

# TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of the Transportation Element is to provide a framework of analysis, goals, policies, and strategies necessary to develop the transportation facilities that will serve Jefferson County in the future. ~~The element describes the service standards desired for the County's transportation system, projects the impact that the land use pattern recommended in this comprehensive plan will have on the transportation system, and identifies the improvements necessary to meet future demand.~~

The Growth Management Act (GMA) ~~provides for~~requires a systematic approach for estimating and planning for future transportation needs based on an analysis of existing conditions and a projection of future ~~conditions-needs~~. This Transportation Element meets the requirements of the GMA.

The Element describes the Level of Service (LOS) standards desired for the County's transportation system and estimates vehicular traffic that will be generated on County Roads and State Routes by the land use designations adopted in this Comprehensive Plan and by regional traffic growth. The analysis in the Element shows that no capacity-related transportation improvements are necessary to meet estimated future traffic growth.

The Element also discusses roadway functional classifications, safety and weather issues pertaining to County Roads, public transportation, and issues related to other transportation modes.

## Element Amendment

This element is part of the ~~2002~~2004 Amendments to the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. It updates information contained in the Transportation Element of the 1998 Plan.

~~One purpose of the Amendment is to address~~It also addresses the addition of the ~~Tri Area as a~~Irondale-Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area (UGA). The addition of a UGA was contemplated in the 1998 Plan following completion of ~~a "Special Study."~~the Tri-Area/Glen Cove Special Study. The Special Study was initiated in 1998 ~~but not~~and completed ~~until~~in 2001. As part of the process, capital needs were addressed and the impacts fully explored in a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS 1999).

The Final SEIS provides estimates of transportation needs based on a ~~full build-out of the Tri Area~~fully developed UGA which, based on population trends, is not expected to occur within the 20 year planning period. Therefore, these estimated needs are not included in this update but can be found in the Final SEIS.

A comprehensive transportation study was completed for the UGA in 2004, after the UGA boundary adoption process was completed. The UGA Transportation Plan contains information and analysis regarding transportation both within and adjacent to the UGA. The Plan considers the impacts to transportation related to UGA designation and forecasts the capital facility needs and costs.

Importantly, within the next 6 years (see the Capital Facilities Element), there are no changes anticipated in infrastructure needs because of the addition of the Tri Area as a UGA. This is due to the fact that the 2002 Amendments to this plan will not allow years, there is no anticipated need for capacity-related County Road improvements related to the designation of the Irondale-Port Hadlock UGA. This is

~~because~~ significant increases in ~~growth~~~~development~~ density from those in the 1998 Plan ~~are not anticipated~~ until sewer facilities are developed for the ~~area (see Land Use Element)-UGA~~. While necessary planning and preliminary engineering is scheduled for these facilities, they ~~will~~~~are~~ not ~~anticipated to~~ be in place within the next 6 ~~years (see Capital Facilities Element)-years~~.

### **Relationship with Other Comprehensive Plan Elements**

Land use and transportation are inextricably connected -- it is the use of the land that determines the demand for travel to, from, and through various locations. The future land use identified in the Comprehensive Plan is, in turn, shaped by the values and goals expressed in the other elements of the Plan. The Plan addresses such issues as the protection and use of natural resources, the amount and type of open space and recreational opportunities available in the County, the locations and types of housing to be made available, the types and locations of various economic activities, and the funding priorities of the County. This Transportation Element has been developed in accordance with the other Comprehensive Plan elements, and has been integrated with the other elements to ensure consistency throughout the Plan.

While the main focus of the goals and policies in the Transportation Element are transportation system-related and addressed solely in this element, this element reflects the policy intent of the other elements as well. Policies relating to design of pedestrian environments, recreation and pedestrian trails, support for urban densities through appropriate transportation facility design, protection of the characteristics of the rural environment, protection of sensitive areas, and encouraging conservation of energy are reinforced in a transportation context. Goals and policies that relate more directly to these areas are found in the following elements: Land ~~Use, Use and~~ Rural, Urban Growth Areas, Housing, Economic Development, Natural Resources Conservation, Environment, and Capital Facilities.

### **TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT STRATEGY**

Jefferson County's strategy for managing its transportation network is to encourage efficient multi-modal transportation through implementation of the policies of the ~~transportation element~~Transportation Element which address: the County's highways and arterials; public transportation needs and services; non-motorized transportation facilities; land development standards associated with the County's transportation network; state, regional, and local intergovernmental coordination; promotion of transportation demand management programs; protection of the environment and conservation of energy in transportation activities; and development of a transportation improvement program that will identify and rank projects for funding.

### **INTRODUCTION**

This Transportation Element describes all relevant modes of travel~~contained~~ in the overall county transportation system, including automobile, transit, freight, air, ferry, bicycle, and pedestrian. The Element presents travel forecasts; level of service standards and analysis; and transportation goals and ~~policies developed~~policies. ~~The 1998 Transportation Element was developed~~ by the Jefferson County Transportation Planning Advisory Board in conjunction with the Planning Commission. The 2004 Transportation Element provides updated technical analysis based on the methodology and policies developed for the 1998 Element. Readers are referred to the archived 1998 Element for a more detailed discussion of the methodology and public process that led to the development of the Element.

The technical information and policies in the Transportation Element Recommendationsprovide the basis for recommendations for transportation improvements that are contained in the ~~Capital Facilities Element~~.

The Transportation Element was developed over a period of several years, during which time, five Technical Memorandums were prepared and reviewed by the Transportation Planning Advisory Board, Planning Commission, and coordinated with the goals, policies, and plans of other appropriate state, regional, and local jurisdictions. These Technical Memorandums and discussion papers (listed below) provide the background data and initial analysis that are the foundation for the Transportation Element as it has evolved:

<u>Technical Memorandum/Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
1. Public Participation Program	11/6/92 (final)
2. Transportation Data Inventory	9/29/92 (initial draft; data updated in subsequent versions)
3. Goals and Policies	6/23/93 (final, as accepted by Transportation Planning Advisory Board)
4. Outline and Format of the Transportation Plan	1/8/93 (format revised since this report)
5. Transportation Facility Adequacy: Existing and Forecast	7/15/93 (updated in subsequent drafts)
<u>Discussion Papers</u>	<u>Date</u>
Transportation Mitigation and Policy Review	4/25/95
Transportation Alternatives Analysis	5/5/95
Transportation Concurrence: Requirements and Potential Solutions	5/10/95

All background data and reports relating to the development of the Transportation Element, including the Technical Memorandums, are available in the County's Public Works Department.

More recently, the Port Hadlock has been selected for designation as a UGA. This decision followed completion (2001) of a "Special Study" assessing the impacts of creation of a Tri-Area UGA. As part of that process, a detailed transportation analysis was completed and included in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS—August 1999).

### **Intergovernmental Coordination**

The Growth Management Act requires that comprehensive plans, including the Transportation Element, be prepared through a process which includes not only public participation but also intergovernmental coordination. In the case of the development of the Jefferson County Transportation Element, this has included coordination with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO), City of Port Townsend, Port of Port Townsend, Jefferson Transit, and Community Planning Groups.

### **Transportation Planning Advisory Board**

A Transportation Planning Advisory Board (TPAB) was formed at the onset of the development of the Transportation Element. The make-up of the TPAB included six citizens (two from each of the County Commissioner's Districts) as appointed by the Board of County Commissioners; and five agency representatives, one each from Jefferson County Public Works, City of Port Townsend Planning, Jefferson County Planning, Jefferson Transit, and the Washington State Department of Transportation.

~~The primary function of the TPAB was to assist in the development of the Element, review the technical work that was prepared by staff, offer input commensurate with the members' knowledge of the geographic area and local regulatory systems, and make recommendations to the Jefferson County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. The meetings of the Transportation Planning Advisory Board were announced in the local newspaper and were open to the general public and representatives of other agencies/jurisdictions which might have input or be impacted by the process and/or decisions.~~

#### ~~*Washington State Department of Transportation*~~

~~The development of the Transportation Element included coordination with Washington State Department of Transportation through a dialogue of input and response regarding existing conditions, forecasting methods and future recommendations. Copies of the technical memorandums and planning reports which were prepared as part of the process were transmitted to WSDOT—Olympic Region officials for their review and comment. The work included in the Transportation Element was coordinated with the data and recommendations included in the State Highway System Plan Element of the Statewide Multimodal Transportation Plan. As stated above, the TPAB membership included a representative of WSDOT. One of the responsibilities of this representative was to provide input and insight with regard to the planning efforts of the Department and how the two plans might be coordinated on issues important to both agencies.~~

~~The County Transportation Element does not include specific recommendations for Washington State Ferry service needs or improvements.~~

#### ~~*Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization*~~

~~The Jefferson County Transportation Element was developed in conjunction with the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO) which coordinates transportation planning activities of the Olympic and Kitsap Peninsulas. The PRTPO provides for cooperative decision making by the agencies within the region in order to bring about a continuous and cooperative planning process. Jefferson County has been a regular and active participant of the PRTPO and has developed a Transportation Element that is well coordinated with the requirements, goals, and implementation of the PRTPO.~~

~~The PRTPO membership consists of representatives from all four counties, cities, tribal nations, public transportation providers, ports, National Park Service, major employers and private citizens on the northern Olympic and Kitsap Peninsulas. Jefferson County's representation in this regional organization included staff members also responsible for the preparation of the Transportation Element. This dual role by staff allowed for continuous coordination of work between the development of the County Transportation Element and the Regional Plan. The analysis performed was similar, used much of the same background data and was reviewed by staff for both regional and local impacts. The recommendations of both plans were reviewed for possible contradictions and coordinated to address the needs of both organizations.~~

#### ~~*City of Port Townsend*~~

~~A representative of the City of Port Townsend participated on the Transportation Planning Advisory Board. Like the Washington State Department of Transportation representative, the City's designee was responsible for providing input specific to the needs and overlapping issues with the City's planning~~

efforts. In addition, one of the citizen representatives on the TPAB also served on the City of Port Townsend's Transportation Advisory Committee.

### *Port of Port Townsend*

Information was obtained from the Port and reviewed with regard to the local airport and marine facilities. The review of these documents included identification of future Port projects which might impact the overall County transportation network and the impacts that County transportation decisions might have on the Port's operations. Road improvement projects, specifically, will be coordinated with the Port's future plans. The County Transportation Element does not include specific recommendations for air and Port related marine needs or improvements. That responsibility has been left to the Port of Port Townsend.

### *Jefferson Transit*

Jefferson Transit was represented on the Transportation Planning Advisory Board. Their representative played a very active role in the review of the various segments of the Transportation Element. In particular, the goals and policies regarding transit facilities, usage and level of service were developed with the active participation of the Transit representative. This ensured that they would be consistent with the Transit Agency's comprehensive plan and the objectives the Transit Agency was establishing inside the Port Townsend city limits. The Jefferson Transit representative on the TPAB also served on both the City's Advisory Committee and on the PRTPO's Technical Advisory Committee providing input and an avenue of consistency between the three organizations.

### *Community Planning Groups*

The County's comprehensive planning efforts have included the formation of community planning groups in various sections throughout the County. These groups have developed goals and policies, as well as recommendations for what they wish to see in their own local communities. The goals and policies of these groups have been reviewed as part of this countywide process. In addition, the documents prepared as part of this effort, and reviewed by the Transportation Planning Advisory Board have been distributed to the community planning groups for review and input. The documents have also been discussed at public meetings held in each of the communities.

### *Summary*

The process initiated at the beginning of the preparation of the Transportation Element and utilized throughout the development of the plan provided for continuous coordination between the overlapping and concurrent planning efforts in the region. An additional system of checks and balances was provided by virtue of the fact that many of the Transportation Planning Advisory Board members were involved in one or more of the related planning efforts. One of the goals of the process used to develop the Transportation Element was to ensure its consistency with other related documents. This was accomplished through the representatives on the advisory board, review of other agencies' plans, distribution of this plan (and supporting technical work) to other agencies and planning groups, and presentation of facts and findings at community meetings and Planning Commission meetings.

Implementation of the Transportation Element of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan will require a cooperative effort between the various jurisdictions mentioned in the preceding intergovernmental section, as well as the private sector.

### **Concurrency**

Concurrency occurs when the transportation facilities or services needed to accommodate growth or change are provided as the development occurs. A key to achieving concurrency is analysis and proper distribution of available funds. Transportation improvements that cannot be funded cannot be built and mitigation measures or reassessment of the land use development are necessary in order to maintain the established level of service.

The concurrency funding analysis is an essential part of the Transportation Element and provides important information in evaluating the Plan's transportation recommendations relative to the various transportation and land use alternatives considered in the Plan's development. The concurrency funding analysis of the Transportation Element is contained in the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

### **Background**

Providing public facilities concurrent with land development is one of the requirements of Washington's Growth Management Act. The main intent of the transportation concurrency requirement is to provide transportation facilities that can absorb the expected traffic increases resulting from land development.

Potential transportation improvements can range from physical improvements (e.g., the addition of travel lanes or new traffic signals) to implementation of various travel demand management techniques (e.g., improved transit service or rideshare programs).

### **Issues**

Jefferson County is in an unusual situation because all of the roadways included in the Transportation Element's analysis requiring capacity improvements are state routes and are, therefore, outside of the County's jurisdiction. At the same time, these state routes form the bulk of the County's arterial system and are thus integral components of the transportation system within the County.

The development impact most commonly thought of when considering formation of a concurrency program is a decline in the level of service. While Jefferson County does have needs associated with transportation facility safety, road preservation, and maintenance, the County is currently focusing primarily on resolving concurrency issues for the state routes within the County that are forecast to exceed capacity in this plan, the Peninsula Regional Transportation Plan, and the Washington State System Plan. To address these concurrency matters, Jefferson County has been an active and regular participant in the development of the Peninsula Regional Transportation Plan and has met with the Washington State Department of Transportation. These questions are, as yet, not fully resolved and the County will continue discussions with the Washington State Department of Transportation.

Part of the capacity-related concurrency discussion has focused on equity and has identified two main issues. The first issue concerns state routes and the regional traffic carried by those routes through local jurisdictions, while the second concerns the scale of that responsibility. Increases in regional traffic flow, appropriately, cannot be assigned to local development. Jefferson County has regarded the need to share the burden of concurrency between locally and regionally generated traffic as an important point of discussion because state routes provide both local and regional access through travel routes. As regional travel routes, state routes within Jefferson County provide access to the Olympic Peninsula and the Pacific Ocean and, therefore, are important links in supporting the regional economy.

~~Distinctions can also be made between roads that are similar in functional classification, but serve a community or area differently. For example, SR 104 and SR 19 are both state routes, but SR 104 does not serve adjacent needs to the extent that SR 19 does. Maintaining through travel capacity on SR 104 could be a higher priority than on SR 19, which already provides access to several local businesses.~~

~~A second equity issue surrounding concurrency is the scale of responsibility—is a small developer as responsible for mitigation of impacts as a large developer? The resolution of this question centers around the interpretation of the concurrency wording in the GMA. No single interpretation has been entirely agreed upon. These issues will be discussed further between the Washington State Department of Transportation and Jefferson County.~~

~~A strict translation of the law would place developers of all sizes equally responsible for impacts exceeding the LOS threshold. That is, a small developer whose project generated enough trips to exceed the threshold would be held equally responsible as a large developer, but only for the impacts he/she generates.~~

~~This potential inequity could be avoided by developing a concurrency management system that focuses on the proportion of impact. Implementing a proportionally based concurrency management system requires a more flexible interpretation of the GMA. This approach has been used in other communities. The more flexible approach can be implemented in coordination with the State Environmental Protection Act.~~

## **Conclusions**

~~Jefferson County is coordinating with the State to develop an equitable concurrency management system, although a system has not been resolved as of this Element's completion date. A flexible concurrency management system based on proportional impacts has been considered because it would be easier to implement and could be more equitable. This concurrency management system would be based on a review process similar to SEPA which would allow the system to be managed on the basis of significant concurrency impacts rather than a more strict "impact/no impact" approach. This plan projects that no concurrency issues on County roads related to excess traffic volumes will occur during the planning period. Other issues of concurrency relating to safety along roadways and at intersections are likely to arise, however.~~

~~The flexible approach to concurrency focuses on developing policies that identify when a concurrency management system should be implemented. The flexible approach can also be implemented through evaluation. Regulations would be required under either the strict or the flexible approach to concurrency. However, under the flexible approach, the regulations are guided by policies and can be written to focus on the main impacts requiring mitigation. This is in contrast to a strict "impact/no impact" approach.~~

~~The policies would also identify the criteria to be used to determine when concurrency should be implemented. For example, a policy could say that concurrency mitigation should occur when a development contributes a certain percent or more of the existing traffic volume to the roadways. Or, the policy could say that access mitigation is required for all developments that contribute more than X percent additional traffic to the roadway system. Developments that generate less than X percent of the current traffic volumes would be small businesses and would have little to no mitigation responsibility.~~

~~At the policy level, distinctions between the uses of the roadways can also be made, such as between the uses of state routes and local roads. Distinctions can also be made between roads that have the same functional classification but serve the communities differently. For example, SR 104 and SR 19 are both~~

~~state routes, but SR 104 does not serve adjacent needs as much as SR 19 serves local needs. Policies might suggest that maintaining the through travel capacity is a higher priority on SR 104 than on SR 19, which already provides access to several local businesses.~~

~~Safety, maintenance, and preservation policies can also be established and used as thresholds for action. For example, a policy could be worded as follows:~~

~~Unacceptable increases in hazards or reduction in safety will be mitigated. The definition of "unacceptable" will be based on analysis of the common roadway, intersection, driveway and nonmotorized design standards in the WSDOT Design Manual, AASHTO, or other commonly used references, such as publications by the Institute of Traffic Engineers.~~

## **EXISTING CONDITIONS**

~~The existing conditions portion of the Transportation Element describes Jefferson County's current transportation system, which is divided into two main categories: motorized and nonmotorized. The motorized transportation system includes all automobile and transit travel (vehicular), as well as some motorized transportation modes that travel on off road routes (e.g., air, waterborne, rail). The nonmotorized transportation system includes both on road and off road modes for pedestrian, bicycle, travel. The non-motorized transportation system is described in detail in the Non-Motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan. In addition, a brief discussion of weather-related traffic hazard areas identified by the County Public Works Department and the public is provided.~~

~~This section also provides a discussion of the level of service (LOS) standards for the County's transportation system adopted by the Transportation Planning Advisory Board. These LOS standards are recommended for adoption in this Transportation Element.~~

### **Motorized Transportation System – Vehicular**

~~A description of the motorized transportation system in Jefferson County begins with an overview of the area's roadway functional classification system. The functional classification system is a hierarchy of roadway types. Each type is described by standards that guide the road's design, use, and travel volumes. Following the description of the functional classification system is a summary of the current traffic on the County's roadways and on surrounding roads.~~

~~Included in this overview of the roadways' designated function and actual use is a review of accident data. The accident data indicates areas where further investigation of the transportation system may be necessary. The reported data summary does not reveal the cause of the accidents—rather, they only indicate where the accidents are occurring. Further investigation at accident locations helps define the problem and appropriate solutions.~~

~~The emergency service routes and facilities within the County are also presented. During emergencies or disasters, the highway system is critical to providing emergency fire and medical services, as well as being the route for evacuation or delivery of supplies.~~

~~As a part of the motorized transportation system, transit service, air and waterborne traffic, and freight traffic are also discussed.~~

### ***Roadway Functional Classification***

Roadways are categorized according to their role and use in carrying vehicles. The categorization is a hierarchy of roadways ranging from principal arterials, such as state routes, to local streets in residential neighborhoods. The different categories vary in their ability to carry traffic for long distances, and in their ability to provide access to land uses.

