 | 28 | 0\% | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 6 |
| Park-and-Ride Lot (Employees) | 13 Stalls | 90 | 0.44 | 80\% | 20\% | 6 | 0\% | 0 | 6 | 0\% | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| Park-and-Ride Lot (Monthly) | 23 Stalls | 90 | 0.44 | 80\% | 20\% | 10 | 0\% | 0 | 10 | 0\% | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 |
| High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant | $-9.354 \mathrm{~K} \mathrm{SF}$ | 932 | 9.57 | 55\% | 45\% | -90 | 0\% | 0 | -90 | 43\% | -39 | -51 | -21 | -18 | -28 | -23 |
| Single-Family Detached | -2 Units | 210 | 0.70 | 26\% | 74\% | -1 | 0\% | 0 | -1 | 0\% | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 |
| $\square$ Total |  |  |  |  |  | -47 |  | 0 | -47 |  | -39 | -8 | -21 | -18 | 7 | -15 |

Trip Generation for: Development Peak Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour between 4 and 6 PM

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | NET | XTERNA | TRIPS | Y TYPE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BOTH | drectio |  | DIR | CTIONAL | ASSIGN | ENTS |
|  |  |  |  | Gros | s Trip |  | Cros | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ernal } \\ & \text { sover } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL |  | S-BY | NEW | PAS | -BY |  |  |
| LAND USES | VARIABLE | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { ITE } \\ \text { Lu } \\ \text { code } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trip } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \% \\ & \text { IN } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In+Out } \\ & \text { (Total) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { Gross } \\ \text { Trips } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Trips In+Out (Total) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In+Out } \\ & \text { (Total) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { Ext. } \\ \text { Trips } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | (Total) <br> In+Out (Total) | In+Out <br> (Total) | In | Out | In | Out |
| Park-and-Ride Lot (Visitors) | 63 Stalls | 90 | 0.55 | 25\% | 75\% | 35 | 0\% | 0 | 35 | 0\% | 0.00 | 34.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 8.66 | 25.99 |
| Park-and-Ride Lot (Employees) | 13 Stalls | 90 | 0.55 | 25\% | 75\% | 7 | 0\% | 0 | 7 | 0\% | 0.00 | 7.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.79 | 5.36 |
| Park-and-Ride Lot (Monthly) | 23 Stalls | 90 | 0.55 | 25\% | 75\% | 13 | 0\% | 0 | 13 | 0\% | 0.00 | 12.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.16 | 9.49 |
| High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant | -9.354 K SF | 932 | 9.05 | 61\% | 39\% | -85 | 0\% | 0 | -85 | 43\% | -36.40 | -48.25 | -22.20 | -14.20 | -29.43 | -18.82 |
| Single-Family Detached | -2 Units | 210 | 0.94 | 63\% | 37\% | -2 | 0\% | 0 | -2 | 0\% | 0.00 | -1.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -1.18 | -0.70 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | -32 |  | 0 | -32 |  | -36.40 | 4.32 | -22.20 | -14.20 | -17.00 | 21.32 |
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## PORT OF EVERETT



| ROOFING |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Built-up |  |  |  |  |
| WALLS |  |  |  |  |
|  | B | 1 | 2 | U |
| Frame |  | Yes |  |  |
| Guard | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| FRAMING |  |  |  |  |
|  | B | 1 | 2 | U |
| F Res | 0 | 9354 | 0 | 0 |
| FINISH |  |  |  |  |
|  | UF | SF | FO | FD |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 9354 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 9354 | 0 |
| HEATING AND AIR CONDITIONING |  |  |  |  |
|  | B | 1 | 2 | U |
| Heat | 0 | 9354 | 0 | 0 |
| A/C | 0 | 9354 | 0 | 0 |

Transfer of Ownership


## Printed 10／26／2022
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# Transportation Concurrency Evaluation and Determination of Transportation Impact Fees 

Date of Complete App

| Project | Mukilteo Landing |
| :--- | :--- |
| Address | 707 Front Street |

1. Exemptions (Deemed Concurrent, MCC 17.15 020)
A. PM peak hour trips same or less than current
B. 10.0 or less new PM Peak hour trips
C. Additions to a Single Family Residence
D. TI with no change of use or increase in services
E. Replacement Structures
F. Re-roofing
G. Demolitions
H. Subject to Master Plan

2. If project meets any of the above, then deemed concurrent.
Exempt $\quad$ Yes $\square$ No

## * If Yes, Stop Here, if No, respond to the following;

3. A. If more than 10 new PM Peak Hour Trips: For transportation concurrency evaluation, the applicant shall provide a traffic study prepared by a traffic engineer, which shall compare the calculated level of service to the adopted level of service standard for each impacted transportation facility. The traffic study shall, at a minimum, provide the following information:
i. Anticipated trip distribution;
ii. The current calculated level of service of all impacted transportation facilities;
iii. The future calculated level of service of all impacted transportation facilities incorporating traffic volumes from the proposed development;
iv. Any proposed mitigation (including calculation of impact fees); and
v. The future calculated level of service of all impacted transportation facilities with the incorporation of proposed development traffic volumes and any proposed mitigation.
Definition:
"Impacted transportation facility" includes any transportation facility which is impacted by ten or more peak hour project trips in one direction.
B. LOS Determination

4. Does any location have a LOS with development of less than:

LOS E Principal/Minor Arterial Road Segments and Intersections
LOS D Collector Arterials/Local Road Segments
(See attached map)
$\square \quad$ Yes Then development not concurrent.
Permit not to be issued without mitigation and approval of Public Works Director.
$\square \quad$ No Then development is concurrent and code requirements are met.
5. Calculated ADT $\qquad$ Calculated Peak PM Trips $\qquad$
*Intersection of $88^{\text {th }}$ Street SW and Hwy 525 a) Peak PM Trips __ N/A
b) ADT

N/A
6. Determination of Transportation Impact Fee from Traffic Study

| 4.32 | X | $\$ 1875.00$ <br> \# New PM Peak Hour Trips | $=\underline{\$ 8,100.00}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fee PM PHT |  |  |

*If 5. (a) is 10 or greater, WSDOT fees apply based on 5. (b)
_Project already completed_
ADT @ $88^{\text {th }}$ St SW/Hwy 525

X
$\$ 205.00$ Fee per ADT
Fee per ADT
TOTAL FEE
$=$
$\qquad$
$=$
0
$\qquad$

Engineer Stamp
(required for all non-exempt projects)

Do not write below this line - City of Mukilteo Office Use Only
A. Concurrency Granted

> Initials

Or

Concurrency Denied

## Initials

B. $\square$ Fees Verified and Approved
C. $\square$ Fee Exempt per MMC 17.15.020

City Staff Signature
Date

TOTAL AMT DUE: \$ $\qquad$
5 YEAR $\qquad$
6 YEAR $\qquad$
TREASURERS RECIEPT \# $\qquad$

C:Project File<br>Concurrency Cert. File<br>Finance Department

## Map 9: Functional Class of Street Network




