Appendix A – Transportation Issues

Working Version

Appendix A Transportation Issues

Summary

Transportation and transportation infrastructure issues have been central to the public discussion regarding the preparation of an updated Comprehensive Plan for Clark County. This appendix represents a summary of the policy discussions undertaken by the Board of County Councilors:

1. Adoption of a new 20-year transportation capital facilities plan to support the land use plan.
2. Confirmation of the 6-year Transportation Improvement Program as the first 6 years of the transportation capital facilities plan.
3. Amendments to the transportation concurrency standards contained both in the transportation element of the comprehensive plan and in Clark County Code.

The final section of this report describes the strategies and future policy actions which, in some combination, could be adopted to address the projected shortfall in revenues to fully fund the proposed transportation capital facilities plan.

Analysis

The analysis of the Comprehensive Plan map followed the approach used with the prior plan alternatives examined in this process. The plan map was converted to households and employment projections based on the yields from the vacant buildable lands model and the application of the expected zoning. As much as possible, the allocation of households and employment was reviewed with local jurisdictions and adjustments were made as needed to reflect local knowledge of development potential. Table A.1 summarizes the land use inputs used for the transportation analysis.

Table A.1 | Land Use Inputs Used in Transportation Analysis

Households	Retail Employment	Other Employment
~~229,998~~217,079	~~49,460~~42,214	~~209,224~~171,692

Source: Clark County GIS~~Clark County Community Planning, 20072016~~

The land use assumptions were inputted into the regional transportation demand model maintained by Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) to prepare an assessment of the likely demand on the county's roadway system (assuming the list of improvements identified in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan). Where substandard major corridors under County jurisdiction showed a Level-of-Service (LOS) E/F, additional mitigation projects were listed in the Clark County Capital Facilities Plan.

Revenue Perspective

The ~~*Revenue Perspective estimates the revenue expected by the county for transportation capital investment over the next 20 years.*~~ projected revenue sources include property taxes dedicated to transportation ("road fund"), gasoline tax distributions to the county, traffic impact fees, Public Works Trust Fund loans, expected grants and miscellaneous revenue streams that accrue for transportation purposes. The analysis accounts for road fund operating expenses that reduce the revenue available for capital facilities projects. The estimated available revenue for county capital transportation improvements over the 20-years of the land use plan is ~~$788.6~~533.1 million as adopted in 2014 (ORD 2014-11-03).

20-Year Transportation Capital Facilities Plan

Table A.2 presents the proposed 20-year list of transportation capital facilities projects. This list, as amended, should be adopted with the comprehensive plan and updated on a regular basis (not to exceed five years). It forms the basis of a future update to the Clark County traffic impact fee program ~~expected to be completed by the end of 2007~~.

In developing the 20-year transportation capital project list, the adopted ~~2007-2012~~2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) was used as the starting point, with cost estimates taken directly from the TIP document. The second group of projects includes a list of corridor improvement projects and intersection needs identified to mitigate major regional corridors which exhibited a low level of service in the transportation analysis. The ~~second~~third group of multi-jurisdictional projects includes regional transportation projects that are programmed in the existing Metropolitan Transportation Plan and were assumed in the ~~2024~~2035 future network for the transportation analysis. ~~The third group included high ranking projects that were identified in the Transportation Improvement Program priority matrix that are beyond the first 6 years.~~ Finally, the fourth group is a list of ~~corridor improvement projects and intersection needs were identified to mitigate major regional corridors which exhibited a low level of service (E/F) in the transportation analysis~~projects that are necessary to maintain, preserve and repair the County's transportation system on an regular annual cycle. The estimated cost of county transportation improvements over the 20-year land use plan is $691.2 million.