*State routes* are roads owned and operated by the Washington State Department of Transportation. These highways provide for regional and interregional travel. In the Jefferson County Transportation Element these routes are classified according to how they function within the County (for example, as principal or minor arterials, or major collectors). State routes within the County include US 101, and State Routes 19, 20, 104, and 116.

*Principal arterials* provide the most mobility. They provide for regional and inter-regional travel, typically carrying large volumes of through traffic, with limited direct access to abutting properties.

*Minor arterials* provide more access to adjacent land uses, but still function primarily to link destination points. Minor arterials tend to link intra-city destinations instead of inter-regional.

*Collectors* provide more access to adjacent land uses than any arterial, but they do not provide the full access that local streets provide. These roads collect and distribute traffic between neighborhoods and business areas, and the rest of the arterial system. They provide for easy and direct access to abutting properties and carry low to moderate volumes of traffic. Major collectors are those collectors that carry higher volumes of traffic directly to the arterial system. Minor collectors typically carry lower traffic volumes directly from local access roads, or from less densely populated areas, and distribute the traffic to major collectors or directly to the arterial system.

*Local access roads* provide direct access to abutting land uses and carry traffic to the collector/arterial system. Local roads typically carry low volumes of traffic, travelling at low speeds. Because of the generalized level of analysis provided in a comprehensive plan, the inventory for the transportation element does not present traffic data on all local roads, only those carrying higher volumes or linking significant collectors.

The existing roadway transportation facilities serving urban and rural areas of Jefferson County consist of principal and minor arterials, major and minor collectors, and local neighborhood streets. The County's existing roadway network and functional classification is depicted in the map sheets in **Figure 10-1**.

At present, 35 percent of the County's road system is classified as major or minor collectors. Functional classifications of individual roadways within Jefferson County are presented in **Table 10-1**. US 101, and State Routes 20 and 104 are classified as principal arterials and SR 19 as a minor arterial. SR 116 is classified as a major collector.

US 101, SR 20, and SR 104 in Jefferson County are designated as tourist corridors by the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization's County's Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP, which is updated annually, is available from the Jefferson County Public Works Department.

### **Intergovernmental Coordination**

The Growth Management Act requires that comprehensive plans, including the Transportation Element, be prepared through a process that includes not only public participation but also intergovernmental

coordination. The development of the 1998 Jefferson County Transportation Element included coordination with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO), City of Port Townsend, Port of Port Townsend, Jefferson Transit, and Community Planning Groups.

#### **Washington State Department of Transportation**

The development of the 1998 Transportation Element included coordination with the Washington State Department of Transportation regarding existing conditions, forecasting methods and future recommendations. The development of the Transportation Element was coordinated with the data and recommendations included in the State Highway System Plan Element of the Statewide Multi-modal Transportation Plan. Jefferson County has continued this coordination with WSDOT through its participation in the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization.

The Transportation Element does not include specific recommendations for Washington State Ferry service needs or improvements.

#### **Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization**

The Transportation Element was developed in coordination with the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO) which coordinates transportation planning activities for the Olympic and Kitsap Peninsulas. The PRTPO provides for cooperative decisionmaking by the agencies within the region in order to bring about a continuous and cooperative planning process. Jefferson County has been a regular and active participant of the PRTPO.

The PRTPO membership consists of representatives from all four counties, cities, tribal nations, public transportation providers, ports, National Park Service, major employers and private citizens on the northern Olympic and Kitsap Peninsulas. Jefferson County's representation in this regional organization includes staff members responsible for the preparation of the Transportation Element. This dual role by staff allows for continuous coordination of work between the development of the Transportation Element and the Regional Plan. The analysis performed is similar, uses much of the same background data and is reviewed by staff for both regional and local impacts. The recommendations of both plans are reviewed for possible contradictions and coordinated to address the needs of both organizations. The Transportation Element is consistent with the requirements, goals, and implementation of the PRT Plan.

#### **Port of Port Townsend**

Information was obtained from the Port regarding local airport and marine facilities. Road improvement projects will be coordinated with the Port's future plans. The Transportation Element does not include specific recommendations for airport and Port-owned marine facility improvements. That responsibility has been left to the Port of Port Townsend.

#### **Jefferson Transit**

Jefferson Transit was consulted during the development of this Element and provided input and review of the transit related portions of this Element. In particular, the goals and policies regarding transit facilities, usage and level of service were developed with the active participation of Jefferson Transit. Therefore the goals and policies are consistent with Transit's comprehensive plan. A Jefferson Transit representative also serves on the PRTPO Technical Advisory Committee.

**CRITERIA USED IN TRANSPORTATION DECISIONS**

The County evaluates several factors when deciding which transportation improvements should be undertaken. These factors include whether the roadway meets the adopted level of service (LOS) standard, identified operational and safety factors, and the County's transportation goals and policies.

**Level of Service Standards**

Level of service (LOS) is a multi-dimensional measurement of the quality of service provided by the existing transportation system. The concept of LOS has traditionally been used in transportation planning and engineering to describe an actual or expected operating condition for a road. A lower LOS implies worsening conditions, either as perceived by the traveler, or as a measure of efficient movement. LOS is the desired minimal operational condition for a facility, something against which actual conditions can be assessed. By applying LOS standards and then monitoring the actual LOS, a jurisdiction can implement a system for establishing traffic flow objectives, prioritizing transportation projects and funding, and directing growth of the transportation network.

LOS can be described by one or more factors, such as travel times, levels of congestion, volume of use compared to system capacity, frequency of service, comfort and convenience, or safety. LOS measurements can address other modes of transportation including transit or bicycles. The Growth Management Act requires the establishment of a level of service standard as a gauge for evaluating the performance of the existing transportation network, including roads and transit. LOS is also used to determine whether transportation improvements or transportation services will be made available to serve proposed development.

**Vehicular Traffic - Level of Service**

For roadways, LOS is typically described in terms of congestion, which may be measured by average travel speed or vehicular density. **Table 10-1** provides general definitions of LOS categories typically used by traffic engineers for roadways. Six levels of service are defined from A to F with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F the worst.

Jefferson County’s adopted level of service standards are consistent with the standards established by the PRTPO and the Washington State Department of Transportation. These standards are as follows:

Rural Roads	(roads outside an urban boundary line)	= LOS C
Urban Roads	(roads within an urban boundary line)	= LOS D
Master Planned Resort Roads	(roads within an MPR boundary line)	= LOS D
HSS/Tourist Corridors	(rural corridors carrying an urban level of traffic)	= LOS D

The LOS standards adopted in this plan for County Road and State Route segments as well as the existing Average Daily Trips (ADT) and the maximum ADT for the LOS standard are shown in **Table 10-6**.

Currently, all County roadways are operating at, or above, the established LOS standards. Figure 10-5 depicts these existing traffic volumes and LOS standards on map sheets showing the County road network.

Some State Route segments are currently operating below their adopted LOS. These include SR 19 (Center Road to SR 20) and SR 20 (SR 19 to Mill Road).

**Table 10-1  
Level of Service Definitions - Roadways**

Level of Service Category	Definition
Level of Service A	Describes a condition of free flow with low volumes and high speeds. Freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely high. Stopped delay at intersections is minimal.
Level of Service B	Represents reasonably unimpeded traffic flow operations at average travel speeds. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted and stopped delays are not bothersome. Drivers are not generally subjected to appreciable tensions.
Level of Service C	In the range of stable flow, but speeds and maneuverability are more closely controlled by the higher volumes. The selection of speed is now significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream, and maneuvering within the traffic stream requires substantial vigilance on the part of the user. The general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.
Level of Service D	Represents high-density, but stable flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level.
Level of Service E	Represents operating conditions at or near the maximum capacity level. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely difficult, and it is generally accomplished by forcing a vehicle or pedestrian to "give way" to accommodate such maneuvers. Comfort and convenience levels are extremely poor, and driver or pedestrian frustration is generally high. Operations at this level are usually unstable, because small increases in flow or minor disturbances within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns.
Level of Service F	Describes forced or breakdown flow, where volumes are above theoretical capacity. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount which can traverse the point. Queues form behind such locations, and operations within the queue are characterized by stop-and-go waves which are extremely unstable. Vehicles may progress at reasonable speeds for several hundred feet or more, then be required to stop in a cyclic fashion.

Source: Transportation Research Board, Highway Capacity Manual 2000

## **Transit - Level of Service**

For transit level of service, Jefferson County worked with Jefferson Transit to establish a level of service standard. This standard, detailed in Transportation Policy TRN 2.3, establishes a minimum level of service based on Annual Transit Revenue 2003-04 Service Hours (ATRSH) for fixed routes in unincorporated Jefferson County. The actual standard as described in Transportation Policy TRN 2.5 calls for providing a minimum of 8,400 ATRSH. ATRSH is defined as the total number of hours the transit service is used on fare-producing fixed routes for one year. For example, a fixed fare route takes 3 hours per round trip and makes the trip 3 times a day for 5 days a week. The ATRSH for this route would be calculated as follows: 3 hours x 3 trips x 5 days x 52 weeks = 2,340 ATRSH. All routes added together provide the system total.

Jefferson County has also estimated a conversion between ATRSH and population. This conversion is provided only as a planning guideline and is not intended to be a fixed measurement of service. By linking population to ATRSH, a guideline of ATRSH per person can be determined. Using recent population estimates, 0.270 ATRSH per capita (270 ATRSH per 1,000 population) can be applied as a current service provision guide.

In contrast, the PRTPO transit level of service is based on the type and frequency of service between activity centers. To coordinate the Jefferson Transit service transit standard with the regional service

## **Concurrency**

### **Background**

Concurrency is one of the requirements of Washington's Growth Management Act. Concurrency occurs when public facilities or services needed to accommodate growth and development are provided at the time that development occurs. Transportation concurrency is intended to ensure that transportation facilities are available to accommodate expected traffic increases resulting from development. This will ensure orderly growth and development and avoid significant transportation impacts such as unacceptable levels of congestion. Achieving concurrency may require transportation improvements ranging from constructing physical improvements (e.g., wider travel lanes or shoulders, additional travel lanes, intersection improvements, or traffic signals) to implementing travel demand management techniques (e.g., improved transit service, rideshare programs, or staggered shift times for larger employers).

Coordinating transportation planning and capital facility planning is an essential part of implementing concurrency. This requires maintaining an inventory of existing transportation facilities and their level of service, forecasting traffic growth particularly in areas designated for intense growth and development, projecting necessary improvements and their cost, identifying revenue sources to fund those improvements, and prioritizing improvements in the County's Six-Year Transportation Improvements Program. Achieving concurrency may require contributions from developers that are commensurate with the transportation impacts generated by their project. This issue is discussed in more detail below under Issues.

### **House Bill 1487**

In 1998 the Washington State legislature introduced and passed House Bill (HB) 1487. This legislation addresses a number of issues relating to transportation and growth management planning. It calls for coordinated planning for major transportation facilities identified as "Transportation Facilities and Services of Statewide Significance (TFSSS)."

TFSSS are identified in Appendix D of the *Washington Transportation Plan* and include the interstate highway system, interregional state principal arterials including ferry connections that serve state-wide travel, intercity passenger rail service, intercity high-speed ground transportation, major passenger inter-modal terminals excluding all airport facilities and services, the freight railroad system, the Columbia / Snake navigable river system, marine port facilities and services that are related solely to marine activities affecting international and interstate trade, and high-capacity transportation systems serving regions as defined in RCW 81.104.015

The bill amends RCW 47.06. It requires the Washington State Transportation Commission to separate state highways into two categories—highways of statewide significance (HSS) and regionally significant highways (non-HSS). In a collaborative process with regional transportation planning organizations (RTPOs), the Commission and WSDOT developed criteria and designated the HSS and non-HSS parts of the highway system (RCW 47.05.021). The HSS routes are designated as part of TFSSS (interstates and state-owned interregional principal arterials). HSS routes in Jefferson County include: US 101, SR 19, SR 20, and SR 104.

The bill provides WSDOT with the authority to set level of service (LOS) standards on these Highways of Statewide Significance. WSDOT accomplishes this through consultation with the Peninsula RTPO. The amended GMA now explicitly exempts HSS routes from concurrency requirements except for counties consisting of islands whose only connection to the mainland are state highways or ferry routes (RCW 36.70A.070).

### *Issues*

Jefferson County is in an unusual situation because all of the roadways identified in the Transportation Element's analysis as requiring capacity improvements are State Routes and are, therefore, outside of the County's jurisdiction. At the same time, these State Routes form the bulk of the County's arterial system and are thus integral components of the transportation system within the County.

The development impact most commonly thought of when considering formation of a concurrency program is a decline in the roadway segment level of service. While Jefferson County does have needs associated with transportation facility safety, road shoulders, pedestrian facilities, and intersection capacity, the County is currently focusing primarily on resolving concurrency issues for the State Routes within the County that are forecast to exceed capacity. To address these concurrency matters, Jefferson County has been an active and regular participant in the development of the Peninsula Regional Transportation Plan and has met with the Washington State Department of Transportation. These questions are, as yet, not fully resolved and the County will continue discussions with the Washington State Department of Transportation.

The analysis of capacity-related concurrency has focused on equity. Two main issues have been identified. The first concerns State Routes and the regional traffic carried by those routes through local jurisdictions. The second concerns the scale of responsibility for achieving concurrency.

Increases in regional traffic flow, appropriately, should not be attributed to local development. Jefferson County has regarded the need to share the burden of concurrency between locally and regionally-generated traffic as an important point of discussion because State Routes provide both local and regional travel routes. As regional travel routes, State Routes within Jefferson County provide access to the Olympic Peninsula and the Pacific Ocean and, therefore, are important links in supporting the regional economy. At the same time, developers of projects that serve local needs should not be required to

mitigate declines in LOS that result from regional traffic growth. This is one reason Highways of State-wide Significance are exempt from local concurrency requirements.

There are also differences between roads that have the same functional classification, but serve a community or area differently. For example, SR 104 and SR 19 are both State Routes and principal arterials, but SR 104 does not serve adjacent needs to the extent that SR 19 does. Local development will affect mobility on SR 19 to a greater degree than SR 104. Maintaining through travel capacity on SR 104 is a higher priority than on SR 19. But as growth occurs within the Irondale-Port Hadlock UGA, the SR 19 corridor could become congested, unless appropriate improvements are made and access controls are implemented. A flexible concurrency management system should address these differences in character.

A second equity issue surrounding concurrency is the scale of responsibility -- is a small developer as responsible for mitigation of impacts as a large developer? The resolution of this question centers around the interpretation of the concurrency wording in the GMA. No single interpretation has been entirely agreed upon. These issues will be discussed further between the Washington State Department of Transportation and Jefferson County.

A strict translation of the law would place developers of all sizes equally responsible for impacts exceeding the LOS threshold. That is, a small developer whose project generated enough trips to exceed the threshold would be held equally responsible as a large developer. This potential inequity could be avoided by developing a concurrency management system that focuses on the proportion of impact. Implementing a proportionally based concurrency management system requires a more flexible interpretation of the GMA. This approach has been used in other communities. The more flexible approach can be implemented in coordination with implementing the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

### Conclusions

Jefferson County needs to coordinate the development of an equitable concurrency management system with the State. A flexible concurrency management system based on proportional impacts has been considered because it would be easier to implement and more equitable. This concurrency management system would be based on a review process similar to SEPA which would allow the system to be managed on the basis of significant concurrency impacts rather than a more strict "impact/no impact" approach.

Regulations would be required under either the strict or the flexible approach to concurrency. However, under the flexible approach, the regulations are guided by policies that identify when concurrency requirements should be implemented and focus on significant impacts requiring mitigation. The policies would identify the criteria to be used to determine when concurrency should be implemented. For example, a policy could state that concurrency mitigation should occur when a development contributes more than a particular percentage of the existing traffic volume to a roadway. On the other hand, policy could state that mitigation is required for all developments that contribute more than a set number of Average Annual Daily Trips (AADT) to the roadway system. Developments that generate less AADT than this would be considered to have no mitigation responsibility.

At the policy level, careful consideration regarding the utilization of adjacent land and direct access to highways should be made. For example, policies might aim to preserve through travel capacity as a priority along SR 19, due to high volumes passing through to Port Townsend and the impact that urban development within the Irondale-Port Hadlock UGA may have on the mobility of this roadway. Typical policies could address appropriate uses adjacent to SR 19 or access management.

The Transportation Element projects that no concurrency issues on County roads related to excess traffic volumes will occur during the planning period. However, other issues relating to safety, road shoulders, pedestrian facilities, and intersection capacity may arise. These issues should be considered, consistent policies should be developed, and an appropriate concurrency management program should be implemented.

### **Transportation Demand Management Strategies**

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies promote travel efficiency and energy conservation while reducing the adverse environmental impacts of the transportation system. In addition, TDM strategies lessen the need for additional capacity improvements by decreasing dependence on single-occupancy vehicle use and preserving capacity on existing roadways. The additional capacity created throughout the County's transportation system can reduce the need for improvements. These strategies can include commute trip reduction and demand and system management strategies, telecommuting, non-motorized travel, site design standards, ridesharing, encouraging commercial and freight shipping during off-peak hours, staggered shift times, flexible work schedules and public transportation.

These strategies are typically achieved through employer-based programs with technical assistance available from WSDOT. The Department of Transportation also provides incentives to individual employers willing to provide a financial benefit to employees for reducing drive-alone commuting. The County should recognize and financially support efforts to advance TDM techniques by funding research, planning and public information towards implementing these strategies.

### **Safety, Maintenance and Preservation**

Safety programs seek to reduce the frequency and severity of traffic accidents through identification of high accident locations, corridors or elements. Maintenance and preservation practices protect the transportation infrastructure through regular repairs as well as responding to emergency situations such as mudslides or flooding.

