
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 Growth Management Act (GMA) requires a systematic approach for estimating and planning for future transportation needs based on an analysis of existing conditions and a projection of future 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 2004 Amendments to the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. It updates information contained in the Transportation Element of the 1998 Plan.

It also addresses the addition of the Irondale-Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area (UGA). The addition of a UGA was contemplated in the 1998 Plan following completion of the Tri-Area/Glen Cove Special Study. The Special Study was initiated in 1998 and completed 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 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, 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 development density from those in the 1998 Plan are not anticipated until sewer facilities are developed for the UGA. While necessary planning and preliminary engineering is scheduled for these facilities, they are not anticipated to be in place within the next 6 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 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 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 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. 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 provide the basis for recommendations for transportation improvements that are contained in the 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 intermodal 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.

The Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization 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.

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 and State Routes. All roadways and bridges maintained by the County are evaluated and ranked for inclusion in the Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), as funding becomes available. The County resurfaces approximately 30 to 40 miles of road annually.

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.

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**

Principal Arterial	Minor Arterial	Major Collector	Minor Collector	Local Access (Selected)
Hwy 101 SR 20 SR 104 SR 19		Center Rd Chimacum Rd Irondale Rd Quinault-S. Shore Rd SR 116 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. Quilcene 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 * Urban collector ** Segments adjacent to the City of Port Townsend are classified as urban collector.	Cedar Ave Egg and I Rd Fredericks Street Gardiner Beach Rd Glen Cove Rd Kala Pt. Dr Leland Valley Rd Lindsey Hill Rd Linger Longer Rd Lords Lake Loop Lower Hadlock Rd S. Jacob Miller Rd E. Marrowstone Rd Mason St E. Maude St Masonic Hall Rd Mill Rd Oil City Rd Old Fort Townsend Rd Osprey Ridge Dr N. Otto St Patison St Pioneer Dr Prospect Ave Queets River Rd Robbins Rd Sandy Shore Rd Seamount Dr Seton Road Shine Rd Snow Creek Rd Swansonville Rd Teal Lake Rd Thomas Dr Thomas St Walker Way West Valley Rd Woodland Drive W. Uncas Rd Zelatched Point Rd 5th Ave 7th Ave S 8th St S 7th Ave

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

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

N/A – Not Available

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

Roadway	Milepost	ADT*	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
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**

Roadway	Milepost	ADT	2000	2001	2002	2003	Average Accident Rate 2000-2003*
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
Average							0.89

*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**

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

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, a Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan was adopted 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. The State of Washington Inventory of Bridges and Structures (SWIBS) is 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

Year 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, 2024 forecast ADT, existing LOS, and 2024 forecast 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**.

The methodology established to estimate future traffic growth links the historic growth rate in housing units to traffic growth rates. The growth in housing units was converted to growth in population by assuming 2.3 residents per unit in order to utilize the 2000 Census population counts in calculations. A ratio of forecast countywide population growth to historic population growth was determined. This ratio was composed of both land use factors characteristic of this plan and planning area factors. The historic population growth rate, based on the years 1998-2003, was determined for each of the community planning areas. A ratio of forecast growth to historic growth was then calculated for each planning area. This population growth ratio was then applied to the historic traffic growth rate to develop a forecast traffic growth rate that linked population growth to traffic growth. The land use characteristics and planning area variations in the ratio served to properly weight the forecast traffic growth rate. Historic traffic growth rates were calculated for road segments within each planning area. For most of the routes, base data was available for the years 1996-2002. Therefore, most of the roadway historic traffic growth rates are based on that time period.

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 development. The forecast traffic growth rates for these roadways were based strictly on the historic traffic growth rates calculated for the road segments within each of the planning areas. Since the greatest influence on State Route traffic is through traffic, the traffic growth rates for these routes are not weighted by planning area. 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.

County Roads. The forecast traffic growth rates for County roads were calculated from historic traffic growth on those roads and weighted by the population growth "ratios" for each of the planning areas and the land use plan. 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.

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 County roads are expected to operate 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)
- SR 104 (SR 19 to Jefferson/Kitsap County Line)
- SR 19 (Center Road to SR 20)
- SR 20 (SR 19 to Mill Road)
- SR 116 (SR 19 to Irondale Road)

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. Jefferson County currently exceeds its adopted level of service. 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:

Highways and Arterials	Goal 1
Public Transportation	Goal 2
Non-motorized 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 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** Encourage the use of 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) or a minimum Level of Service of 270 ATRS per 1,000 County-wide population for fixed routes in 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.

TRP 3.3 Promote the development of new trails and linkages between trails in accordance with the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan and in coordination with Federal, State, 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 Element and Rural 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 or road 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 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 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 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 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 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. (Proposed in response to BOCC public hearing testimony.) (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 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)
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. (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. (A 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. When implementing projects identified in the Non-motorized Transportation and Trails 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) (This action item has been addressed through the development of the Non-motorized Transportation and 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 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) (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: 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 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 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 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)