~~The first portion of the list includes projects already included in the 6-year Transportation Improvement Project (TIP). The second portion, "priority A", includes projects that have not previously ranked high enough to be included in the TIP. The third and last portion has new projects that have not been reviewed in previous TIP processes.~~

~~The estimated cost of county transportation improvements over the 20-year land use plan is $952.3 million. This estimate reflects the direction of the Board of County Commissioners to eliminate six projects from the draft CFP and reduce the scope of work on two other projects to sidewalk improvements, resulting in a reduction of almost $96 million from the draft CFP cost estimate of $1.048 billion.~~

Table A.2 | Clark County Twenty Year Capital Facilities Plan

CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN 2016-2035

I. Committed - TIP (2016-2021)

Road	From	To	Comments	Total Costs in 6-year TIP	Total Project Cost	Spent Prior to 2016	Completed by 2021	Cost to Complete after 2021	2016-2035 Project Costs
NE 119th St	NE 72nd Ave	NE 87th Ave		$ 3,744,000	$ 23,655,000	$ 19,911,000	Yes	$ -	$ 3,744,000
NE 47th Ave @ NE 78th St	Intersection			$ 214,000	$ 2,623,000	$ 2,409,000	Yes	$ -	$ 214,000
NE 94th Ave	NE Padden Pkwy	NE 99th St		$ 5,021,000	$ 8,973,000	$ 3,952,000	Yes	$ -	$ 5,021,000
TSO Projects (5)	Various			$ 3,766,000	$ 4,981,000	$ 1,215,000	Yes	$ -	$ 3,766,000
Highway 99	NE 99th St	NE 103rd St		$ 10,116,000	$ 10,757,000	$ 641,000	Yes	$ -	$ 10,116,000
NE 99th St	NE 94th Ave	NE 117th Ave		$ 2,065,000	$ 10,547,000	$ 1,304,000	No	$ 7,178,000	$ 9,243,000
NE 119th St	NE 50th Ave	NE 72nd Ave		$ 6,225,000	$ 6,994,000	$ 769,000	Yes	$ -	$ 6,225,000
NE 10th Ave	NE 154th St	NE 164th St		$ 18,824,000	$ 22,751,000	$ 3,927,000	Yes	$ -	$ 18,824,000
NE 10th Ave	NE 149th St	NE 154th St		$ 9,929,000	$ 10,195,000	$ 266,000	Yes	$ -	$ 9,929,000
NE 179th St	NE Delfel Rd	NE 15th Ave		$ 1,876,000	$ 13,100,000	$ 950,000	No	$ 10,274,000	$ 12,150,000
NE 119th St	NE 87th Ave	NE 112th Ave	1.0 capacity EB	$ 11,342,000	$ 12,017,000	$ 675,000	Yes	$ -	$ 11,342,000
NE 15th Ave	NE 179th St	NE 10th Ave		$ 640,000	$ 15,000,000	$ -	No	$ 14,360,000	$ 15,000,000
Salmon Ck Ave	WSU Entrance	west of NE 50th Ave	WSU provide R/W; env. Issu	$ 1,523,000	$ 18,062,000	$ 122,000	No	$ 16,417,000	$ 17,940,000
NE 72nd Ave	NE 122nd St	NE 133rd St		$ 2,600,000	$ 10,800,000	$ -	No	$ 8,200,000	$ 10,800,000
Miscellaneous Projects				$ 600,000	$ 650,000	$ 50,000	Yes	$ -	$ 600,000
Totals				**$ 78,485,000**	**$ 171,105,000**	**$ 36,191,000**		**$ 56,429,000**	**$ 134,914,000**

II. New - Concurrency Driven Projects

Road	From	To	Comments	Cost
Padden Pkwy @ Andresen	Intersection		Interim upgrade	$ 15,000,000
Ward Road	NE 88th St	NE 172nd Ave Bridge	1.7 capacity NB	$ 9,700,000
NE 72nd Ave	NE 133rd St	NE 219th St	NB 1.23 capacity	$ 19,200,000
Urban Arterial Intersections	Minnehaha Street & NE 17th Avenue NE 87th Avenue & NE 63rd Street NE 117th Street & NE Stutz Road NW 36th Avenue & Bliss Road NE 119th Street & NE 132nd Avenue NE 239th Street & NE 92nd Avenue		New 2016-2035 Project	$ 15,000,000
NE 172nd Ave	NE Ward Rd	NE 119th St	New 2016-2035 Project	$ 6,000,000
NE Ward Rd	NE 162nd Ave	NE Davis Rd	New 2016-2035 Project	$ 6,000,000
NE 172nd Ave	NE 18th St	NE 39th St	New 2016-2035 Project	$ 4,000,000
NE 152nd Ave	NE Padden Pkwy	NE 99th St	New 2016-2035 Project	$ 8,000,000
NW Lakeshore Ave	NW 78th St	NW 109th St	New 2016-2035 Project	$ 15,000,000
Cost of New Projects				**$ 97,900,000**