### **EXISTING CONDITIONS**

Jefferson County's current transportation system is divided into two main categories: motorized and non-motorized. The motorized transportation system includes all automobile and transit travel and freight traffic, as well as some motorized transportation modes that travel on off-road routes (e.g., air and waterborne freight). The non-motorized transportation system includes both on-road and off-road modes for pedestrian and bicycle travel. The non-motorized transportation system is described in detail in the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.

This section also discusses accident data, weather-related traffic hazard areas, and emergency service routes.

## **Motorized Transportation System - Vehicular**

A description of the motorized transportation system in Jefferson County begins with an overview of the roadway functional classification system. This system is a hierarchy of roadway types. Each type is described by standards that guide the road's design, use, and travel volumes.

### **Roadway Functional Classification**

Roadways are categorized according to their role and use in carrying vehicles. The categorization is a hierarchy of roadways ranging from principal and minor arterials and major and minor collectors to local access roads and streets. The different categories vary in their ability to carry traffic for long distances, and in their ability to provide access to land uses.

Principal arterials provide the most mobility. They provide for regional and inter-regional travel, typically carrying large volumes of through traffic, with limited direct access to abutting properties.

Minor arterials compliment and support the principal arterial systems. They provide more access to adjacent land uses, but still function primarily to link destination points. Minor arterials tend to link intra-city destinations instead of inter-regional.

Collectors provide more access to adjacent land uses than arterials, but they do not provide the full access that local streets provide. These roads collect and distribute traffic between neighborhoods and business areas, and the rest of the arterial system. They provide for easy and direct access to abutting properties and carry low to moderate volumes of traffic. Major collectors are those collectors that carry higher volumes of traffic directly to the arterial system. Minor collectors typically carry lower traffic volumes directly from local access roads or from less densely populated areas and distribute the traffic to major collectors or directly to the arterial system.

Local access roads provide direct access to abutting land uses and carry traffic to the collector/arterial system. Local access roads typically carry low volumes of traffic, at low speeds. Because of the generalized level of analysis provided in a comprehensive plan, the inventory for the transportation element does not present traffic data on all local roads, only those carrying higher volumes or linking significant collectors.

The County's road network and functional classifications are depicted in **Figure 10-1 Functional Classification**. Functional classifications for State Routes, County collectors and selected local access roads are shown in **Table 10-2 Functional Classification of Roads**.

State Routes, roads owned and operated by the Washington State Department of Transportation, provide for regional and interregional travel. State routes within the County are US 101 and State Routes 19, 20, 104, and 116. They are classified according to how they function, for example, as principal or minor arterials or collectors. US 101, and State Routes 19, 20 and 104 are classified as principal arterials. SR 116 is classified as a major collector.

SR 19 was recently designated as a Highway of Statewide Significance (HSS) and its functional classification was changed from a minor arterial to a principal arterial. This change reflects the highway's increasing importance within the region as an HSS route that links SR 104 to Port Townsend. 2.2 million tourists visit the Port Townsend area every year with approximately 50% accessing the area by way of SR 19. Although SR 19 currently serves adjacent needs (direct access) more readily than other principal arterials, unfavorable restrictions to mobility that may develop through this corridor should be avoided.

~~Tourist corridors were identified by the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization using a set of criteria. These criteria require that PRTPO Technical Advisory committee members agree that such corridors serve as a primary conduit providing access to and from tourist attractions. In addition, full WSDOT design standards apply to these identified "tourist corridors" which should include a minimum of 8 foot shoulders. However, a modified design level may apply based on a corridor or project specific basis. Road segments along tourist corridors not meeting these design standards were listed as deficient and improvement projects were recommended.~~

~~Most of the County's roadways have minimal gravel shoulders except in locations bordering suburban development, shopping centers, and various other public facilities. In these more developed areas, roadways tend to include paved shoulders and/or sidewalks in addition to an upgraded roadway cross section. The County will develop a plan to upgrade has designated US 101, SR 20, and SR 104 in Jefferson County as tourist corridors, using criteria developed by the RTPO. These criteria require that PRTPO Technical Advisory Committee members agree that such corridors serve as a primary conduit providing access to and from tourist attractions. In addition, full WSDOT design standards apply to these identified "tourist corridors" which include a minimum of 8 feet wide shoulders. However, a modified design level may apply based on a corridor or project specific basis. Road segments along tourist corridors not meeting these design standards were listed as deficient and improvement projects were recommended.~~

~~roadways to meet current standards.~~

~~The County Road inventory consists of 395.85 miles of County Roads: Major Rural Collectors = 34.66 miles; Minor Rural Collectors = 101.65 miles; Local Rural Access = 249.12 miles; Urban Collectors = 1.54 miles; and Urban Access = 8.88 miles. There are also 26 County-owned bridges. This inventory does not include City of Port Townsend streets. The County maintains 390 miles of roads and 24 bridges. Approximately 30 to 40 miles of road are resurfaced annually, and State Routes. All roadways and bridges maintained by the County are evaluated and ranked for inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program, as funding becomes available.~~

~~Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), as funding becomes available. The County resurfaces approximately 30 to 40 miles of road annually.~~

~~Figure 10-1~~ ~~1~~

|

| **Figure 10-1** \_\_\_\_\_ **2**

~~Figure 10-1~~ ~~3~~

|

| ~~Figure 10-1~~ ~~4~~

~~Figure 10-1~~ ~~5~~

|

| **Figure 10-1** — **6**

~~Figure 10-1~~ ~~7~~

**Table 10-1**

Road design standards are based on a roadway’s function and use as determined by the Federal Functional Classification System. There are numerous County Roads that are classified as rural local access roads that, in fact, function as collectors. They provide access to commercial and industrial developments and to dense residential neighborhoods. Generally, roads classified as rural local access are not eligible for grant funding. Since only limited local road funds are available, improvements to these roads are not typically funded and collector road standards are not applied when improvement are made.

In order to provide needed improvements to these roads and ensure that appropriate standards are applied, a local functional classification system could be developed that recognizes these distinctions. Such a system could create additional classifications such as Residential Neighborhood Collector and Commercial and Industrial Area Local Collector.

**Functional Classification of Roads  
Jefferson County**

Principal Arterial	Minor Arterial	Major Collector	Minor Collector	Local Access
Hwy 101 SR 20 SR 104	SR 19 (Airport Cut-off/Rhody Dr/Beaver Valley Rd)	Center Rd Chimacum Rd Irontdale Rd Quinault S. Shore Rd SR 116 (Ness' Corner Rd/Oak Bay Rd/Flagler Rd) Upper Hoh Rd	Anderson Lake Rd Bee Mill Rd Cape George Rd Clearwater Rd Cook Ave Extension Coyle Rd Dabob P.O. Rd Dabob Rd Dosewallips Rd Duckabush Rd E. Quileene Rd Eaglemount Rd Four Corners Rd Hastings Ave W Hazel Point Rd Larson Lake Rd Oak Bay Rd Paradise Bay Rd Penny Creek Rd Point Whitney Rd S. Discovery Rd South Point Rd Thorndyke Rd	Carrol Ave Cedar Ave E. Marrowstone Rd E. Maude St Egg and I Rd Gardiner Beach Rd Glen Cove Rd Hoh Village Rd Kala Pt. Dr Leland Valley Rd W Lindsey Hill Rd Linger Longer Rd Lords Lake Loop Lower Hadlock Rd Mason St Mill Rd Oil City Rd North Otto St Osprey Ridge Dr Patison St Pioneer Dr Prospect Ave Queets River Rd Robbins Rd S. Jacob Miller Rd Sandy Shore Rd Seamont Dr Shine Rd Snow Creek Rd Swansonville Rd Teal Lake Rd Thomas Dr Thomas St Walker Way W Uneas Rd W Valley Rd Zelatched Point Rd

				<del>5th Ave</del> <del>7th Ave</del> <del>S 8th St</del> <del>S 7th Ave</del>
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

~~Source: Berryman & Henigar.~~

~~**Accident Data**~~

~~Table 10-2 provides a listing of the corridors within Jefferson County (including State and County roadways) which have experienced a high rate of accidents. The table is organized by corridor and details the number of accidents along that corridor, by year.~~

**Table 10-2  
Jefferson County Transportation Network  
Traffic Accidents by Location**

Roadway	Owner	From-To	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
SR-20	State	Milepost 00.00-12.56	N/A	34	47	43	N/A	N/A	55	53	68	53
SR-104	State	Milepost 00.00-14.67	N/A	43	65	47	N/A	N/A	61	44	64	39
SR-104	State	Milepost 143.98-184.62	N/A	32	41	35	N/A	N/A	36	32	33	30
SR-104	State	Milepost 274.65-314.01	N/A	88	101	97	N/A	N/A	87	80	68	81
Airport Cut-off (SR-19)	State	Milepost 11.88-14.20	7	3	13	5	5	2	N/A	N/A	6	15
Beaver Valley Rd (SR-19)	State	Milepost 0.00-9.10	18	22	18	16	18	2	20	18	18	30
Cape George Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-7.52	3	4	8	4	8	6	5	7	12	5
Center Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-14.98	13	9	10	8	15	7	13	12	16	16
Chimacum Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-1.57	0	3	1	4	0	6	0	0	1	0
Coyle Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-14.17	5	6	5	3	3	5	5	3	1	4
Flagler Rd (SR-116)	State	Milepost 1.98-9.83	3	8	8	8	4	3	10	5	6	4
Four Corners Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-1.33	3	0	3	6	2	3	2	1	2	3
Irondale Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-1.93	7	3	4	7	6	5	2	2	6	5
Ness' Corner Rd (SR-116)	State	Milepost 0.00-1.12	5	2	2	6	6	N/A	3	6	4	10
Oak Bay Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-10.80	17	16	18	17	12	7	13	13	21	15
Paradise Bay Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-6.00	4	9	7	16	11	1	10	7	8	4
Rhody Dr (SR-19)	State	Milepost 9.10-11.88	3	11	8	11	8	3	N/A	N/A	10	15
S Jacob Miller Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-2.00	1	1	3	3	3	2	1	1	3	2
Swansonville Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-3.21	0	2	1	1	4	1	0	3	0	1
S Discovery Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-4.81	5	11	6	6	8	6	9	2	2	5
Thorndyke Rd	County	Milepost 0.00-8.52	3	2	2	3	2	3	6	0	5	3

N/A = Not Available  
Source: Berryman & Henigar.

### *Weather-Related Traffic Hazards*

Inelement weather affects driving conditions, contributes to accidents, and can damage the roadways. High elevation roads, such as Dosewallips and Duckabush Roads, are subject to frost conditions. During periods of thawing, the Public Works Department installs signs informing travelers of load-limit restrictions due to freeze/thaw conditions. Some roadway segments require sanding during winter conditions, including Irondale Road (dip); Flagler Road/Oak Bay Road intersection; SR 19 Beaver Valley Road/Center Road/Chimacum intersection; Walker Mountain above 700 feet elevation; Dosewallips and Duckabush River Roads; and several roads in the Brinnon area. In addition, some roads are subject to flooding and washout during storm events, such as the Oil City Road, Quinault South Shore Road, and Upper Hoh Road. In the last twelve or so years, the Upper Hoh Road has experienced severe flooding/washout damage and has been totally closed on several occasions due to the impacts of severe weather.

### *Emergency Service Routes and Facilities*

During emergencies or disasters, the highway system is crucial to evacuation and to the delivery of supplies. The County has developed an Emergency Management Plan (September 1996) that addresses transportation issues and needs.

The Emergency Management Plan provides for actions to be taken in the event that certain transportation systems become disabled, and requires the cooperation of various County departments, police and sheriff's departments, the City of Port Townsend, Jefferson Transit, school districts, and the State of Washington. Major routes of travel in the County include northbound on SR 101; westbound on SR 104; northbound on Center Road, SR 19 Beaver Valley Road/Rhody Drive/Airport Cutoff Road), and eastbound on SR 116 (Ness's Corner Road, portion of Oak Bay Road/Flagler Road).

Fire trucks, sheriff's vehicles and ambulances must also be considered as part of the evaluation of emergency service routes. These vehicles must be able to respond to emergencies as quickly as possible. Access to roadways by emergency vehicles as they leave the station, as well as the road conditions on the way to the emergency, are both safety concerns. Potential safety hazard locations include the Chimacum Fire District access to SR 19 (Rhody Drive) and Fire District 6 access to SR 19 (Airport Cutoff Road). Chimacum Fire District has requested a fire signal from the Washington State Department of Transportation.

### *Public Transit*

Jefferson Transit was created in 1981 to provide transportation services primarily to transit-dependent persons. Jefferson Transit Service serves Port Townsend and Jefferson County with additional service to Sequim and Poulsbo. Transfers are available between the City and County bus routes. Adjoining transit systems include Island Transit, Kitsap Transit (from Route 7), Clallam Transit (from Route 8), Mason Transit (from Route 1) and Grays Harbor Transit (West Jefferson Transit service connecting Forks and Amanda Park along the Pacific Coast). Bicycle racks are available on all Jefferson Transit routes. **Table 10-3** describes the destinations, passenger trips, and ridership per service hour for August 1996. Major transit routes are depicted in **Figure 10-2**.

**Table 10-3  
Jefferson Transit Routes: Ridership—January 1998**

<b>Route</b>	<b>Route Number</b>	<b>Passenger Trips</b>	<b>Riders/Service Hour (January 1998)</b>
Brinnon	1	1,809	10.19
Shuttle (serving Port Townsend: Water St at Quincy/Sheridan at Hastings, etc.)	3	5,445	32.49
Shuttle (serving Port Townsend: Water St at Quincy/Sheridan at Hastings, etc.) (Saturday)	3S	1,033	31.98
Shuttle (serving Port Townsend: Water St at Quincy/Sheridan at Hastings, etc.) (Sunday)	3U	544	23.86
North Beach	4	774	8.19
North Beach (Saturday)	4S	162	9.00
North Beach (Sunday)	4U	126	8.75
Fort Worden	5	605	6.21
Fort Worden (Saturday)	5S	141	8.39
Fort Worden (Sunday)	5U	103	7.66
Landfill Shuttle	6	397	9.46
Kitsap/Seattle	7	1,921	8.78
Kitsap/Silverdale (Saturday)	7S	258	10.42
Kitsap/Silverdale (Sunday)	7U	95	9.65
Sequim	8	2,018	10.02
Sequim (Saturday)	8S	184	9.53
Tri-Area	9	1,825	12.80
Transit (fixed route)		17,440	13.28
West Jefferson (fixed route—transit service between Forks and Amanda Park)		902	3.71
Dial-A-Ride		1,927	2.90
Other (Specials, Vanpool, Community Van)		1,734	N/A
<b>TOTAL RIDERS</b>		<b>22,003</b>	

N/A—Not applicable.  
Source: Jefferson Transit, 1998.

## *Air, Waterborne, & Freight Travel*

### *Airports*

The Jefferson County International Airpoorteovers approximately 240 acres, of which 40 acres are reserved for runway and 22 acres for aviation related industry. **Figure 10-3** depicts airport and port locations.

In 1992, the airport recorded 43,000 take offs and landings. In 1994, the Port completed a master plan for the airport that was accepted by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The Port of Port Townsend recently received a \$1 million grant from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to rehabilitate existing taxiways; construct additional taxiways, taxi lanes, and hangar pads; and to extend the runway apron. In order to coordinate their planning with the mandates of the Growth Management Act, the Port is currently working on a subarea plan for the immediate airport area. The plan is intended to minimize future conflicts between airport activities and other land uses.

### *Ferry Service*

Ferry service is provided by the Washington State Ferry System (WSF) to Whidbey Island via the Port Townsend/ Keystone ferry route, and to the greater Puget Sound through Kitsap County via the Kingston/Edmonds, Bainbridge Island/Seattle, Bremerton/Seattle, and Southworth/Vashon/ Fauntleroy routes. The ferry service can accommodate automobiles, pedestrians, bicyclists, kayaks, and canoes. A private carrier, Puget Sound Express, provides passenger-only service between Port Townsend and the San Juan Islands.

WSF service at Port Townsend is provided by two Steel Electric Class ferries. Schedules vary according to the season, with fewer crossings during the winter months. Service between Port Townsend and Keystone, in general, begins at 7:00 a.m., with the last ferry leaving Keystone at 9:30 p.m. Special fares are available for authorized vanpools containing seven or more regular passengers. Special fares are also available to disabled passengers; however, not all terminals and vessels are wheelchair accessible. The ferry system supports a tourism loop that runs through the North Cascades Highway. The system brings visitors to the City of Port Townsend and experiences overloads, particularly on weekends and holidays during summer months.

Development of additional passenger-only runs from Port Townsend to areas within greater Puget Sound is an option. Expanded ferry service would potentially increase commerce within the city, but may also result in higher seasonal or permanent populations.