III. New - Regional & Partnership Projects

Road	From	To	Comments	Cost
NE 179th St/I-5 Interchange/15th Ave	Delfel	NE 15th Ave	County road only	$ 16,900,000
SCIP Phase 2	NE 134th St	I-205	Assumes 50% WSDOT	$ 17,500,000
NE 182nd Ave @ SR-500[1]	Intersection			$ 3,000,000
NE 179th St@29th Ave or @50th Ave	Intersections		Environmental Issues	$ 5,000,000
County Cost of Partnership Projects				**$ 42,400,000**

IV. TIP On-Going Programs

Programs	Potential Specified Projects	Estimated Annual	20-Year Costs	2016-2021 TIP Costs
Advanced Right-of-Way Program		$ 100,000	$ 2,000,000	$ 60,000
Bridge Repair/Rehab		$ 2,600,000	$ 52,000,000	$ 8,472,000
Road Preservation		$ 9,000,000	$ 180,000,000	$ 50,124,000
Rural Road Improvement Program	NE 19th Street & 276th Avenue NE 212th Avenue & NE 109th Street NE Ward Road/NE182nd Avenue & NE 119th Street NE 144th Street & NE 137th Avenue NE 137th Avenue & NE 159th Street NE 159th Street & NE 142nd Avenue NE 179th Street & NE 92nd Avenue NE 199th Street & NE 29th Avenue NE 199th Street & NE 50th Avenue NE 199th Street & NE 167th Avenue NE 259th Street & NE 72nd Avenue	$ 2,000,000	$ 40,000,000	$ 5,196,000
Sidewalks and ADA		$ 1,500,000	$ 30,000,000	$ 6,956,000
Transportation Safety Imp.		$ 3,600,000	$ 72,000,000	$ 10,441,000
Urban Development Road Prgm		$ 1,700,000	$ 34,000,000	$ 4,084,000
Traffic Signal Optimization		$ 300,000	$ 6,000,000	
Cost of OGP's		**$ 20,700,000**	**$ 416,000,000**	**$ 85,333,000**

Notes:

1 Amounts shown in 2014 Dollars

CFP COST	**$ 691,214,000**
TIP COST	**$ 163,818,000**

TABLE A.2 **CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN 2014-2033**

I. Committed - TIP (2014-2019)

Road	From	To	Comments	Cost
NE 119th St	NE 72nd Ave	NE 87th Ave		$ 15,000,000
NE 47th Ave @ NE 78th St	Intersection			$ 1,800,000
NE 94th Ave	NE Padden Pkwy	NE 99th St		$ 7,755,000
TSO Projects (5)	Various			$ 6,120,000
Highway 99	NE 99th St	NE 107th St		$ 8,800,000
NE 99th St	NE 94th Ave	NE 107th Ave		$ 7,500,000
NE 119th St	NE 50th Ave	NE 72nd Ave		$ 8,239,000
NE 47th Ave	NE 68th St	NE 78th St	Urban Dev Road OGP	$ 3,417,000
NE 99th St @ SR 503	Intersection		Urban Dev Road OGP	$ 2,269,000
NE 10th Ave	NE 154th St	NE 164th St		$ 22,000,000
Completed Cost of 2014-19 TIP Projects				**$ 82,900,000**

II New - Concurrency Driven Projects

Road	From	To	Comments	Cost
Padden Pkwy @ Andresen	Intersection		Interim upgrade	$ 15,000,000
Ward Road	NE 88th St	NE 172nd Ave Bridge	1 7 capacity NB	$ 9,700,000
Salmon Ck Ave	WSU Entrance	NE 50th Ave	WSU provide R/W, env Issu	$ 12,100,000
NE 119th St	NE 87th Ave	NE 112th Ave	1.0 capacity EB	$ 26,200,000
NE 72nd Ave	NE 122nd St	NE 219th St	NB 1 23 capacity	$ 30,000,000
Urban Arterial Intersections	Various		N/A	$ 15,000,000
Cost of New Projects				**$ 108,000,000**

III. New - Regional & Partnership Projects

Road	From	To	Comments	Cost
NE 179th St/I-5 Interchange	Delfel	NE 15th Ave	County road only	$ 15,000,000
SCIP Phase 2	NE 134th St	I-205	Assumes 50% WSDOT	$ 17,500,000
NE 182nd Ave @ SR-500[1]	Intersection			$ 1,000,000
NE 15th Ave Extension[2]	NE 179th St	NE 10th Ave	Bridge may increase cost	$ 7,000,000
NE 99th St	NE 107th Ave	SR 503		1,000,000
NE 10th Ave	NE 149th St	NE 154th St	Interim upgrade option	$ 2,100,000
NE 179th St@29th Ave & @50th Ave	Intersections		Environmental Issues	$ 5,000,000
County Cost of Partnership Projects				**$ 48,600,000**

IV. TIP On-Going Programs

Programs	Comments	Estimated Annual		Cost
Bridge Repair/Rehab		$ 2,500,000		$ 50,000,000
Road Preservation		$ 7,000,000		$ 140,000,000
Rural Road Improvement Program		$ 2,000,000		$ 40,000,000

Level-of-Service Standards

Level-of-service (LOS) standards serve both as a standard of measure in administration of the county's transportation concurrency program and as a general indicator of congestion levels. The goals of the Transportation Concurrency Program and the Growth Management Act require a balance between land development and the transportation facilities serving that development. The variables in this balance include the growth rate, transportation investments and level-of-service standards. The growth rate was chosen from a range provided by the State Office of Financial Management. Transportation improvement investments were planned over the 20-year horizon based on transportation model analysis and a projection of current revenue streams. The LOS standards are subject to local discretion, but to some extent are dependent on the growth rate, revenue, capital improvements and the local level of tolerance for peak hour traffic congestion. Maintaining current LOS standards would require either increasing transportation investments through more revenue or ~~possibility~~ a reduction in the chosen growth rate and the supply of buildable lands.

Even with the capacity provided by the improvements in the transportation CFP and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the transportation cost/revenue analysis shows that it may not be possible to maintain the current adopted corridor level-of-service standards. The county population will increase by about ~~200,000~~128,586 residents. The number of jobs will also grow to approximately 101,153. ~~With the assistance of economic development efforts by the county and others, the number of new jobs is expected to increase at a higher rate than the number of residents.~~ These two major factors plus the projected increase in vehicle miles traveled will likely result in levels of congestion that could require a lowering of standards in the future. One purpose of the concurrency program is to prevent land development from greatly outpacing transportation facilities and services. If specific areas of the county rapidly develop before the public and private investments are made in surrounding corridors, moratoria declared by ordinance may be one result. The county also uses Urban Holding to insure that critical improvements are reasonably funded before new areas are opened for urban development.

WAC 365-196-415(2)(b) recommends "Counties forecast needs for capital facilities during the planning period, based on the levels of service or planning assumptions selected and consistent with the growth, densities and distribution of growth anticipated in the land use element. The forecast should include reasonable assumptions about the effect of any identified system management or demand management approaches to preserve capacity or avoid the need for new facilities." The needs analysis for the 2016-2035 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan utilized travel demand forecast modeling to determine locations where improvements to the transportation system may be necessary. This analysis focused on two types of transportation deficiencies: segments (link) and intersections.

Segment (Link) Analysis

The link deficiency analysis focused on the PM peak hour Committed 2035 RTC model. All links showing volume to capacity (v/c) ratios greater than 0.90 were identified as corridor level deficiencies. Once the deficiencies were identified, the PM Peak hour Capital Facilities Plan 2035 RTC model was analyzed for deficiencies, using the same link level criteria (v/c > 0.9). The link level network improvements between the Committed model and Capital Facilities Plan model were identified as projects and reviewed to determine which (if any) deficiency each project addressed. The projects that met an identified link level deficiency were kept in the updated Financially Constrained Project list. Projects included in the Financially Constrained model but not addressing any identified deficiencies were removed from the updated Capital Facilities Plan Project list. All link

deficiencies identified in the Capital Facilities Plan model were addressed with new capacity improvement projects. These projects were added to the updated Capital Facilities Plan Project list.