### *Freight Travel*

There are three basic forms of freight travel in Jefferson County: truck, waterborne (shipping and ferry) and air. Trucking is the predominant mode of freight transportation. Most of the total westbound truck freight is carried over the Hood Canal Bridge, towards Port Townsend, or up US 101 through Shelton.

| ~~Figure 10-2—Transit Routes~~

**Figure 10-3**  
**Airports and Ports**

~~Washington State Ferries are also a part of the freight transport system in the County, carrying commercial trucks from East Puget Sound via Keystone to Port Townsend. Port Townsend Paper Corporation also owns a 600-foot dock that can accommodate large ocean-going vessels. Due to shallow waters, ships cannot leave fully loaded. The Port Townsend Paper Corporation generates more than 40 in-bound trucks per day. In-bound freight consists primarily of raw materials such as wood chips, and outbound trucking freight is paper goods. Most air freight is handled at Fairchild International Airport in Port Angeles. Regularly scheduled commercial air service is provided by Horizon Airlines, Federal Express, United Parcel Service, and Pony Express Air Service. Port locations are depicted in **Figure 10-3**, along with airport locations.~~

~~Freight travel can have impacts on County roadways and roadway needs. The heavy weight of trucks breaks down pavement structure and is a significant factor in the need for maintenance of roadways. Road characteristics such as width, alignment, and sight distance on some roads may be inappropriate for trucks.~~

### **Nonmotorized Transportation System**

~~(This section was revised in conjunction with the adoption of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan in 2002.)~~

#### ***Pedestrian Circulation and Bicycle Facilities***

~~Given the rural nature of Jefferson County, travel occurs predominantly by motorized vehicle. However, bicycle and pedestrian circulation are important transportation modes that are used by County residents. More residents would likely use non-motorized transportation modes if adequate and more extensive facilities were available. Many County roads lack adequate shoulders that would make bicycling and walking safer and more enjoyable. Pedestrian facilities including sidewalks and walking paths would improve conditions for walking to school and in densely developed areas such as Port Hadlock. Off-road trails would provide alternative routes for non-motorized travel.~~

~~In order to fulfill policies and action items of the Transportation Element and develop a systematic approach for providing additional non-motorized transportation facilities, the Public Works Department conducted a non-motorized transportation and trails planning process during 2001 and 2002. A Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan was developed in conjunction with an update of the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan.~~

~~The planning process began with a series of public workshops that were held in communities throughout Jefferson County. An inventory of existing non-motorized transportation and trails facilities was compiled, as well as a vision of the facilities that County residents would like to have. This vision included providing a system of on-road and off-road bicycle and pedestrian facilities linking communities, commercial and employment centers, schools, and recreational areas and developing the Olympic Discovery Trail from the end of the Larry Scott Trail at Four Corners to Clallam County.~~

~~Many of the County's roadways have minimal, gravel shoulders except in limited locations bordering suburban development, commercial areas, and various public facilities. In these more developed areas, some roadways have paved shoulders and/or sidewalks in addition to an upgraded roadway cross section. The County also has a large number of roads with unimproved, gravel surfaces. The County's Transportation Improvement Plan includes a program to upgrade these road by chip sealing them.~~

**Figure 10-1 Functional Classification – County Base Map**

**Figure 10-1a Functional Classification – East County**

**Figure 10-1b Functional Classification – West End**

**Table 10-2**  
**Functional Classification of Roads**  
**Jefferson County**

<u>Principal Arterial</u>	<u>Minor Arterial</u>	<u>Major Collector</u>	<u>Minor Collector</u>	<u>Local Access (Selected)</u>
<u>Hwy 101</u> <u>SR 20</u> <u>SR 104</u> <u>SR 19</u>		<u>Center Rd</u> <u>Chimacum Rd</u> <u>Irondale Rd</u> <u>Quinault-S. Shore Rd</u> <u>SR 116</u> <u>Upper Hoh Rd</u>	<u>Anderson Lake Rd</u> <u>Bee Mill Rd</u> <u>Cape George Rd</u> <u>Clearwater Rd</u> <u>Cook Ave Extension*</u> <u>Coyle Rd</u> <u>Dabob P.O. Rd</u> <u>Dabob Rd</u> <u>Dosewallips Rd</u> <u>Duckabush Rd</u> <u>E. Quilcene Rd</u> <u>Eaglemount Rd</u> <u>Four Corners Rd</u> <u>Hastings Ave W**</u> <u>Hazel Point Rd</u> <u>Larson Lake Rd</u> <u>Oak Bay Rd</u> <u>Paradise Bay Rd</u> <u>Penny Creek Rd</u> <u>Point Whitney Rd</u> <u>S. Discovery Rd**</u> <u>South Point Rd</u> <u>Thorndyke Rd</u>  <u>* Urban collector</u>  <u>** Segments adjacent to the City of Port Townsend are classified as urban collector.</u>	<u>Cedar Ave</u> <u>Egg and I Rd</u> <u>Fredericks Street</u> <u>Gardiner Beach Rd</u> <u>Glen Cove Rd</u> <u>Kala Pt. Dr</u> <u>Leland Valley Rd</u> <u>Lindsey Hill Rd</u> <u>Linger Longer Rd</u> <u>Lords Lake Loop</u> <u>Lower Hadlock Rd</u> <u>S. Jacob Miller Rd</u> <u>E. Marrowstone Rd</u> <u>Mason St</u> <u>E. Maude St</u> <u>Masonic Hall Rd</u> <u>Mill Rd</u> <u>Oil City Rd</u> <u>Old Fort Townsend Rd</u> <u>Osprey Ridge Dr</u> <u>N. Otto St</u> <u>Patison St</u> <u>Pioneer Dr</u> <u>Prospect Ave</u> <u>Queets River Rd</u> <u>Robbins Rd</u> <u>Sandy Shore Rd</u> <u>Seamount Dr</u> <u>Seton Road</u> <u>Shine Rd</u> <u>Snow Creek Rd</u> <u>Swansonville Rd</u> <u>Teal Lake Rd</u> <u>Thomas Dr</u> <u>Thomas St</u> <u>Walker Way</u> <u>West Valley Rd</u> <u>Woodland Drive</u> <u>W. Uncas Rd</u> <u>Zelatched Point Rd</u> <u>5th Ave</u> <u>7th Ave</u> <u>S 8th St</u> <u>S 7th Ave</u>

Based on Federal Functional Classification System

**Traffic Safety**

The goal of the transportation system is to move people and goods in a safe and efficient manner. Within any region, certain locations will have a higher incidence of accidents than others. **Table 10-3** lists accident rates for both County Roads and State Routes in Jefferson County.

**Table 10-3**  
**Jefferson County Transportation Network**  
**Traffic Accidents by Location**

<b>Roadway</b>	<b>Length</b>	<b>ADT*</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>
<u>Anderson Lake Rd</u>	<u>2.77 miles</u>	<u>1,822</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Cape George Road</u>	<u>7.55 miles</u>	<u>2,520</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Cedar Avenue</u>	<u>0.63 miles</u>	<u>1,937</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Center Road</u>	<u>15.01 miles</u>	<u>2,946</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Chimacum Road</u>	<u>1.57 miles</u>	<u>5,534</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Cook Avenue Ext.</u>	<u>0.62 miles</u>	<u>1,064</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Coyle Road</u>	<u>14.97 miles</u>	<u>371</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Dabob Road</u>	<u>5.23 miles</u>	<u>523</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>S. Discovery Rd</u>	<u>4.84 miles</u>	<u>4,013</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>Eaglemount Road</u>	<u>5.34 miles</u>	<u>431</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Four Corners Rd</u>	<u>1.29 miles</u>	<u>2,678</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Fredericks Street</u>	<u>0.22 miles</u>	<u>1,279</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Hastings Avenue</u>	<u>2.80 miles</u>	<u>2,367</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Upper Hoh Road</u>	<u>12.04 miles</u>	<u>455</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Irondale Road</u>	<u>1.93 miles</u>	<u>4,276</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>S. Jacob Miller Rd</u>	<u>2.00 miles</u>	<u>2,023</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Larson Lake Road</u>	<u>4.06 miles</u>	<u>375</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Leland Valley Rd W</u>	<u>4.13 miles</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Linger Longer Road</u>	<u>1.71 miles</u>	<u>875</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Mason – Thomas – Patison Streets</u>	<u>0.83 miles</u>	<u>898</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Mill Road</u>	<u>0.77 miles</u>	<u>1,682</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Oak Bay Road</u>	<u>9.94 miles</u>	<u>3,674</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>Oil City Road</u>	<u>10.98 miles</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Paradise Bay Rd</u>	<u>6.00 miles</u>	<u>3,734</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>Prospect Avenue</u>	<u>1.38 miles</u>	<u>2,409</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>East Quilcene Road</u>	<u>4.43 miles</u>	<u>218</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Seton Road</u>	<u>0.23 miles</u>	<u>1,379</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>South Point Road</u>	<u>3.05 miles</u>	<u>1,101</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Swansonville Rd</u>	<u>3.21 miles</u>	<u>1,016</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Teal Lake Road</u>	<u>3.46 miles</u>	<u>1,754</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Thorndyke Road</u>	<u>8.52 miles</u>	<u>800</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>West Valley Road</u>	<u>5.56 miles</u>	<u>884</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>

N/A – Not Available

\*ADT - On roads with multiple segments, the highest ADT was used

<u>Roadway</u>	<u>Milepost</u>	<u>ADT*</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>
SR 19	MP 0.00 – 9.10	6,600	N/A	N/A	20	20	22	24
SR 19	MP 9.10 – 11.88	12,470	N/A	N/A	8	15	10	18
SR 19	MP 11.88 – 14.09	16,900	N/A	N/A	8	8	11	8
SR 20	MP 0.00-7.79	4,400	N/A	N/A	22	24	22	15
SR 20	MP 7.79-9.78	16,000	N/A	N/A	11	4	4	3
US 101	MP 143.98-184.62	1,400	N/A	N/A	25	28	26	28
US 101	MP 274.63-314.01	11,000	N/A	N/A	56	82	80	95
SR 104	MP 0.20-14.67	17,000	N/A	N/A	48	62	31	41
SR 116	MP 0.00-1.98	7,100	N/A	N/A	5	3	4	9
SR 116	MP 1.98-9.83	2,900	N/A	N/A	5	5	11	5

To obtain a better understanding of the accident and safety characteristics of Jefferson County, accident data for State Route segments identified in **Table 10-3** was used to calculate Average Accident Rates. This rate is based on millions of vehicle miles traveled on each segment and ADT. This rate is easily comparable to statewide averages and State Routes with similar characteristics to Jefferson County. The Average Accident Rate for 2000-2003 is presented in **Table 10-4**.

**Table 10-4**  
**Average Accident Rate 2000-2003**

<u>Roadway</u>	<u>Milepost</u>	<u>ADT</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>Average Accident Rate 2000-2003*</u>
SR 19	MP 0.00 – 9.10	6,600	20	20	22	24	0.98
SR 19	MP 9.10 – 11.88	12,470	8	15	10	18	1.01
SR 19	MP 11.88 – 14.09	16,900	8	8	11	8	0.64
SR 20	MP 0.00-7.79	4,400	22	24	22	15	1.66
SR 20	MP 7.79-9.78	16,000	11	4	4	3	0.45
US 101	MP 143.98-184.62	1,400	25	28	26	28	1.31
US 101	MP 274.63-314.01	11,000	56	82	80	95	0.49
SR 104	MP 0.20-14.67	17,000	48	62	31	41	0.51
SR 116	MP 0.00-1.98	7,100	5	3	4	9	1.02
SR 116	MP 1.98-9.83	2,900	5	5	11	5	0.78
<b>Average</b>							<b>0.89</b>

\*Accidents per million vehicle miles of travel

WSDOT compiles State Highway accident data for all 39 Counties in Washington. The average rate, on State Routes in Jefferson County, in 1996 was 1.39 accidents per million vehicle miles of travel. Statewide, in 1996, rural areas experienced an accident rate of 1.36 accidents per million vehicle miles of travel, with urban areas experiencing a higher rate of 2.24. Compared to statewide averages, Jefferson County currently experiences a relatively low number of accidents (0.89 per million vehicle miles of travel) along its highway system. Despite increases in population and the number of vehicles, the accident rate has decreased over the past eight years.

The accident data does not reveal the cause of accidents, it only indicates areas where further investigation of may be necessary. Further investigation at accident locations helps define the problem and appropriate solutions.

### **Weather-Related Traffic Hazards**

Inclement weather affects driving conditions, contributes to accidents, and can damage roadways. Higher elevation areas of some roads, such as Dosewallips and Duckabush Roads, are subject to freezing conditions. During periods of thawing, the Public Works Department installs signs informing travelers of load-limit restrictions, because heavy loads can damage the road structure. Some roadway segments require sanding during winter conditions, including Irondale Road, Flagler Road/Oak Bay Road intersection, SR 19 Beaver Valley Road/Center Road/Chimacum Road intersection, Walker Mountain above 700 feet elevation, Dosewallips and Duckabush River Roads, and several roads in the Brinnon area. In addition, some roads are subject to flooding and washouts during storm events. These include the Oil City Road, Quinault-South Shore Road, and Upper Hoh Road. In the past few years, the Upper Hoh Road has experienced severe flooding and washout damage and has been totally closed on several occasions.

### **Emergency Service Routes and Facilities**

During emergencies or disasters, the highway system is crucial for evacuation and the delivery of supplies. The County has developed an Emergency Management Plan (September 1996) that addresses transportation issues and needs.

The Emergency Management Plan provides for actions to be taken in the event that certain transportation systems become disabled. It requires the cooperation of various County departments, police and sheriff's departments, the City of Port Townsend, Jefferson Transit, school districts, and the State of Washington. Major routes of travel in the County include northbound on SR 101; westbound on SR 104; northbound on Center Road, SR 19, and eastbound on the Ness' Corner Road segment of SR 116.

Fire trucks, sheriff's vehicles and ambulances must also be considered as part of the evaluation of emergency service routes. These vehicles must be able to respond to emergencies as quickly as possible. Access to roadways by emergency vehicles, as they leave the station, as well as the road conditions on the way to the emergency, are both safety concerns. Potential safety hazard locations include the Fire District 1 access to SR 19 in Chimacum and the Fire District 6 access to SR 19 at Airport Road. Fire District 1 has requested a fire signal from the Washington State Department of Transportation.

### **Public Transit**

Jefferson Transit was created in 1981 to provide transportation services primarily to transit-dependent persons. Jefferson Transit provides service between Port Townsend and Jefferson County communities including Port Hadlock, Port Ludlow, Quilcene, and Brinnon with additional service to Sequim and Poulsbo. Jefferson Transit provides links to adjoining transit systems including Island Transit, Kitsap Transit (from Route 7), Clallam Transit (from Route 8), Mason Transit (from Route 1) and Grays Harbor Transit (West Jefferson Transit service connecting Forks and Amanda Park along the Pacific Coast). The link with Kitsap Transit provides Transit Service to the Washington State Ferry terminals in Bainbridge Island and Kingston. Bicycle racks are available on all Jefferson Transit routes. **Table 10-5** describes the destinations, passenger trips, and ridership per service hour for June 2004. Major transit routes are depicted in **Figure 10-2**.

**Table 10-5**  
**Jefferson Transit Routes: Ridership – June 2004**

<b>Route</b>	<b>Route Number</b>	<b>Passenger Trips</b>	<b>Passengers/Service Hour</b>
Brinnon (M-F)	<u>1</u>	<u>1,130</u>	<u>6.29</u>
Tri-Area Loop (M-F)	<u>6</u>	<u>2,415</u>	<u>13.23</u>
Tri-Area Loop (Sat)	<u>6</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>12.05</u>
Tri-Area Loop (Sun)	<u>6</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>6.93</u>
Poulsbo (M-F)	<u>7</u>	<u>2,031</u>	<u>7.09</u>
Poulsbo (Sat)	<u>7</u>	<u>94</u>	<u>6.33</u>
Poulsbo (Sun)	<u>7</u>	<u>101</u>	<u>4.91</u>
Sequim (M-F)	<u>8</u>	<u>1,758</u>	<u>7.53</u>
Sequim (Sat)	<u>8</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>4.67</u>
Downtown Shuttle (M-F)	<u>11</u>	<u>3,931</u>	<u>19.85</u>
Downtown Shuttle (Sat)	<u>11</u>	<u>447</u>	<u>19.87</u>
Downtown Shuttle (Sun)	<u>11</u>	<u>444</u>	<u>14.80</u>
North Beach/Fort Worden (M-F)	<u>12</u>	<u>1,890</u>	<u>8.59</u>
North Beach/Fort Worden (Sat)	<u>12</u>	<u>263</u>	<u>11.74</u>
North Beach Fort Worden (Sun)	<u>12</u>	<u>234</u>	<u>7.83</u>
Castle Hill (M-F)	<u>13</u>	<u>2,715</u>	<u>17.12</u>
Castle Hill (Sat)	<u>13</u>	<u>261</u>	<u>14.87</u>
Castle Hill (Sun)	<u>13</u>	<u>243</u>	<u>10.38</u>
West Jefferson (M-Sat)		<u>923</u>	<u>3.30</u>
<b>Fixed Route Total</b>		<b><u>19,098</u></b>	<b><u>9.80</u></b>
<b>Dial-A-Ride (M-Sun)</b>		<b><u>2,391</u></b>	<b><u>2.92</u></b>
<b>Other (Specials, Contracts, Vanpools)</b>		<b><u>2,481</u></b>	
<b>Total Passenger Trips</b>		<b><u>23,970</u></b>	

Source: Jefferson Transit, 2004.

### **Air, Waterborne, & Freight Travel**

#### **Airports**

The Jefferson County International Airport is owned and operated by the Port of Port Townsend. The airport covers approximately 240 acres, of which 40 acres are reserved for runway and 22 acres for aviation-related industry. **Figure 10-3** depicts airport and port locations. In 2003, there were approximately 47,500 take-offs and landings at the airport. The Port received a grant from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to rehabilitate existing taxiways; construct additional taxiways, taxi lanes, and hangar pads; and to extend the runway apron.

**Figure 10-2 Transit Routes**

In 2003, the Port adopted a Master Plan for the airport. In order to coordinate airport development under the Master Plan with the mandates of the Growth Management Act, the Port has proposed several 2004 Comprehensive Plan amendments including designating the airport and adjacent Port-owned property as an Essential Public Facility (EPF); changes related to the allowed and prohibited land uses within the Airport EPF; and establishing a future planning process by which limited, rural-scale light industrial uses would be allowed within the Airport EPF.

### *Ferry Service*

Ferry service is provided by the Washington State Ferry System (WSF) to Whidbey Island via the Port Townsend/ Keystone ferry route, and to the greater Puget Sound through Kitsap County via the Kingston/Edmonds, Bainbridge Island/Seattle, Bremerton/Seattle, and Southworth/Vashon/Fauntleroy routes. The ferry service can accommodate automobiles, pedestrians, bicyclists, kayaks, and canoes. A private carrier, Puget Sound Express, provides passenger-only service between Port Townsend and the San Juan Islands.

WSF service at Port Townsend is provided by two Steel Electric Class ferries. Schedules vary according to the season, with fewer crossings during the winter months. Service between Port Townsend and Keystone, in general, begins at 6:30 a.m., with the last ferry leaving Keystone at 9:15 p.m. Special fares are available for authorized vanpools containing seven or more regular passengers. Special fares are also available to disabled passengers; however, not all terminals and vessels are wheelchair accessible. The ferry system supports a tourism loop that runs through the North Cascades Highway. The system brings visitors to the City of Port Townsend and experiences overloads, particularly on weekends and holidays during summer months.

Development of additional passenger-only runs from Port Townsend to areas within greater Puget Sound is an option. Expanded ferry service would potentially increase commerce within the city, but may also result in higher seasonal or permanent populations.

### *Freight Travel*

There are three basic forms of freight travel in Jefferson County: truck, waterborne (shipping and ferry) and air. Trucking is the predominant mode of freight transportation. Most of the total westbound truck freight is carried over the Hood Canal Bridge, towards Port Townsend, or up US 101 through Shelton. Washington State Ferries are also a part of the freight transport system in the County, carrying commercial trucks from East Puget Sound via Keystone to Port Townsend. Port Townsend Paper Corporation also owns a 600-foot dock that can accommodate large ocean-going vessels. Due to shallow waters, ships cannot leave fully loaded. The Port Townsend Paper Corporation generates more than 40 in-bound trucks per day. In-bound freight consists primarily of raw materials such as wood chips, and outbound trucking freight is paper goods. Most air freight is handled at Fairchild International Airport in Port Angeles. Regularly scheduled commercial air service is provided by Horizon Airlines, Federal Express, United Parcel Service, and Pony Express Air Service. Port locations are depicted in **Figure 10-3**, along with airport locations.