Comparisons between the RTC models with the old land use and the updated land use indicated significant trip loss within the Vancouver city limits, especially on the freeways (I-5 and I-205). As this trip loss was attributed to some outdated land use projects within the Vancouver city limits, the major WSDOT projects on I-5 and I-205 were not compared to modeled deficiencies, but were kept unchanged on the updated Capital Facilities Plan project list. The same approach was used when analyzing projects in urban areas near the Vancouver city limits.

All new segment projects were coded simply as increased link level capacity within the travel models. In addition, the Committed model network was updated to include all the committed projects from the most recent Capital Facilities Plan.

Intersection Analysis

The intersection deficiency analysis also focused on the PM peak hour Committed 2035 RTC model. The analysis focused on unsignalized intersections with forecasted volumes high enough to trigger possible improvements. Unsignalized intersection deficiencies were estimated based on the conflicting major/minor street unsignalized capacities. The conflicting volume analysis helps identify intersections that may fail to meet LOS E standards or may meet signal warrants. As all the intersection analysis was performed at the approach link level (turn volumes were not analyzed). Intersections identified by this process do not necessarily require signalization and in some cases, other intersection improvements may be sufficient. The potential deficiencies were revised after assuming some traffic disaggregation on the modeled collector roadways, as the Committed 2035 RTC model is a simplified network with aggregated volumes. For example, potential deficiencies that were triggered based on aggregated volumes from local roads not included in the Committed 2035 RTC model were not included as intersection deficiencies since these volumes would likely be spread across multiple intersections. Next, the intersection deficiencies were compared to the corridor level deficiencies and overlapping deficiencies were grouped into one project. All remaining intersection deficiencies identified were addressed with new intersection improvement projects. These projects were added to the updated Capital Facilities Plan Project list.

The committed and financially constrained segment and intersection projects for the Clark County unincorporated areas are shown in the attached figure and tables.

Project Identification

The methodology used to analyze segments and intersections resulted in the Clark County 2035 Needs Analysis, detailed in Table A.3. This list separates projects into six categories:

- Modified Existing CFP Projects
- Newly Identified CFP Projects
- Removed Existing CFP Projects
- Committed CFP Projects
- Existing CFP Projects
- WSDOT Projects

The modified "Existing CFP Projects" category recommend amending one project currently listed in the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program. The "Newly Identified CFP Projects" section recommends adding 26 projects to the 20-year Capital Facilities Plan. The "Removed Existing CFP Projects" section recommends removing a project from the 20-year Capital Facilities Plan because it was not identified as a capacity need. The "Committed CFP Projects" section identifies projects in the

existing 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that are needed to serve future growth. The "Existing CFP Projects" category identifies projects that are currently included in the 2014-2033 Capital Facilities Plan that are still needed. The "WSDOT Projects" category includes projects using State funds on State facilities.

The following list in Table A.3 is the result of analysis that forecasted potential areas of congestion in the next 20 years. The Capital Facilities Plan incorporates some, but not all of these identified locations into the 20-year project list. Locations that are not included may be street segments that are fully developed and cannot be expanded beyond the existing classification or constrained by environmental areas.

~~**Table A.3 identifies the proposed level of service standards. Three new transportation concurrency corridors are proposed with the adoption of this comprehensive plan. One existing corridor segment would be deleted due to annexation and the limits of one corridor would be extended. Changes to the existing standards are identified by highlighted and crossed out text. No reductions in travel speed standards are proposed at this time. The Board of County Commissioners has suggested that a more comprehensive review of travel speed standards be conducted in the near future.**~~

Table A.3. | 2035 Capital Transportation Needs

2016-2021 TIP Projects		
Road	**From**	**To**
NE 119th St	NE Salmon Creek Ave	NE 72nd Ave
NE 99th St	NE 94th Ave	NE 107th Ave
NE 99th St @ SR 503	Intersection	-
Highway 99	NE 99th St	NE 107th St
NE 119th St	NE 72nd Ave	NE 87th Ave
NE 10th Ave	NE 154th St	NE 164th St
NE 47th Ave @ NE 78th St	Intersection	-
NE 94th Ave	NE Padden Pkwy	NE 99th St
Existing Capital Facilities Plan Projects		
Road	**From**	**To**
NE 15th Ave Extension	NE 179th St	NE 10th Ave
Salmon Ck Ave	WSU Entrance	NE 50th Ave
NE 119th St	NE 87th Ave	NE 112th Ave
NE Padden Parkway	NE 78th St	NE Ward Rd
NE 10th Ave	NE 149th St	NE 154th St
NE 179th St/I-5 Interchange	Delfel	NE 15th Ave
NE Ward Rd	NE 88th St	NE 172nd Ave Bridge
SCIP Phase 2	NE 134th St	I-205
NE 179th St@50th Ave	Intersection	-
NE 179th St@29th Ave	Intersection	-
NE 182nd Ave @ SR-5001	Intersection	-
NE 72nd Ave	St John's Road	NE 223rd St
Newly Identified Projects		
Road	**From**	**To**
NE Delfel Rd	NW 179th St	NW 199th St
NE 29th Ave	NE 134th St	NE 179th St
NE 172nd Ave	NE Ward Rd	NE 119th St
NE Ward Rd	NE 162nd Ave	NE Davis Rd
NE 172nd Ave	NE 18th St	NE 39th St
NW 78th St	Hazel Dell Ave	Hwy 99
NE 107th Ave	NE Covington Rd	NE 99th St
NE 99th St	NE 7th Ave	Hwy 99

NW 31st Ave	NW 219th St	NW 229th St
NE 82nd Ave	NE 259th St	NE Daybreak Rd
NE 182nd Ave	NE 159th St	NE 174th St
NE 152nd Ave	NE Padden Pkwy	NE 99th St
NE Fourth Plain Blvd	NE 166th Ave	NE 65th St
NW Lakeshore Ave	NW 78th St	NW 109th St
Minnehaha Street & NE 17th Avenue	Intersection	-
NE 87th Avenue & NE 63rd Street	Intersection	-
NE 19th Street & 276th Avenue	Intersection	-
NE 117th Street & NE Stutz Road	Intersection	-
NW 36th Avenue & Bliss Road	Intersection	-
NE 212th Avenue & NE 109th Street	Intersection	-
NE Ward Road/NE182nd Avenue & NE 119th Street	Intersection	-
NE 119th Street & NE 132nd Avenue	Intersection	-
NE 144th Street & NE 137th Avenue	Intersection	-
NE 137th Avenue & NE 159th Street	Intersection	-
NE 159th Street & NE 142nd Avenue	Intersection	-
NE 179th Street & NE 92nd Avenue	Intersection	-
NE 199th Street & NE 29th Avenue	Intersection	-
NE 199th Street & NE 50th Avenue	Intersection	-
NE 199th Street & NE 167th Avenue	Intersection	-
NE 239th Street & NE 92nd Avenue	Intersection	-
NE 259th Street & NE 72nd Avenue	Intersection	-
Removed Existing Capital Facilities Plan Projects		
Road	**From**	**To**
NE 99th St	NE 107th Ave	SR 503
WSDOT Projects		
Road	**From**	**To**
SR 503	NE 87th St	SW 40th St
NW 219th St	NW 31st Ave	I-5 NB Ramps
I-205	Vancouver City Limits	Padden Pkwy
I-5	NE 179th St	NE 99th St
SR 503	NE Gren Fels Dr	NE 132nd Ave
SR 503	NE Rosewood Ave	NE 87th St
SR 503	NE Gren Fels Dr	NE 269th St
NE 50th Avenue & NE 219th Street	Intersection	-