Freight travel can have impacts on County roadways and roadway needs. The heavy weight of trucks breaks down pavement structure and is a significant factor in the need for maintenance of roadways. Road characteristics such as width, alignment, and sight distance on some roads may be inappropriate for trucks.

**Figure 10-3 Airports and Ports**



## **Non-motorized Transportation System**

### **Pedestrian Circulation and Bicycle Facilities**

Given the rural nature of Jefferson County, travel occurs predominantly by motorized vehicle. However, bicycle and pedestrian circulation are important transportation modes that are used by County residents. More residents would likely use non-motorized transportation modes if adequate and more extensive facilities were available. Many County roads lack adequate shoulders that would make bicycling and walking safer and more enjoyable. Pedestrian facilities including sidewalks and walking paths would improve conditions for walking to school and in densely developed areas such as Port Hadlock. Off-road trails would provide alternative routes for non-motorized travel.

In order to fulfill policies and action items of the Transportation Element and develop a systematic approach for providing additional non-motorized transportation facilities, The Public Works Department convened a Non-motorized Transportation Task Force to assist in developing goals and policies and facility design standards and prioritizing non-motorized transportation projects. A survey of County voters was conducted to determine opinions regarding project priorities and alternative funding sources. A Six Year Capital Facilities Plan was developed. The Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan was adopted as a stand-alone document during the 2002 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle. The Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan has a detailed inventory of non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities, goals and policies, design standards, a list of potential projects, discussion of alternative funding strategies, and alternative capital facilities plans.

Figure 10-4 depicts existing and proposed on-road bicycle routes identified in the Plan.

**Figure 10-4**  
**Multi-purpose Trails Trails**

The Plan noted the lack of a public trail system in the County and the need for a comprehensive trail system to meet the growing demand. The Parks Plan includes policies containing standards for development of new trails, including the need for trails to perform a transportation function and connect and serve schools, shopping areas, entertainment and recreation facilities, churches and places of employment. The Plan's action plan includes development of a master plan/inventory of existing and potential trails as part of a comprehensive trails plan. Plans also include an agreement with the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation to begin acquisition of trail properties to create the Larry Scott Memorial Park Trail and coordination between the Parks Department and Public Works Road Design Section to create safe conditions for bicycle pathways along County roads.

### **EXISTING ROADWAY DEFICIENCIES**

Jefferson County has developed three systems for use in evaluating deficiencies of transportation facilities (roadway segments, intersections, and bridges) and ranking them for improvement according to need. Two systems, Road Project Priority Programming System and Intersection Rating System, are used to determine what structural, design, or other characteristics may need revision to improve the functioning of the facility. The third system used by the County to evaluate in 2002 in conjunction with an update of the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan. The Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan has a detailed inventory of non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities, goals and policies, design standards, a list of potential projects, discussion of alternative funding strategies, and alternative capital facilities plans. **Figure 10-4** and **Figure 10-5** depict existing and proposed on-road bicycle routes and multi-purpose trails, respectively.

### **EXISTING ROADWAY DEFICIENCIES**

Jefferson County has developed a systematic approach for evaluating deficiencies of transportation facilities (roadway segments, intersections, and bridges) and ranking them in the Six Year Transportation Improvement Program. The Road Project Priority Programming System is used to determine what structural, design, or other characteristics may need revision to improve the functioning of roadway facilities. facilities is the The State of Washington Inventory of Bridges and Structures (SWIBS). (SWIBS) is

#### **Road Project Priority Programming System**

The Road Project Priority Programming System was developed in order to equitably balance the various needs of the transportation system: general capital and operational needs; safety needs; nonmotorized needs; transportation planning needs; and others. The model contains three main steps. The first, needs identification and screening, identifies a list of potential improvements from a large number of sources. Projects identified are then screened for 1) feasibility, 2) whether they are maintenance projects rather than capital projects, or 3) inappropriateness because they conflict with existing County policy or they are not the best solution to the problem. Remaining projects are grouped according to the category of project (e.g., general transportation, nonmotorized needs, safety needs, planning project, or other). The second step evaluates prospective projects using a technical evaluation and ranking. Eighteen criteria have been developed (e.g., accident history, nonmotorized needs, public request or complaints, Average Daily Traffic). A point system ranging from 1 to 10 has been developed to reflect the degree of need, deficiency, or demand. The third step is to include the policy direction of the Board of County Commissioners who determine the weight to be applied to the 18 criteria and how the transportation revenue is to be split between categories. The end result is a ranking of the roads within the transportation system. This ranking provides direction for the allocation of funding available for improvement projects.

~~These projects are then listed on the County's annual Six-year Transportation Improvement Program update, and are listed in the Capital Facilities Element of this Plan.~~

~~While the planning analysis is more "broad brush", this ranking system would be used in conjunction with more detailed analysis of specific segments and/or intersections.~~

### ~~Intersection Rating Procedure~~

~~The procedure used by the County to identify and rank needed intersection improvements is similar to the program used to identify and rank road improvements. The methodology for this process combines factors such as the number of accidents at the site, annual accident rate, accident severity, sight distance, speed, and accident severity in order to develop a hazard ratio. Intersections are then ranked according to their respective hazard ratios, and their improvements are funded accordingly.~~

### ~~State of Washington Inventory of Bridges and Structures (SWIBS)~~

~~The State of Washington Inventory of Bridges and Structures (SWIBS) utilized by the County enables all bridges in the State to be inventoried and rated for structural and operational deficiencies. The bridges can then be ranked much like roadway segments and intersections (as discussed in the preceding text). SWIBS also meets the Federally mandated inventory of bridges required by the Federal Aid Highway Act (now the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act - ISTEA).~~

~~The methodology used to rate bridges by SWIBS consists of at least bi-annual inspections that includes a rating of individual members of the bridge for conditions; a structural rating based on the bridge design; and, for bridges over water, a scour evaluation. Functional operation is also considered in the evaluation.~~

### ~~Observed and Perceived Deficiencies~~

~~In addition, a list of observed and perceived transportation facility deficiencies has been developed through a cooperative process with members of the Transportation Planning Advisory Board (TPAB), County staff, and attendees at a public workshop held in November 1992. Roadway deficiencies identified through this process were categorized as roadway preservation issues (e.g., lane striping and ditch cleaning), roadway structural issues (e.g., shoulder widening, intersection reconfiguration), and safety issues (e.g., blind corners and signalization needs). Roadway capacity issues addressed at this public workshop included the potential need for a bypass in the Tri Area from Four Corners to Chimacum. In addition, development of an additional park and ride facility on SR 20 at the Port Townsend city limits was recommended. The transportation facility deficiency information provided at that meeting was used in the development of Technical Memorandum No. 2, Transportation Data Inventory, and is available, as updated, in that document. This list of projects continues to serve as a reference and is considered in the ranking of roadway improvement projects.~~

~~Overall, roadway deficiencies and issues relating to capacity are addressed in the Traffic Forecasts section of this Element.~~

## ~~CRITERIA USED IN TRANSPORTATION DECISIONS~~

~~The County evaluates several factors in deciding what transportation improvements should be undertaken. Factors to consider include the level of service (LOS) standard for each roadway adopted by the County in this plan, and the County's transportation goals and policies.~~

### Level of Service Standards

Level of service (LOS) is a multi-dimensional measurement of the quality of service provided by the existing transportation system. The concept of LOS has traditionally been used in transportation planning and engineering to describe an actual or expected operating condition for a road. A lower LOS implies worsening conditions, either as perceived by the traveler, or as a measure of efficient movement. LOS is the desired minimal operational condition for a facility, something against which actual conditions can be assessed. By applying LOS standards and then monitoring the actual LOS, a jurisdiction can implement a system for establishing traffic flow objectives, prioritizing transportation projects and funding, and directing growth of the transportation network.

LOS can be described by one or more factors, such as travel times, levels of congestion, volume of use compared to system capacity, frequency of service, comfort and convenience, or safety. LOS measurements can address other modes of transportation including transit or bicycles.

**10-4** The County Transportation Planning Advisory Board for State and County roadways within Jefferson County; these level of service standards are recommended for adoption by the County in this Plan. The recommended LOS standards those set by the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization — = = LOS D  
Urban/Tourist  
urban level of traffic) — = = LOS D

The standards recommended in this plan are depicted in **Table 10-6**, which also presents Annual Daily Trips (AADT) on each roadway segment and identifies the maximum AADT allowable at the level of service standard established. **Table 10-7** consolidates the information in Table 10-6 and identifies existing and forecast traffic volumes and levels of service for roadway segments. Currently, all roadways are operating at, or above, established LOS standards. **Figure 10-5** depicts these existing traffic volumes and LOS standards on map sheets showing the County road network.

### Transit – Level of Service

For transit level of service, Jefferson County worked with Jefferson Transit to establish a level of service standard. This standard, detailed in Transportation Policy TRN is defined as the total number of hours the transit service is used on fare-producing fixed routes for one year. For example, a fixed fare route takes 3 hours per round trip and makes the trip 3 times a day for 5 days a week. The ATRSH for this route would be calculated as follows: 3 hours x 3 trips x 5 days x 52 weeks = 2,340 ATRSH. All routes added together provide the system total:

Manual: Special Report 209, Washington, D.C. 1985.

0.472(472 ATRSH per 1,000 population) can be applied as a current service provision guide.

In contrast, the PRTPO transit level of service is based on the type and frequency of service between activity centers. To coordinate the Jefferson Transit service transit standard with the regional service standard, Policy TRN 2.5 also establishes a planning guideline for Jefferson Transit to seek to provide service to meet the PRTPO origin-destination goals.

The PRTPO origin-destination level of service distinguishes between Rural Routes, Commuter Regional Routes, and High Capacity Feeder Routes (to ferry terminals). **Table 10-5** depicts the adopted PRTPO transit level of service. Because many of the routes are inter-county, the table includes Rural and

Commuter routes for all counties participating in the PRTPO. High Capacity Feeder routes are not designated in Jefferson County because the Port Townsend ferry route is predominately a tourist route.

**Table 10-5  
Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization LOS Summary Analysis**

- ☉ ——— Satisfies recommended LOS standard
- ☉+ ——— Exceeds recommended LOS standard
- (☉) ——— Does not satisfy recommended LOS standard

Transit Service Link		Adopted Level of Service (LOS)	
<b>Rural Routes</b>			
LOS Standards	Route No.	1 Trip Per Day	7 Days Per Week
Port Townsend—Brinnon	1	☉+	(☉)
Brinnon—Port Townsend			
Port Townsend—Port Ludlow	7	☉+	☉
Port Ludlow—Port Townsend			
Port Townsend—Cape George	No Service	(☉)	(☉)
Cape George—Port Townsend			
Port Townsend—Marrowstone Island	No Service	(☉)	(☉)
Marrowstone Island—Port Townsend			
Amanda Park—Forks	N/A	☉+	(☉)
Forks—Amanda Park			
<b>Commuter—Regional Routes</b>			
Route	Route No.	5 Trips Per Day	5 Days Per Week
Sequim—Port Townsend	8	☉	☉+
Port Townsend—Sequim			
Port Townsend—Poulsbo	7	(☉)	☉+
Poulsbo—Port Townsend			
Chimacum/Port Hadlock—Port Townsend	9	☉+	☉+
Port Townsend—Chimacum/Port Hadlock			
Port Townsend—Kingston	No direct service	(☉)	(☉)

Source: Berryman & Henigar, 1996.

As is evident in the following table, Jefferson Transit meets the PRTPO transit level of service for the number of trips per day where there is service, but not for the number of days a week. The PRTPO has set a goal of seven days a week while Jefferson Transit primarily provides regular service five days a week.

## **LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLANNING METHOD**

### **Analysis Of Alternatives**

~~The County considered several land use alternatives in developing the Comprehensive Plan. To meet the requirements of the Growth Management Act and to allow the community the opportunity to analyze the various land use alternatives, travel forecasts were developed for the alternatives and the baseline condition. The analysis of these land use scenarios and their impacts on transportation in the County is available in the Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Comprehensive Plan and the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Comprehensive Plan 1999 Amendments.~~

### ***Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan***

~~The alternative chosen for the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan adopted in August, 1998 designated one Urban Growth Area, Port Townsend. However, the Plan does recommended studies to analyze whether the Port Hadlock/Irondale (Tri Area) and Glen Cove should become Urban Growth Areas. Based on the results of the Tri Area / Glen Cove Special Study, an Urban Growth Area has been designated in Port Hadlock and Irondale. This designation will permit commercial, industrial, and residential development at an urban scale and density. Transportation studies that were conducted for the Tri Area / Glen Cove Special Study provide useful information regarding the transportation facilities necessary to support urban development in the Port Hadlock UGA.~~

~~Port Ludlow be has been designated as a Master Planned Resort. This designation permits urban style development that is consistent with the MPR designation.~~

~~Commercial areas in Quilcene and Brinnon are designated as Rural Village Centers. These established historic rural business centers will continue to serve as commercial and service centers serving their respective surrounding communities and rural neighborhoods, and are not to be regarded as future urban growth areas.~~

~~The type and intensity of future commercial growth within the Rural Village Centers will be regulated so as to allow for only development that serves the needs of the surrounding rural area, including the expected needs of the projected future residential population.~~

~~The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan requires that any future subdivision of rural residential land not exceed 1:5, 1:10, or 1:20 acre densities. The overall land use pattern intended for unincorporated Jefferson County outside of the Port Hadlock UGA is rural in nature, with rural commercial activities focused in the Rural Village Centers.~~

~~It is recognized that the County has an excess of buildable lots needed for the growth projected for the County. A large number of these lots are located within the Port Hadlock UGA. Many of these lots are at densities greater than the 1:5 rural density specified in the Land Use Element. Since these lots are recognized as existing lots of record, they can be developed provided that they meet Health Department requirements. As these lots are developed in the future and additional traffic is generated, transportation system improvements, including non-motorized transportation facilities, may be necessary.~~

~~It is important to note, however, that transportation growth and needs anticipated in the 1998 Plan will remain unchanged with the addition of the Port Hadlock area as a UGA for the near term. This is due to the continuing constraint placed on development in the Port Hadlock through lack of sewer facilities. Therefore, past analysis of population and transportation and the analysis contained in the 1998 plan are~~

~~still applicable until such time as sewer planning is complete (within the next Plan update). With the designation of the UGA, sewer planning will begin, but facilities will not be in place over the next six years. An analysis of the build-out impacts (beyond the 20-year planning horizon) due to the Port Hadlock area UGA addition, are contained in the FSEIS for the proposed Comprehensive Plan 1999 Amendments.~~

### *Linking Land Use and Transportation*

~~The link between the future land use alternatives and the transportation system is the traffic forecasting process. The demand for transportation is considered to be a derived demand. That is, people do not travel specifically for the sake of traveling, but travel to perform other tasks that are in different locations. Travel is secondary and derived from the need to perform other tasks.~~

~~Land use designations determine the location of these other activities. These variations in potential land use influence the travel demand. The travel forecasts conducted for this transportation analysis were based on the varying land use alternatives. This forecasting procedure is described below.~~

### **Traffic Forecasts**

~~To analyze the impacts of the growth pattern designated by the Jefferson County Land Use Element on the roadway system, traffic forecasts were developed. Traffic forecasts, shown in **Table 10-6**, were developed for the horizon year 2016. The traffic forecasts did not, at this time, indicate that bypasses of the Tri Area or Paradise Bay were feasible.~~

~~The methodology established to estimate future traffic growth for the proposed land use plan links the historic growth rate in housing units to traffic growth rates. A ratio of future countywide housing growth to historic growth in housing units was determined. This ratio was composed of both land use factors characteristic of this plan and planning area factors. The historical housing growth rate, based on the years 1986-1990, was determined for each of the community planning areas. A ratio of future growth to historical growth was then calculated for each planning area.~~

~~This housing growth ratio was then applied to the historic traffic growth rate to develop a future traffic growth rate and served to link land use growth to traffic growth. The land use plan characteristics and planning area variations in the ratio served to properly weight the future traffic growth rate.~~

~~Historic traffic growth rates were calculated by road segments within each planning area. For most of the routes, base data was available for the years 1986 to 1990; thus, most of the roadway historical traffic growth rates are based on that time period.~~

~~**US 101 and SR 104.** Traffic growth on US 101 and SR 104 is influenced primarily by regional or through traffic and was not considered to be influenced as significantly by local development variable. The forecast traffic growth rates for these roadways were based strictly on the historical traffic growth rates calculated for the road segments within each of the planning areas. Since the greatest influence on US 101 and SR 104 traffic is through traffic, the traffic growth rates for these routes are not weighted by planning area.~~

~~**SR 19 and SR 20.** The forecast traffic growth rates for these roadways were determined from a weighted historical growth calculation. The "weight" applied to the historical traffic growth figure was a ratio of projected housing growth rate to historical housing unit growth rate for the combination of the Port Townsend, Quimper Peninsula, Marrowstone Island, and Tri Area Planning Areas. A "composite growth~~

ratio" was used because of the inter-relationship of traffic patterns in the SR 20/SR 19 area (i.e., the number and type of short trips between adjacent planning areas).

**County Roads.** The forecast traffic growth rates for local (County) roads were calculated from historical traffic growth on those roads and weighted by the housing growth "ratios" for each of the planning areas and the land use plan. Roads that experienced unusually high or unexplained growth rates which would skew the analysis were assigned a forecast traffic growth rate equivalent to that being used for US 101 or SR 104 segments within the same planning area.

Precise modal shifts from the automobile to other modes were not calculated into the traffic forecasts. Estimating modal shifts is difficult under the best of situations, and travel forecasters often rely on national estimates applied to local data. Jefferson County travel behavior may not comply with national trends and applying a nationwide estimate in the calculations was not considered appropriate.

### **Transportation Element Recommendations**

Based on this Transportation Element and the Capital Facilities Element, Jefferson County requires concurrency for only County owned facilities within the County transportation system. Analysis of other transportation facilities is provided in this discussion and in the Capital Facilities Element background data document, Capital Facilities Element Requirements; however, the County has not identified all of these projects in the Capital Facilities Element itself.

Based on the level of service standards set forth in this Element and the projected impact of the land use plan on the transportation system, this Transportation Element provides the following findings and recommendations:

#### ***Capacity Analysis***

##### ***Motorized Transportation System—Vehicular***

The capacity analysis and traffic forecasts indicate that at the planning horizon year of 2018, no County facilities are expected to exceed the adopted level of service standard. However, if any proposed development were to cause the level of service to fall below adopted levels, the proponents of the development would be required to mitigate the deficiency prior to development approval. However, a number of state route highway segments will exceed their estimated capacity based on the levels of service standards established in this Element. used by the County to evaluate bridges. The County also has two additional rating systems: the Gravel Road Priority Program that rates gravel roads for upgrading to chip seal and the Safety Priority Program that rates road safety projects. These two programs are funded through the TIP.