~~Table A.3 Proposed Concurrency Corridor Standards~~

~~Corridors~~	~~Corridor Limits Description~~	~~Corridor Distance (mi.)~~	~~Minimum Travel Speeds (mph)~~	~~Equivalent Travel Time (min)~~
~~Lakeshore Avenue~~	~~Bliss Rd to NE 78th St~~	~~3.54~~	~~22~~	~~9.65~~
~~Hazel Dell Avenue~~	~~Highway 99 to NE 63rd St~~	~~3.57~~	~~17~~	~~12.60~~
~~Highway 99 and NE 20th Avenue~~				
~~North~~	~~NE 179th St to S of NE 134th St~~	~~2.72~~	~~17~~	~~9.60~~

Central	N of NE 134th St to NE 99th St	2.10	13	9.69
South	NE 99th St to NE 63rd St	1.79	13	8.26
St. Johns Road	NE 119th St to NE 68th St	2.53	22	6.90
NE 72nd Avenue	SR 502 to NE 119th St	5.00	27	11.11
Andresen Road	NE 119th St to NE 58th St	3.07	13	14.17
Gher/Covington Rd/NE 94th Avenue	NE 119th St to SR 500	3.46	17	12.23
SR 503				
North	NE 199th St. to NE 119th St	4.07	27	9.04
South	NE 119th St to Fourth Plain	2.80	13	12.92
NE 137th Avenue	NE 119th St to Fourth Plain	2.46	17	8.68
Ward Road	Davis Rd to SR 500	1.18	13	5.45
NE 162nd Avenue	Ward Rd to NE 39th St	2.39	13	11.03
NE 182nd Avenue	Risto Rd to Davis Rd	4.43	27	9.84
SR 502	NW 30th Ave (Battle Ground) to NE 179th St	6.52	27	14.49
179th Street				
West	NW 41st Ave to I-5	2.40	22	6.55
West Central	I-5 to NE 72nd Ave	2.97	22	8.10
139th Street and Salmon Creek Avenue				
West	Seward Rd to I-5	2.66	17	9.39
West Central	I-5 to NE 50th Ave	2.20	13	10.20
119th Street				
West	Lakeshore to Hazel Dell	2.21	22	6.03
West Central	Hwy 99 to NE 72nd Ave	2.64	17	9.32
East Central	NE 72nd Ave to SR 503	2.26	22	6.16

~~East~~	~~SR-503 to NE 182nd Ave~~	~~3.18~~	~~22~~	~~8.70~~
~~99th Street~~				
~~West~~	~~Lakeshore to I-5~~	~~1.97~~	~~17~~	~~6.95~~
~~West Central~~	~~I-5 to St. Johns Rd~~	~~2.13~~	~~22~~	~~5.81~~
~~East~~	~~SR-503 to NE 172nd Ave~~	~~2.76~~	~~22~~	~~7.53~~
~~Padden Parkway~~				
~~East Central~~	~~I-205 to SR-503~~	~~1.91~~	~~17~~	~~6.74~~
~~East~~	~~SR-503 to Ward Rd.~~	~~2.11~~	~~22~~	~~5.75~~
~~78th/76th Street~~				
~~West~~	~~Lakeshore to I-5~~	~~1.31~~	~~17~~	~~4.62~~
~~West Central~~	~~I-5 to Andresen (on Padden)~~	~~3.09~~	~~17~~	~~10.91~~
~~East Central~~	~~Andresen to SR-503~~	~~2.43~~	~~17~~	~~8.58~~
~~East~~	~~SR-503 to Ward Rd~~	~~1.65~~	~~17~~	~~5.82~~
~~Fourth Plain Boulevard~~				
~~East Central~~	~~I-205 to SR-503~~	~~1.03~~	~~13~~	~~4.75~~
~~88th Street~~		~~2,83~~	~~17~~	~~10.00~~
~~63rd Street~~				
~~West Central~~	~~Hazel Dell to Andresen~~	~~3.25~~	~~22~~	~~8.86~~
~~East Central~~	~~Andresen to NE 94th Ave~~	~~1.24~~	~~17~~	~~4.38~~