##### **Road Project Priority Programming System**

The Road Project Priority Programming System was developed in order to equitably balance the various needs of the transportation system: general capital and operational needs; safety needs; non-motorized needs; transportation planning needs; and others. The model contains three main steps. The first, needs identification and screening, identifies a list of potential improvements from a large number of sources. Projects identified are then screened for 1) feasibility, 2) whether they are maintenance projects rather than capital projects, or 3) inappropriateness because they conflict with existing County policy or they are not the best solution to the problem. Remaining projects are grouped according to the category of project (e.g., general transportation, non-motorized needs, safety needs, planning project, or other). The second

step evaluates prospective projects using a technical evaluation and ranking. Twenty-four criteria have been developed (e.g., accident history, non-motorized needs, public request or complaints, Average Daily Traffic). A point system ranging from 1 to 10 has been developed to reflect the degree of need, deficiency, or demand. The third step is to include the policy direction of the Board of County Commissioners that determines the weight to be applied to the criteria and how transportation revenue is to be split between categories. The end result is a ranking of road projects within the transportation

**Figure 10-4 On-road bicycle routes**

**Figure 10-5 Multi-purpose Trails**

system. This ranking provides direction for the allocation of funding available for improvement projects. These projects are then adopted in the annual update of the County's Six-year Transportation Improvement Program.

### **State of Washington Inventory of Bridges and Structures (SWIBS)**

The State of Washington Inventory of Bridges and Structures (SWIBS) utilized by the County enables all bridges in the State to be inventoried and rated for structural and operational deficiencies. The bridges can then be ranked much like roadway segments and intersections (as discussed in the preceding text). SWIBS meets the requirements of the Federal Highway Administration.

The methodology used to rate bridges by SWIBS consists of at least bi-annual inspections that include a rating of individual members of the bridge for conditions; a structural rating based on the bridge design; and, for bridges over water, a scour evaluation. Functional operation is also considered in the evaluation.

### **Gravel Road Priority Program**

This program uses factors such as functional classification, traffic volume, accident rating, and commercial/industrial use to prioritize the limited funds available for upgrading gravel roads to chip seal.

### **Safety Priority Program**

This program uses an inventory of roadway and intersection characteristics, analysis of collision data, and a benefit/cost analysis to analyze and prioritize potential roadway safety projects.

## **LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLANNING METHOD**

Transportation planning is closely linked with land use. Traffic forecasts are built on the location and demand of traffic generators, which are controlled by the adopted land use designations. Analysis for this Transportation Element is consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Land Use and UGA Elements of the Jefferson County Comprehensive plan. The analysis of the established land use scenario and its impacts on transportation in the County is available in the Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Comprehensive Plan and the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Comprehensive Plan 1999 Amendments.

### **Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan**

The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan designates two Urban Growth Areas; Port Townsend and Irondale-Port Hadlock. This designation permits commercial, industrial, and residential development at an urban scale and density. The Irondale-Port Hadlock UGA Transportation Plan provides a complete examination regarding the transportation facilities necessary to support urban development in the UGA.

Port Ludlow has been designated as a Master Planned Resort. This designation permits urban-style development that is consistent with the MPR designation as well as urban level of service standards for transportation facilities.

Commercial areas in Quilcene and Brinnon are designated as Rural Village Centers. These established historic rural business centers will continue to serve as commercial and service centers serving their

respective surrounding communities and rural neighborhoods, and are not to be regarded as future urban growth areas.

The type and intensity of future commercial growth within the Rural Village Centers will be regulated so as to allow for development that serves the needs of the surrounding rural area, including the expected needs of the projected future residential population.

The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan requires that any future subdivision of rural residential land not exceed 1:5, 1:10, or 1:20 acre densities. The overall land use pattern intended for unincorporated Jefferson County outside of the Irondale-Port Hadlock UGA is rural in nature, with rural commercial activities focused in the Rural Village Centers.

It is recognized that the County has an excess of buildable lots needed for the growth projected for the County. A large number of these lots are located within the Irondale-Port Hadlock UGA, but are not projected to be served by a sanitary sewer system. Many of these lots located in rural areas are at densities greater than the densities specified in the Land Use Element. Since these lots are recognized as existing lots of record, they can be developed provided that they meet Health Department requirements. As these lots are developed in the future and additional traffic is generated, transportation system improvements, including non-motorized transportation facilities, may be necessary.

It is important to note, however, that transportation growth and needs anticipated for the County will remain unchanged with the addition of the Irondale-Port Hadlock UGA for the near-term. This is due to the continuing constraint placed on development in the residential areas of the UGA through lack of sewer facilities. Therefore, designation of the UGA will have little impact on population and transportation trends, until the sewer system is complete (anticipated by 2011). The UGA Transportation Plan analysis takes into account the introduction of the sewer system and the effect this will have within the UGA and surrounding area. An analysis of the build-out impacts (beyond the 20 year planning horizon) due to the Irondale-Port Hadlock UGA addition, are contained in the FSEIS for the proposed Comprehensive Plan 1999 Amendments.

### **Linking Land Use and Transportation**

The link between the future land uses and the transportation system is the traffic forecasting process. The demand for transportation is considered to be a derived demand. That is, people do not travel specifically for the sake of traveling, but travel to perform other tasks that are in different locations. Travel is secondary and derived from the need to perform other tasks.

Land use designations and development regulations determine the locations and intensities of these activities. These variations in potential land use influence the travel demand. The travel forecasts conducted for this transportation analysis were based on the land use designations and policies discussed in the Land Use and UGA Elements. This forecasting procedure is described below.

### **Traffic Forecasts**

2010 and 2024 traffic forecasts were developed in order to analyze the impacts to the road system from the growth patterns designated in the Land Use and UGA Elements. The traffic forecasts are shown in **Table 10-6 Existing and Forecast ADT and LOS**. It depicts State Routes and selected County Road segments, adopted LOS standards, road capacity in Average Daily Trips (ADT) at the adopted LOS standard, existing ADT and LOS, and 2010 and 2024 forecast ADT and LOS. **Table 10-6** also depicts factors used to develop the forecasts: historic and forecast population and traffic growth rates. Existing ADT and LOS for selected State Routes and County Roads are also depicted on **Figure 10-6 Existing Traffic Volumes and Level of Service**.

Comparing the 2010 forecasts to actual 2010 traffic counts will provide the means to confirm the accuracy of the forecast methodology and to revise it as appropriate in subsequent Comprehensive Plan updates.

**County Roads.** The methodology used to forecast future traffic growth on County Roads, is based on the connection between historic population growth in County Planning Areas and historic traffic growth on the roads in those areas. It assumes that this connection will continue in the future. That is, if future population growth rates in a Planning Area remain constant, then traffic growth rates will also remain fairly constant. Conversely, if future population growth increases or decreases from historic rates, then traffic growth rates will also increase or decrease. The methodology also assumes that these relationships will vary based on the land use designations and particular characteristics of each County Planning Area.

In order to apply this concept, the methodology developed a ratio of the forecast population growth rate to the historic population growth rate for each Planning Area. A ratio greater than one indicates that population growth rates in the Planning Area are expected to increase. A ratio less than one indicates that population growth rates are expected to decrease. Historic traffic growth rates were then multiplied by this ratio to derive forecast traffic growth rates.

Projections of future population growth rates were based on Jefferson County Board of Commissioners Resolution 55-03 (September 22, 2003) that adopted a County-wide 2024 population projection. The Resolution allocated that projected growth to the City of Port Townsend, the Irondale and Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area, the Port Ludlow Master Planned Resort, and the remaining rural area of Jefferson County. However, the estimate of historic rural population and the projection of future rural population growth were not allocated to specific rural Planning Areas. In order to do this, an estimate of the rate and distribution of historic population growth from 1998 to 2003 was developed for each Planning Area using 2000 Census data as a base year and building permit data for new residential construction as a surrogate for population. The number of building permits was converted to a population estimate by using the County average of 2.3 persons per residence. This produced both an estimate of historic population growth rates and a projection of future population growth rates for each Planning Area.

Historic traffic growth rates for County Road segments were based on Jefferson County Public Works Department traffic counts for the years 1996-2002.

As stated previously, forecast traffic growth rates for most County Roads were derived by multiplying historic traffic growth rates by the ratio of the forecast population growth rate to the historic population growth rate. Traffic forecasts for roads within and adjacent to the Irondale and Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area were developed for the UGA Transportation Plan (2004) that used a more detailed analysis. Roads that experienced unusually high or unexplained growth rates that would skew the analysis were assigned a forecast traffic growth rate equivalent to that being used for US 101 or SR 104 segments within the same Planning Area.

**State Routes.** Traffic growth on US 101, SR 104, SR 20, and SR 19 is influenced primarily by regional or through traffic and not significantly influenced by local population growth and development. Traffic forecasts therefore reflect historic traffic growth rates based on traffic counts provided by the Washington Department of Transportation. Forecast traffic growth rates were prepared for highway segments within each of the Planning Areas, but the traffic growth rates were not weighted by Planning Area growth ratios.

SR 19. Traffic growth on SR 19 is affected by development near the Irondale-Port Hadlock UGA. But due to the high level of through traffic traveling from SR 104 to Port Townsend along the SR 19 corridor, the forecast rate was based strictly on historic traffic growth, except for the segment that passes through the UGA boundary. This section of SR 19 utilized the forecast rates and ADT developed in the UGA Transportation Plan.

SR 116. SR 116 is a notable exception to the analysis of State Routes. The forecast traffic growth rates for this roadway were developed separately in the UGA Transportation Plan, due to the anticipated growth and development that will occur along the segment of SR 116 within the UGA boundary. Outside of the boundary, the forecast traffic growth rates were calculated using the same technique as County roads.

#### —Transportation Element Recommendations

Based on the policies in this Transportation Element and the Capital Facilities Element, Jefferson County requires concurrency only for County-owned transportation facilities. Analysis of other transportation facilities is provided, but concurrency is not required.

Based on the level of service standards set forth in this Element and the projected impact of the land use designations and policies on the transportation system, this Transportation Element provides the following findings and recommendations:

**Figure 10-6 Existing Traffic Volumes and Level of Service**

## Capacity Analysis

### Motorized Transportation System - Vehicular

The capacity analysis and traffic forecasts indicate that at the planning horizon year of 2024, all Jefferson County roads are expected to operate within the LOS standards. Based on the methodology used for this plan (i.e., using ADT to identify if traffic volume is projected to exceed capacity), state roads which are forecast to exceed capacity within the planning period for the LOS standards include:

- US 101 (Jefferson/Clallam County Line to SR 20)
- SR 104 (US 101 to Center Road)
- SR 104 (SR 19/Beaver Valley Road to Jefferson/Kitsap County Line)
- SR 19 (Oak Bay Road to SR 20)
- SR 20(Four Corners Road to Mill/Discovery Road)

The analysis performed was a "broad brush", general planning analysis which involved road segments. Individual intersections were not analyzed in this study. Specific studies of intersections and congested road segments should be performed as necessary.

The Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization utilized a composite growth rate developed from the individual growth rates established by the four counties (Clallam, Jefferson, Kitsap, and Mason) within the region. This regional growth rate factor identified the same State Route segments as exceeding capacity within the planning horizon. The Washington State Highway System Plan provides a statewide analysis. Under the "financially constrained" alternative, the state system plan also identifies the same segments of US 101, SR 104, and SR 20 as exceeding capacity as identified in this plan.

### Motorized Transportation System—Transit, Airports, Ferry Service, and Freight Travel

The Capital Facilities Element Requirements presents proposed capacity related improvements for Capital Improvements for Jefferson Transit service. Capacity related projects for airports and ferry service are also presented in the Capital Facilities Element Requirements. Freight service is partially addressed by the County in its evaluation of roadway and airport facilities; rail service and other port related freight services are addressed by those entities.

## Capacity Analysis

### Non-motorized Transportation System

Capacity related needs for non-motorized transportation and recreational trails are presented in Table 12 PR 2d of the Capital Facilities Element of this Plan. This table shows Jefferson County's adopted level of service of 0.52 miles of trails per 1,000 population and an inventory of 15 miles in 1998. The table shows there would be a deficiency of 0.59 miles in 2003, if additional facilities are not provided. Since 1998 Jefferson County has developed 4.8 miles of the Larry Scott Trail, 5 miles of walking and mountain bike trails at Gibbs Lake Park, and 1.5 miles of trails at HJ Carroll Park, at or above the adopted level of service standard. However, if any proposed development were to cause the level of service to significantly fall below adopted levels, the proponents of the development would be required to mitigate the deficiency prior to development approval.

A number of State Route segments will exceed their estimated capacity based on the levels of service standards established in this Element. Based on the methodology used for this plan, State Routes that are forecast to exceed capacity within the planning period for the LOS standards include:

- US 101 (Jefferson/Clallam County Line to SR 20): LOS E
- SR 104 (SR 19 to Jefferson/Kitsap County Line): LOS F
- SR 19 (Center Road to Four Corners Road): LOS E
- SR 19 (Four Corners Road to SR 20): LOS F
- SR 20 (SR 19 to Mill Road): LOS E
- SR 116 (SR 19 to Irondale Road): LOS E

The analysis performed was a "broad-brush", general planning analysis that involved road segments. Individual intersections were not analyzed in this study. Specific studies of intersections and congested road segments should be performed as necessary.

The Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization utilized a composite growth rate developed from the individual growth rates established by the four counties (Clallam, Jefferson, Kitsap, and Mason) within the region. This regional growth rate factor identified the same State Route segments as exceeding capacity within the planning horizon. The Washington State Highway System Plan provides a statewide analysis. Under the "financially constrained" alternative, the state system plan also identifies the same segments of US 101, SR19, SR 20, SR 104 and SR 116 as exceeding capacity as identified in this plan.

#### *Motorized Transportation System - Transit, Airports, Ferry Service, and Freight Travel*

No capital improvements have been identified as necessary for Jefferson Transit to meet its level of service standard for the period 2005-2010. Capacity-related projects for airports and port facilities are presented in the Port of Port Townsend's Capital Improvements Plan. Freight service is partially addressed in this Element through the evaluation of State Routes and County Roads. Air freight and port-related freight services are addressed by the Port of Port Townsend.

#### *Capacity Analysis*

##### *Non-motorized Transportation System*

Capacity-related needs for non-motorized transportation and recreational trails are presented in Table 12-PR-2d of the Capital Facilities Element of this Plan. This table shows Jefferson County's adopted level of service of 0.52 miles of trails per 1,000 population and an inventory of 16.2 miles in 2004. Based on these facility additions, Jefferson County currently exceeds its adopted level of service. More detailed information regarding existing facilities is available in the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.

##### *Non-Capacity Analysis...*

##### *Non-motorized Transportation System*

Detailed information regarding non-capacity related non-motorized transportation and recreational trail projects can be found in the Non-Motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.

## GOALS AND POLICIES

The purpose of the Jefferson County Transportation Element is to establish goals and policies in support of the desired and projected transportation system pursuant to the Washington State Growth Management Act. Accordingly, the overall goal of the transportation element is to "encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans" (RCW 36.70A.020(3)).

The transportation goals and policies are an integral part of the adopted plan and set forth the adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards and other policy commitments for Jefferson County. Individual goals are established for specific targeted issues relating to transportation planning. The overall set of goals relate to the following targeted issues:

Highways and Arterials	Goal 1
Public Transportation	Goal 2
Nonmotorized Transportation	Goal 3
Land Development Standards	Goal 4, Goal 5, and Goal 6
Intergovernmental Coordination	Goal 7 and Goal 8
Demand Management	Goal 9
Environment and Energy	Goal 10
Transportation Improvement Program	Goal 11

Each goal statement is followed by policies that provide direction and mechanisms for reaching the stated Goals. Also, the Capital Facilities Element provides a list of specific transportation projects determined to be necessary to address deficiencies identified in roadway sections and at intersections. These projects are also listed in the County's Six-year Transportation Improvement Plan.

## HIGHWAYS AND ARTERIALS

### GOAL

**TRG 1.0** Provide a safe, convenient, efficient and integrated highway and arterial system for the movement of people and goods, one that is functionally well maintained, reflects local environment, and meets the demands of the future.

### POLICIES

**TRP 1.1** Provide for a Level of Service C, or better, for rural road facilities based upon Average Annual Daily Trips.

**TRP 1.2** Provide for a Level of Service D, or better, on all road facilities within Urban Growth Area's (UGAs), and Designated Tourist Corridors as established by the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization, based upon Average Annual Daily Trips.

**TRP 1.3** Preserve and maintain the existing highway and arterial system to avoid costly reconstruction.

~~TRP 1.4~~ — Maintain the efficiency of traffic flow by monitoring traffic, upgrading traffic control devices, and developing traffic management techniques as appropriate.

~~TRP 1.5~~ — Require that streets are designed and constructed to County standards to efficiently and effectively meet the needs of the community and promote overall transportation safety.

~~TRP 1.6~~ — Require use of access management techniques to regulate driveway access.

~~TRP 1.7~~ — Through application of standards, reflect the rural aesthetic of the county, minimize impervious surfaces, and minimize cost to taxpayers and developers.

~~TRP 1.8~~ — Prevent glare and minimize pollution to the night sky through the use of appropriate roadway lighting and fixtures without compromising public safety.

~~TRP 1.9~~ — Encourage the retention or use of roadway features that enhance rural qualities by applying appropriate rural standards.

## **PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

### GOAL

~~TRG 2.0~~ — **Promote a coordinated and integrated public transportation system available to all residents, guests, and those without personal transportation options in Jefferson County.**

### POLICIES

~~TRP 2.1~~ — Support existing public transportation programs and coordinate with the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization to improve the system as needed.

~~TRP 2.2~~ — Encourage cooperation between private transportation providers and public transportation providers.

~~TRP 2.3~~ — Provide for a minimum Level of Service of It is anticipated that an additional 5.6 miles of the Larry Scott trail will be constructed during the period 2005-2010. This will result in a net reserve of 5.76 miles in 2010. More detailed information regarding existing facilities is available in the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.

### *Non-Capacity Analysis*

#### *Motorized Transportation System - Vehicular*

Detailed information regarding non-capacity-related motorized transportation system projects is contained in the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program.

#### *Non-motorized Transportation System*

Detailed information regarding non-capacity-related non-motorized transportation and recreational trail projects can be found in the Non-Motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.

**GOALS AND POLICIES**

The purpose of the Jefferson County Transportation Element is to establish goals and policies in support of the desired and projected transportation system pursuant to the Washington State Growth Management Act. Accordingly, the overall goal of the transportation element is to “encourage efficient multi-modal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans” (RCW 36.70A.020(3)).

The transportation goals and policies are an integral part of the adopted plan and set forth the adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards and other policy commitments for Jefferson County. Individual goals are established for specific targeted issues relating to transportation planning. The overall set of goals relate to the following targeted issues:

<u>Highways and Arterials</u>	<u>Goal 1</u>
<u>Public Transportation</u>	<u>Goal 2</u>
<u>Non-motorized Transportation</u>	<u>Goal 3</u>
<u>Land Development Standards</u>	<u>Goal 4, Goal 5, and Goal 6</u>
<u>Intergovernmental Coordination</u>	<u>Goal 7 and Goal 8</u>
<u>Demand Management</u>	<u>Goal 9</u>
<u>Environment and Energy</u>	<u>Goal 10</u>
<u>Transportation Improvement Program</u>	<u>Goal 11</u>

Each goal statement is followed by policies that provide direction and mechanisms for reaching the stated Goals. Also, the Capital Facilities Element provides a list of specific transportation projects determined to be necessary to address deficiencies identified in roadway sections and at intersections. These projects are also listed in the County’s Six-year Transportation Improvement Plan.

**HIGHWAYS AND ARTERIALS**

GOAL

**TRG 1.0 Provide a safe, convenient, efficient and integrated highway and arterial system for the movement of people and goods, one that is functionally well maintained, reflects local environment, and meets the demands of the future.**

POLICIES

**TRP 1.1 Provide for a Level of Service C, or better, for rural County Road facilities based upon Average Annual Daily Trips.**

**TRP1.2 Provide for a Level of Service D, or better, on all County Road facilities within Urban Growth Areas, the Port Ludlow Master Planned Resort, and Designated Tourist Corridors as established by the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization, based upon Average Annual Daily Trips.**

**TRP 1.3 Minimize life cycle costs of the County transportation system by preserving and maintaining both the adequacy and operating condition of the existing transportation system.**

- TRP 1.4** Maintain the efficiency of traffic flow by monitoring traffic, upgrading traffic control devices, and developing traffic management techniques as appropriate.
- TRP 1.5** Require that streets are designed and constructed to County standards to efficiently and effectively meet the needs of the community and promote overall transportation safety.
- TRP 1.6** Require use of access management techniques to regulate driveway access.
- TRP 1.7** Use roadway features in rural areas that enhance rural character, minimize impervious surfaces, and minimize cost to taxpayers and developers.
- TRP 1.8** Prevent glare and minimize pollution to the night sky through the use of appropriate roadway lighting and fixtures without compromising public safety.
- TRP 1.9** Encourage the retention or use of roadway features that enhance rural qualities by applying appropriate rural standards.
- TRP 1.10** Enhance urban qualities by applying appropriate urban standards in Urban Growth Areas and Master Planned Resorts.
- TRP 1.11** Design roadways in the County Road system according to their functional classification and forecasted 20-year traffic demand.

## **PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

### **GOAL**

- TRG 2.0** **Promote a coordinated and integrated public transportation system available to all residents, guests, and those without personal transportation options in Jefferson County.**

### **POLICIES**

- TRP 2.1** Support existing public transportation programs and coordinate with the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization to improve the system as needed.
- TRP 2.2** Encourage cooperation between private transportation providers and public transportation providers.
- TRP 2.3** Provide 8,400 Annual Transit Revenue Service Hours (ATRSH) for fixed routes in unincorporated Jefferson County. Additionally, as planning guidelines, seek to provide for the Level of Service for Transit Service Links adopted by the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization's Plan that have an origin or destination in Jefferson County, and maintain a 472 ATRSH per 1,000a minimum Level of Service of 270 ATRSH per 1,000 County-wide population for fixed routes in unincorporated Jefferson County.

- ~~TRP 2.4~~ Provide convenient automobile and bicycle access to park and ride facilities on arterial/collector routes where warranted and cost effective.
- ~~TRP 2.5~~ Require that retail shopping facilities, offices, industrial and residential developments and similar uses be designed to accommodate public transit plans and goals.
- ~~TRP 2.6~~ Identify and invest in road and pedestrian improvements that support transit reliability and safety, and encourage use of the public transportation system.
- ~~TRP 2.7~~ Promote and enhance passenger and freight travel opportunities, including development of air and water transportation alternatives.

## **NONMOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION**

### GOAL

- ~~TRG 3.0~~ Provide safe, accessible and convenient routes, trails and parking facilities, trail heads, and other amenities that promote the use of nonmotorized travel in a manner that is integrated with other forms of transportation.

### POLICIES

- ~~TRP 3.1~~ Using established standards and in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan, provide facilities for safe bicycle and pedestrian travel when conducting roadway improvements projects and constructing new roadways.
- ~~TRP 3.2~~ Encourage development of a non-motorized transportation network between all major activity centers in Jefferson County in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.
- ~~TRP 3.3~~ In coordination with the County Parks and Recreation Division, federal, state and regional agencies, Jefferson County. Additionally, as a planning guideline, seek to provide the Level of Service for Transit Service Links adopted by the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization's Plan for routes that have an origin or destination in Jefferson County.
- ~~TRP 2.4~~ Provide convenient automobile and bicycle access to park and ride facilities on arterial/collector routes where warranted and cost effective.
- ~~TRP 2.5~~ Ensure that retail shopping facilities, offices, industrial and residential developments and similar uses are designed to accommodate public transit plans and goals by involving Jefferson Transit in the planning and permit review process.
- ~~TRP 2.6~~ Identify and invest in road and pedestrian improvements that support transit reliability and safety, and encourage use of the public transportation system.
- ~~TRP 2.7~~ Promote and enhance passenger and freight travel opportunities, including development of air and water transportation alternatives.

**NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION****GOAL**

**TRG 3.0** **Provide safe, accessible and convenient routes, trails, parking facilities, trail heads, and other amenities that promote the use of non-motorized travel in a manner that is integrated with other forms of transportation.**

**POLICIES**

**TRP 3.1** **Using established standards and in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan, provide facilities for safe bicycle and pedestrian travel.**

**TRP 3.2** **Encourage development of a non-motorized transportation network between all major activity centers in Jefferson County in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.**

~~utilities and other agencies, and citizen groups, promote~~ **TRP 3.3 Promote** the development of new trails and linkages between trails in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails ~~Plan.~~

Plan and in coordination with Federal, State,

~~**TRP 3.4** **Promote development of an integrated trail system in the County in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan by seeking opportunities to provide links between existing trails during planning for improvements to the County transportation system and in review of land development proposals.**~~

~~**TRP 3.5** **Promote coordinated bicycle, equestrian, and pedestrian way improvements in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan, emphasizing access to schools, parks, employment and service centers, and mass transit facilities (ferry, bus, etc.).**~~

~~**TRP 3.6** **Require that roadway improvements and new subdivisions within the defined school pedestrian walking zone meet established standards intended to ensure the safety of pedestrians.**~~

~~**TRP 3.7** **Support educational opportunities for children and adults that will encourage safe use of roadways, trails, and sidewalks for all transportation modes.**~~

~~**TRP 3.8** **Promote safe, convenient, and protected bicycle parking at activity centers such as schools, parks, commercial centers, employment and service centers, and mass transit facilities (ferry, bus, etc.) in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.**~~

~~**TRP 3.9** **In coordination with the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan and the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan, provide signage for on-street segments of bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian routes in accordance with the Federal Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).**~~

~~**TRP 3.10** **Promote development of adequate pedestrian walkways and crossings, where appropriate, including facilities separated from the roadway, in accordance with the Non-motorized**~~

~~Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan. Evaluate safety issues associated with pedestrian and bicycle travel near school sites and identify potential improvements.~~

## **LAND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

### GOAL

~~TRG 4.0 — Encourage land use types, mixes, and densities that promote efficient multimodal transportation systems.~~

### POLICIES

~~TRP 4.1 — Reinforce the link between land use and public transportation by promoting urban residential densities within urban growth areas.~~

~~TRP 4.2 — Encourage land development proposals that are consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element and Rural Element and utilize the capacity of the existing transportation system, including the capacity of transit and nonmotorized modes, and avoid costly expansion of the system.~~

~~TRP 4.3 — Consider the use of impact fees as a means to ensure that adequate facilities (including, but not limited to transit, pedestrian facilities, bikeways or roadways) are available to serve new growth and development, and to maintain adopted level of service standards for those facilities.~~

~~TRP 4.4 — Enhance transportation system safety by requiring appropriate facility design, including providing landscaping and setbacks adjacent to transportation facilities.~~

~~TRP 4.5 — Protect outstanding scenic vistas accessible from transportation facilities through site design, and provide visual, and where possible and appropriate, physical, access to these resources.~~

~~TRP 4.6 — Require that subdivision and commercial project designs address the following issues:~~

- ~~a. Cost effective transit and delivery of emergency service;~~
- ~~b. Provisions for all transportation modes;~~
- ~~c. Dedication of rights of way for existing and future transportation needs;~~
- ~~d. Motorized and nonmotorized access;~~
- ~~e. Sidewalks and bicycle pathways;~~
- ~~f. Compatibility between motorized vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users;~~
- ~~g. Inclusion of transit friendly design elements; and~~
- ~~h. Adequate parking for non-peak periods.~~

~~TRP 4.7 — Provide adequate right of way for future transportation needs, through implementation of a systematic right of way acquisition program, by limiting encroachment of structures or ancillary uses into the right of way (e.g., setbacks), and through the use of other methods of preserving existing rights of way.~~

~~**TRP 4.8** — Ensure that unacceptable safety hazards will be mitigated. The definition of unacceptable will be based on analysis of the existing facility(s) and the current standards for that facility(s) contained in commonly used and adopted transportation publications.~~

~~**TRP 4.9** — Ensure that the Level of Service for County roads are met for existing and proposed development concurrent with proposed development prior to issuing development approvals.~~

#### GOAL

~~**TRG 5.0** — Provide additional roadway aesthetic features that are consistent with surrounding land use.~~

#### POLICIES

~~**TRP 5.1** — Develop additional features that enhance accessibility to and visibility of commercial establishments, and apply the features to the appropriate locations.~~

~~**TRP 5.2** — Protect arterials and highways from encroachment and congestion by access, utilizing appropriate traffic mitigation techniques for commercial development and other impediments to flow.~~

~~**TRP 5.3** — Ensure that local access roads provide through passage at appropriate speeds that minimize impacts to the surrounding area, and discharge to an appropriate facility.~~

#### GOAL

~~**TRG 6.0** — Ensure that the transportation system in Jefferson County encourages the efficient movement of goods, services and passengers and is integrated with the statewide system.~~

#### POLICIES

~~**TRP 6.1** — Coordinate with the PRTPO and other jurisdictions to ensure that adequate Washington State Ferry System service is provided to the community.~~

~~**TRP 6.2** — Allow the use of public funds that ensure that appropriate transportation facilities are in place at the time of development in designated commercial and industrial zones.~~

~~**TRP 6.3** — Ensure that access to the major air and water transportation facilities via county arterials and state highways is safe, efficient, and coordinated with other transportation modes.~~

~~**TRP 6.4** — Recognize the existence and current use of private small airfields, landing strips, and private helistops in land use decisions, and ensure proposed expansions of these private facilities meet all required development criteria.~~

#### **INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION**

GOAL

~~TRG 7.0 — Ensure that the Jefferson County Transportation Plan reflects public desire and is coordinated and consistent with the plans of state, regional, and local governments.~~

POLICIES

~~TRP 7.1 — Ensure efficient management of all transportation resources through cooperation in planning and project development with Federal, State, regional, and local jurisdictions.~~

~~TRP 7.2 — Coordinate with relevant agencies in the development of federal, state, and county regulations and guidelines for transportation of hazardous materials through the County.~~

~~TRP 7.3 — Reduce duplication of services, program costs, and increase the quality of service.~~

~~TRP 7.4 — Coordinate planning for transportation improvements and projects with the facilities/utility planning activities of other agencies and utilities in order to ensure that per project costs are reduced, environmental impacts minimized, and community inconvenience and disruption lessened.~~

~~TRP 7.5 — Comply with the "Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA)" in all transportation projects.~~

GOAL

~~TRG 8.0 — Ensure that transportation planning includes extensive opportunities for public involvement.~~

POLICIES

~~TRP 8.1 — Maintain a transportation advisory committee to assist the County with transportation planning and implementation issues.~~

~~TRP 8.2 — Continue to work with the public to review and revise application of established criteria and standards. Such criteria and standards may include, but are not limited to, arterials, collectors, local access, commercial standards, maintenance standards and residential standards.~~

**DEMAND MANAGEMENT**GOAL

~~TRG 9.0 — Promote demand management programs as a means of reducing traffic, minimizing environmental impacts, and optimizing existing transportation investments.~~

POLICIES

~~TRP 9.1~~ — Encourage employers to offer flexible work schedules that reduce peak period travel and lessen the need for roadway capacity.

~~TRP 9.2~~ — Encourage employers to provide on-site facilities that encourage use of alternative transportation modes, such as transit shelters and covered bike racks, lockers, and showers at work sites.

~~TRP 9.3~~ — Facilitate transportation demand management by coordinating and assisting in the development of transit amenities in County road or highway improvements, including bus pullouts, passenger shelters, bypass lanes, and park and ride facilities, where appropriate.

~~TRP 9.4~~ — Participate with state government and transit agencies in developing, promoting, and facilitating regional ridesharing through such programs as parking management, and ride match services and preferential parking for carpools and vanpools.

## ~~ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY~~

### ~~GOAL~~

~~TRG 10.0~~ — **Provide transportation facilities and services which are energy efficient, protect and enhance the environment, and preserve the existing residential quality of life.**

### ~~POLICIES~~

~~TRP 10.1~~ — Continue the County's twenty year commitment to use only mechanical and manual methods to control roadside vegetation.

~~TRP 10.2~~ — Ensure that all transportation projects comply with the Jefferson County Critical Areas Ordinance in order to protect critical areas, preserve open space, and maintain wildlife habitat in transportation projects and planning. Include the mitigation of adverse impacts on water resources, drainage patterns, and soils in the design of transportation facilities.

~~TRP 10.3~~ — Protect air quality by improving the operating efficiency of the overall transportation system, through the effective use of different modes.

~~TRP 10.4~~ — Promote the conservation of energy through transportation demand management policies and techniques.

~~TRP 10.5~~ — Address environmental retrofitting of transportation facilities, including the implementation of storm water facility best management practices and the replacement of culverts that impede fish passage, as opportunities and funding allows.

~~TRP 10.6~~ — Transportation facilities and services shall be sited, designed, or buffered to fit in harmoniously with their surroundings, as appropriate. When sited within or adjacent to residential areas, special attention should be given to noise, light, and glare impacts.

~~TRP 10.7~~ — Encourage buffering between motorized travel and nonmotorized transportation modes, where appropriate and economically feasible.

**TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**GOAL

~~TRG 11.0 — Develop a transportation improvement program that is consistent with the comprehensive plan.~~

POLICIES

~~TRP 11.1 — Roadway improvement projects included in the County's six-year transportation improvement program shall be consistent with the goals and policies of the Transportation Element, other elements of the County's Comprehensive Plan, and the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.~~

~~TRP 11.2 — Projects included in the transportation improvement program shall be evaluated and ranked using the County's adopted Road Project Priority Programming System and Intersection Rating Procedure and the criteria included therein.~~

## STRATEGIES

### Action Items

- ~~1. Monitor traffic volumes on all arterial and major collector facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 1)~~
- ~~2. Develop access management techniques to regulate driveway access, including use of shared driveway access. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 1)~~
- ~~3. Discourage direct access from individual lots to present and planned future arterials wherever possible; access from these sites should be provided through local or collector roadways that connect to arterials. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 1)~~
- ~~4. Develop a method to assess the need for rural area parking facilities on County routes using appropriate service standards. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 2)~~
- ~~5. Develop site design standards for public transit facilities to be incorporated into County land use codes and regulations. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 2)~~
- ~~6. As appropriate, require that construction of new roadways and improvements to existing roadways to address the safety needs of bicyclists and pedestrians in conformance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)~~
- ~~7. Address the needs of nonmotorized users of the transportation network by developing a non-motorized comprehensive plan. The plan will include strategies that; develops a Non-motorized Project Priority Programming System that identifies and ranks projects necessary to provide safe bicycle and pedestrian travel; develops operation standards and a maintenance program that addresses the safety needs of non-motorized travelers, and; develops a proposal to the Board of County Commissioners for inclusion in the six-year transportation improvement plan a strategy potentially allocating a percentage of transportation funds to be used to support non-motorized projects. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3) (This action item has been addressed through the development of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan)~~
- ~~8. Encourage opportunities to develop abandoned railroad rights of way or utility corridors as future transportation corridors such as bikeways, pedestrian/equestrian trails, and roadways. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3) (This action item will be addressed through the implementation of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan)~~
- ~~10. Develop incentives for developers to dedicate land for expansion of the County's trail network and adopt into land development regulations. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)~~
- ~~10. Develop and adopt bicycle/pedestrian facilities standards compatible with County road standards and those applicable standards of adjacent jurisdictions and require compliance with these standards in the permitting and review process. (Corresponding Goals: TRG 3 and TRG 4) (This action item has been addressed through the development of and regional agencies, utilities, and citizen groups)~~

**TRP 3.4** Promote development of an integrated trail system in the County in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan by seeking opportunities to

provide links between existing trails during planning for improvements to the County transportation system and in review of land development proposals.

- TRP 3.5** Promote coordinated bicycle, equestrian, and pedestrian way improvements in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan, emphasizing access to schools, parks, employment and service centers, and mass transit facilities (ferry, bus, etc.).
- TRP 3.6** Require that roadway improvements and new subdivisions within the defined school pedestrian walking zone meet established standards intended to ensure the safety of pedestrians.
- TRP 3.7** Support educational opportunities for children and adults that will encourage safe use of roadways, trails, and sidewalks for all transportation modes.
- TRP 3.8** Promote safe, convenient, and protected bicycle parking at activity centers such as schools, parks, commercial centers, employment and service centers, and mass transit facilities (ferry, bus, etc.) in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.
- TRP 3.9** In coordination with the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan and the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreation Trails Plan, provide signage for on-street segments of bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian routes in accordance with the Federal Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).
- TRP 3.10** Promote development of adequate pedestrian walkways and crossings, where appropriate, including facilities separated from the roadway, in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan. Evaluate safety issues associated with pedestrian and bicycle travel near school sites and identify potential improvements.

## LAND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

### GOAL

- TRG 4.0** Encourage land use types, mixes, and densities that promote efficient multi-modal transportation systems.