Figure A.1 | Transportation Needs Identification


NE 359TH ST
NE GABRIEL RD
NE 299TH ST
NE LUCIA FALLS RD
NE 279TH ST
NE 289TH ST
NE ALLWORTH RD
NE 219TH ST
W MAIN ST
E MAIN ST
NE RISTO RD
NE 199TH ST
NE 179TH ST
NE 159TH ST
NE 139TH ST
NW 139TH ST
NW 119TH ST
NE 119TH ST
NE 99TH ST
NE 83RD ST
NE 78TH ST
NE 68TH ST
NE 39TH ST
NE 28TH ST
NE 18TH ST
NE 72ND AVE
NE 172ND AVE
NE 182ND AVE
E MILL PLAIN BLVD
MACARTHUR BLVD
EVERGREEN BLVD
SE MILL PLAIN BLVD
SE MCGILLIVRAY BLVD
SE 34TH ST
NW LAKE RD
Legend
Intersection Needs
Type
Street Needs
Type

030504

Strategies to Balance the CFP

The Growth Management Act requires the 6-year transportation improvement plan to be financially constrained and balanced. The 20-year transportation capital facilities plan is more speculative and is not required to be balanced. The projected revenue shortfall of ~~$163,715~~8.1 million represents about 23~~17~~% of the total projected capital cost, which could be considered significant in the absence of any strategies to close the gap.

There are a variety of strategies and policy actions available to the Board of County Councilors to balance the 20-Year CFP. Options for increasing revenues include updating Traffic Impact Fees, adopting a motor vehicle excise tax of up to $20 per vehicle and increasing the local option fuel tax to the statutory limit. Traffic Impact Fee revenue is projected to be $43 million over the 20-year period. Based on recent policy decisions and preliminary work on the Traffic Impact Fee update, it is realistic to assume that an additional $40 to 50 million will be raised from these fees. Grant revenue estimates are also very conservative.

On the cost side, the public share of many of the capital projects could be substantially reduced if policy changes were adopted that limited traffic impact fee reimbursements to only the extra width of the roadway. Current policy provides reimbursement for construction of even that portion of the frontage improvements that would normally be required with development.

A second round of reductions in the capital projects list is also likely. Several projects on the list would not contribute substantially to mobility on the transportation network in proportion to their estimated cost. Other listed projects are in areas that are likely to be annexed before county financing is available and would then become the responsibility of the annexing city.

The Transportation Capital Facilities Plan will be reviewed on a regular basis, not to exceed every five years, to ensure that the projected gap between costs and revenues is declining. If the potential shortfall increases and becomes critical, the potential courses of action in addition to those identified above would include reduction in the level of service standards and reassessment of the land use plan.

The county ~~will pursue a~~ modified the transportation concurrency program in 2014 to~~that would~~ better protect against the unplanned use of newly created roadway capacity, while allowing new developments to be permitted with predictability. In addition, the revised program ~~could potentially~~ set concurrency standards at a level that ~~would be~~ is consistent with the 20-Year Comprehensive Plan, population and employment forecast, the Capital Facilities Plan and capital funding projections.

Chronology of Transportation Concurrency Ordinances

Ordinance No.	Content
2000-10-03	Amended the Transportation Concurrency Management System (CCC 12.41); amended Chapter 3 and Appendix A of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted a revised CFP.
2001-08-01A	Modified the traffic impact fee; modified the transportation CFP; dissolved TIF overlay areas.
2001-12-01	Emergency adoption of a moratorium in the Salmon Creek Area.
2002-02-05	Confirmed the filing of certain development applications within the Salmon Creek Moratorium area; and declaring an emergency expansion of such area.
2002-03-11	Confirmed the expanded moratorium area.
2002-12-02	Extended the duration of the Salmon Creek moratorium.
2003-04-02	Extended the duration of the Salmon Creek moratorium.
2003-04-09	Modified transportation concurrency and CFP; amended Arterial Atlas; Salmon Creek "fix".
2003-04-16	Corrected 2003-04-09.
2003-06-02	Reserved capacity in Salmon Creek area for preferred land uses.
2005-07-21	Declared a moratorium within the Salmon Creek Moratorium area by emergency ordinance.
2005-09-07	Confirmed the Salmon Creek Moratorium.
2006-09-01	Extended the Salmon Creek Moratorium.
2014-08-09	Replacing the level-of-service approach to measure congestion with a volume-to-capacity ratio approach.
2014-11-03	Adopting the 2014-2033 Capital Facilities Plan.