### POLICIES

- TRP 4.1** Reinforce the link between land use and public transportation by promoting urban residential densities within urban growth areas.
- TRP 4.2** Encourage land development proposals that are consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan Land Use and Rural Element and Urban Growth Areas Element and utilize the capacity of the existing transportation system, including the capacity of transit and non-motorized modes, and avoid costly expansion of the system.
- TRP 4.3** Consider the use of impact fees as a means to ensure that adequate facilities (including, but not limited to transit, pedestrian facilities, bikeways, and roadways and shoulders) are

available to serve new growth and development, and to maintain adopted level of service standards for those facilities.

**TRP 4.4** Enhance transportation system safety by requiring appropriate facility design, including providing landscaping and setbacks adjacent to transportation facilities.

**TRP 4.5** Protect outstanding scenic vistas accessible from transportation facilities through site design, and provide visual, and where possible and appropriate, physical, access to these resources.

**TRP 4.6** Require that subdivision and commercial project designs address the following issues:

- a. Cost effective transit and delivery of emergency service;
- b. Provisions for all transportation modes;
- c. Dedication of rights of way for existing and future transportation needs;
- d. Motorized and non-motorized access;
- e. Shoulders, sidewalks and bicycle pathways;
- f. Compatibility between motorized vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users;
- g. Inclusion of transit friendly design elements;
- h. Adequate parking for non-peak periods; and
- i. Frontage improvements and roadway features to meet urban design standards within the Irondale-Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area and, when appropriate, the Port Ludlow Master Planned Resort.

**TRP 4.7** Provide adequate right-of-way for future transportation needs, through implementation of a systematic right-of-way acquisition program, by limiting encroachment of structures or ancillary uses into the right-of-way (e.g., setbacks), requiring right-of-way dedication or easements as part of development approval, and by acquiring right-of-way for future needs through purchase from willing sellers.

**TRP 4.8** Ensure that unacceptable safety hazards will be mitigated. The definition of unacceptable will be based on analysis of the existing facility(s) and the current standards for that facility(s) contained in commonly used and adopted transportation publications.

**TRP 4.9** Ensure that the Level of Service for County roads are met for existing and proposed development concurrent with proposed development prior to issuing development approvals.

**TRP 4.10** Ensure that new developments that would generate traffic that would significantly decrease the Level of Service below the adopted Level of Service Standard for an intersection or roadway segment not be approved without stipulations for mitigation. When a new development would lower the Level of Service below the adopted Level of Service Standard, require the development proponent to mitigate the impact by one of the following:

- 1. Construct improvements that restore the Level of Service to the adopted Level of Service Standard;
- 2. Contribute an impact fee that is a proportionate share of the cost of improvements related to the development;
- 3. Implement alternative measures such as Transportation Demand Management (TDM), project phasing, or other appropriate measures determined by the County that

will avoid the impact.

**TRP 4.11** Encourage land use development patterns and support technologies that reduce the demand for increased capacity on roadways.

**TRP 4.12** Ensure that proposed roads on unopened public rights-of-way are constructed to appropriate County standards based on their function, location, projected traffic, and potential for future circulation.

#### GOAL

**TRG 5.0** Provide additional roadway aesthetic features that are consistent with surrounding land use.

#### POLICIES

**TRP 5.1** Develop additional features that enhance accessibility to and visibility of commercial establishments, and apply the features to the appropriate locations.

**TRP 5.2** Protect arterials and highways from encroachment and congestion by access, utilizing appropriate traffic mitigation techniques for commercial development and other impediments to flow.

**TRP 5.3** Ensure that local access roads provide through passage at appropriate speeds that minimize impacts to the surrounding area, and discharge to an appropriate facility.

#### GOAL

**TRG 6.0** Ensure that the transportation system in Jefferson County encourages the efficient movement of goods, services and passengers and is integrated with the statewide system.

#### POLICIES

**TRP 6.1** Coordinate with the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO) and other jurisdictions to ensure that adequate Washington State Ferry System service is provided to the community.

**TRP 6.2** Allow the use of public funds that ensure that appropriate transportation facilities are in place at the time of development in designated commercial and industrial zones.

**TRP 6.3** Ensure that access to the major air and water transportation facilities via County arterials and State highways is safe, efficient, and coordinated with other transportation modes.

**TRP 6.4** Recognize the existence and current use of private small airfields, landing strips, and private helistops in land use decisions, and ensure proposed expansions of these private facilities meet all required development criteria.

#### **INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION**

GOAL

**TRG 7.0** **Ensure that the Jefferson County Transportation Plan reflects public desire and is coordinated and consistent with the plans of state, regional, and local governments.**

POLICIES

- TRP 7.1      Ensure efficient management of all transportation resources through cooperation in planning and project development with Federal, State, regional, and local jurisdictions.
- TRP 7.2      Coordinate with relevant agencies in the development of Federal, State, and County regulations and guidelines for transportation of hazardous materials through the County.
- TRP 7.3      Reduce duplication of services, program costs, and increase the quality of service.
- TRP 7.4      Coordinate planning for transportation improvements and projects with the facilities/utility planning activities of other agencies and utilities in order to ensure that per-project costs are reduced, environmental impacts minimized, and community inconvenience and disruption lessened.
- TRP 7.5      Comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) in all transportation projects.

GOAL

- TRG 8.0      Ensure that transportation planning includes extensive opportunities for public involvement.

POLICIES

- TRP 8.1      Consider convening a transportation advisory committee to assist the County with transportation planning and implementation issues.
- TRIP 8.2      Conduct a public process to develop local criteria and standards for arterial, collector, and local access streets, commercial and residential development, and roadway maintenance.

DEMAND MANAGEMENTGOAL

- TRG 9.0      Promote demand management programs as a means of reducing traffic, minimizing environmental impacts, and optimizing existing transportation investments.

POLICIES

- TRP 9.1      Encourage employers to offer flexible work schedules that reduce peak period travel and lessen the need for roadway capacity.
- TRP 9.2      Encourage employers to provide on-site facilities that encourage use of alternative transportation modes, such as transit shelters and covered bike racks, lockers, and showers at work sites

**TRP 9.3** Facilitate transportation demand management by coordinating and assisting in the development of transit amenities and non-motorized transportation facilities in County Road or highway improvements, including bus pullouts, passenger shelters, bypass lanes, park-and-ride facilities, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and multi-purpose trails, where appropriate.

**TRP 9.4** Participate with State government and transit agencies in developing, promoting, and facilitating regional ridesharing through such programs as parking management, and ride match services and preferential parking for carpools and vanpools.

## **ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY**

### **GOAL**

**TRG 10.0** **Provide transportation facilities and services that are energy efficient, protect and enhance the environment, and preserve the existing residential quality of life.**

### **POLICIES**

**TRP 10.1** Continue the County's commitment to use only mechanical and manual methods to control roadside vegetation.

**TRP 10.2** Ensure that all transportation projects comply with the Jefferson County Unified Development Code Environmentally Sensitive Areas standards in order to protect critical areas, preserve open space, and maintain wildlife habitat in transportation projects and planning. Include the mitigation of adverse impacts on water resources, drainage patterns, and soils in the design of transportation facilities.

**TRP 10.3** Protect air quality by improving the operating efficiency of the overall transportation system, through the effective use of different modes.

**TRP 10.4** Promote the conservation of energy through transportation demand management policies and techniques.

**TRP 10.5** Address environmental retrofitting of transportation facilities, including the implementation of stormwater management facility best management practices (BMPs) and the replacement of culverts that impede fish passage, as opportunities and funding allows.

**TRP 10.6** Transportation facilities and services shall be sited, designed, or buffered to fit in harmoniously with their surroundings, as appropriate. When sited within or adjacent to residential areas, special attention should be given to noise, light, and glare impacts.

**TRP 10.7** Encourage separation between motorized travel and non-motorized transportation modes, where appropriate and economically feasible.

## **TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

### **GOAL**

---

**TRG 11.0** Develop a transportation improvement program that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

**POLICIES**

**TRP 11.1** Roadway improvement projects included in the County's Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program shall be consistent with the goals and policies of the Transportation Element, other elements of the County's Comprehensive Plan, and the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.

**TRP 11.2** Projects included in the transportation improvement program shall be evaluated and ranked using the County's adopted Road Project Priority Programming System and the criteria included therein.

**TRP 11.3** In order to provide needed improvements to local access roads that function as collectors and ensure that appropriate standards are applied, consider developing a local functional classification system that includes sub-classifications for local access roads.

**STRATEGIES****Action Items**

1. Monitor traffic volumes and intersection performance within UGAs on all arterial and major collector facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 1)
2. Develop access management techniques to regulate driveway access, including use of shared driveway access. Work with the Washington State Department of Transportation and property owners to develop appropriate access management measures that will minimize the impacts to SR 19 and SR 116 from new developments and redevelopments in the Irondale and Port Hadlock UGA. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 1)
3. Discourage direct access from individual lots to present and planned future arterials and collectors wherever possible. Access from these sites should be provided through local access or collector roadways. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 1)
4. Develop a method to assess the need for rural area parking facilities on County routes using appropriate service standards. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 2)
5. Develop site design standards for public transit facilities to be incorporated into County land use codes and regulations. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 2)
6. As appropriate, require that construction of new roadways and improvements to existing roadways address the safety needs of bicyclists and pedestrians in conformance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
7. Develop a Non-motorized Project Priority Programming System that identifies and ranks projects necessary to provide safe bicycle and pedestrian travel; develop operation standards and a maintenance program that addresses the safety needs of non-motorized travelers, and; develop a proposal to the Board of County Commissioners for inclusion in the Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan for allocating transportation funds to support non-motorized transportation projects. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
- ~~10.8. When appropriate opportunities occur, develop abandoned railroad rights-of-way or utility corridors as future transportation corridors such as bikeways, pedestrian/equestrian trails, and roadways. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)~~
9. Develop incentives for developers to dedicate land for expansion of the County's trail network and adopt into land development regulations. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
10. As appropriate, require that development proposals provide bicycle/pedestrian facilities that meet the standards in the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan)
- ~~11. In cooperation with school districts, identify the boundaries of school pedestrian walking zones, develop standards and criteria for roadways within these areas, and define the types of improvement projects that would need to comply with these standards. (This portion of the action item has been addressed through the development of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan.) Adopt the standards into the county subdivision code. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)~~

- ~~12. Encourage area school districts to discourage unsafe pedestrian and bicycle activities by students. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)~~
- ~~13. Identify existing deficiencies related to pedestrian walkways and crossings, and incorporate improvements into the six-year Transportation Improvement Program. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)~~
- ~~14. Consider acquisition of out-of-use railroad rights of way to preserve these resources as future transportation corridors such as bikeways, pedestrian or equestrian trails, and roadways. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3) (This action item has been addressed through the development of Plan. (Corresponding Goals: TRG 3 and TRG 4)~~
11. In cooperation with school districts, identify the boundaries of school pedestrian walking zones, develop standards and criteria for roadways within these areas, and define the types of improvement projects that would need to comply with these standards. Adopt the standards into the county subdivision code. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
- 14.12. Encourage area school districts to discourage unsafe pedestrian and bicycle activities by students. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
13. Identify existing deficiencies related to pedestrian walkways and crossings, and incorporate improvements into the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
14. When implementing projects identified in the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan)
- ~~15. Develop criteria to be met to justify expansion of transportation system, and a list of alternatives to be considered before system expansion will be permitted. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4)~~
- ~~16. Develop and adopt standards that enhance safety for inclusion into implementing ordinances. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4)~~
- ~~17. Consider use of street design and traffic management alternatives to discourage unsafe travel speeds and inappropriate through traffic in neighborhoods, such as traffic calming devices, intersection configuration, or the use of curvilinear streets. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4)~~
- ~~18. Develop and adopt site design standards and guidelines that encourage the preservation of outstanding vistas. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 5)~~
- ~~19. Design residential transportation facilities to discourage high-speed through traffic, by utilizing appropriate design criteria, such as traffic calming facilities when supported by the surrounding area. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 5)~~
- ~~20. Develop a plan and criteria for the use and financial support for traffic calming facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 5)~~
- ~~21. Review and revise, as necessary, performance standards for the review of proposed developments that ensure the proper functioning of transportation facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)~~

- ~~22. As necessary, review and revise minimum requirements for setbacks and rights-of-way (including pedestrian and nonmotorized facilities) for new and existing roadways, based on the roadway functional classification. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)~~
- ~~23. Develop and adopt criteria for the establishment of public roadways based on function, capacity, health and safety, access, public need, adopted County Road Standards, and the financial capability for maintenance and preservation. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)~~
- ~~24. As needed, develop and adopt standards that require and promote efficient access, mobility and compatibility for motorized vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4, TRG 5, and TRG 6) (This action item has been in part addressed through the development of the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan)~~
- ~~25. As necessary, develop and adopt land development standards that provide guidance in how to include transit-friendly design elements in developments, and require all developments to adhere to these standards. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)~~
- ~~26. Develop and adopt parking standards and provide a range of alternatives for meeting the need for parking while not generating an oversupply of parking. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)~~
- ~~27. Explore opportunities for development of private or public passenger-only ferry service to Jefferson County. (corresponding Goal: TRG 6)~~
- ~~28. Continue participation in intergovernmental planning efforts, and develop additional mechanisms to achieve this cooperation and coordination as needed. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 6, TRG 7, and TRG 8)~~
- ~~29. During the annual review of capital projects, identify services that may be duplicated, opportunities to reduce program costs, and ways to increase the quality of service. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 7 and TRG 8)~~
- ~~30. Develop coordinated planning and construction of capital and transportation projects with relevant parties (County, City, and State department and agencies, utility companies, etc.) through periodic communications regarding future projects. Use the Regional Transportation Improvement Program and local Transportation Improvement Programs to identify these potentially collaborative projects. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 7 and TRG 8)~~
- ~~31. Develop a mechanism in the project review process that requires interjurisdictional coordination, where projects involve various jurisdictions, to enable shared compliance with current ADA requirements. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 7)~~
- ~~32. Develop, as needed, a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program that provides a range of TDM techniques appropriate to Jefferson County. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 9)~~
- ~~33. Require the use of storm water best management practices (BMPs) as found in the Storm water Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin, or equivalent, in the development of transportation projects. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 10)~~
- ~~34. As needed, review and revise maintenance standards and requirements that include the maintenance of storm water management facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 10)~~

- ~~35. Identify culverts that impede fish passage and develop a schedule for replacement of these passageways as funding permits. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 10)~~
- ~~36. As needed, review the County's adopted Road Project Priority Programming System and Intersection Rating Procedure and use the established project criteria in the updating of the County's transportation improvement program. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 10)~~
- ~~37. Include in ordinances a transportation concurrency management system that requires development proponents to mitigate the LOS deficiencies for Category A Public Facilities: Rural Road and Designated Tourist Road Facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4.0).~~

**FIGURE 10-5****JEFFERSON COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT****EXISTING VOLUMES AND LOS**

37. Plan, consider acquisition of out-of-use railroad rights-of-way to preserve these resources as future transportation corridors such as bikeways, pedestrian or equestrian trails, and roadways. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3)
15. Develop criteria to be met to justify expansion of transportation system, and a list of alternatives to be considered before system expansion will be permitted. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4)
16. Develop and adopt standards that enhance safety for inclusion into implementing ordinances. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4)
17. Consider use of street design and traffic management alternatives to discourage unsafe travel speeds and inappropriate through traffic in neighborhoods, such as traffic calming devices, intersection configuration, or the use of curvilinear streets. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4)
18. Develop and adopt site design standards and guidelines that encourage the preservation of outstanding vistas. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 5)
19. Design residential transportation facilities to discourage high speed through traffic, by utilizing appropriate design criteria, such as traffic calming facilities when supported by the surrounding area. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 5)
20. Develop a plan and criteria for the use and financial support for traffic calming facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 5)
21. Review and revise, as necessary, performance standards for the review of proposed developments that ensure the proper functioning of transportation facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)
22. As necessary, review and revise minimum requirements for setbacks and rights-of-way (including pedestrian and non-motorized facilities) for new and existing roadways, based on the roadway functional classification. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)
23. Develop and adopt criteria for the establishment of public roadways based on function, capacity, health and safety, access, public need, adopted County Road Standards, and the financial capability for maintenance and preservation. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)
24. As needed, develop and adopt standards that require and promote efficient access, mobility and compatibility for motorized vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4, TRG 5, and TRG 6)
25. As necessary, develop and adopt land development standards that provide guidance in how to include transit-friendly design elements in developments and require all developments to adhere to these standards. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)

26. Develop and adopt parking standards and provide a range of alternatives for meeting the need for parking while not generating an oversupply of parking. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4 and TRG 5)
27. Explore opportunities for development of private or public passenger-only ferry service to Jefferson County. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 6)
28. Continue participation in intergovernmental planning efforts, and develop additional mechanisms to achieve this cooperation and coordination as needed. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 6, TRG 7, and TRG 8)
29. During the annual review of capital projects, identify services that may be duplicated, opportunities to reduce program costs, and ways to increase the quality of service. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 7 and TRG 8)
30. Develop coordinated planning and construction of capital and transportation projects with relevant parties (County, City, and State departments and agencies, utility companies, etc.) through periodic communications regarding future projects. Use the Regional Transportation Improvement Program and local Transportation Improvement Programs to identify these potentially collaborative projects. (Corresponding Goal: TRO 7 and TRG 8) -
31. Develop a mechanism in the project review process that requires inter-jurisdictional coordination, where projects involve various jurisdictions, to enable shared compliance with current ADA requirements. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 7)
32. Develop, as needed, a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program that provides a range of TDM techniques appropriate to Jefferson County. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 9)
33. Require the use of stormwater management best management practices (BMPs) as found in the Washington Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, or equivalent or the Washington Department of Transportation Highway Runoff Manual in the development of transportation projects. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 10)
34. As needed, review and revise maintenance standards and requirements that include the maintenance of stormwater management facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 10)
35. Identify culverts that impede fish passage and develop a schedule for replacement as funding permits. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 10)
36. As needed, review the County's adopted Road Project Priority Programming System and use the established project criteria in updating the County's transportation improvement program. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 10)
37. Include in ordinances a transportation concurrency management system that requires development proponents to mitigate the LOS deficiencies that result from traffic generated by their projects for Category A Public Facilities: Rural, Urban Growth Area, and Master Planned Resort Roads and Designated Tourist Road Facilities. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4.0)
38. Develop standards that provide pedestrian facilities along one side of local access streets and both sides of collectors and arterials. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 3.0)

- 39. Develop and implement a Truck Routing Plan to direct truck and heavy truck traffic away from residential neighborhoods. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 1.0)
- 40. Develop a traffic circulation plan within and adjacent to Urban Growth Areas that considers the adjacent land use and potential development patterns to ensure that the proper transportation facilities are planned. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4.0)
- 41. Amend the Unified Development Code to provide a consistent and equitable process for opening public rights-of-way in existing plats. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 4.0)
- 42. Develop a County Road functional classification system that includes sub-classifications for local access roads. (Corresponding Goal: TRG 11.0)