SAN JUAN COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
135 Rhone Street, PO Box 947, Friday Harbor, WA 98250
(360) 378-2354 | (360) 378-2116 | FAX (360) 378-3922
cdp@sanjuanco.com | www.sanjuanco.com

MEMO

TO:	Planning Commission
CC:	County Council Mike Thomas, County Manager
FROM:	Linda Kuller, AICP, Planning Manager, DCD
SUBJECT:	2036 Comprehensive Plan Update: Transportation Element Update Briefing
DATE:	July 5, 2019
BRIEFING:	Planning Commission: July 19, 2019
ATTACHMENTS:	A. Excerpt: WA. State Dept. of Commerce Checklist (Transportation Element) https://deptofcommerce.app.box.com/s/tfb53cistlruqonxwwewwyar57d3mcbv B. SJC Ordinance 24-2018 Adopting a Complete Streets Program C. SJCC 18.60.200 Concurrency D. Related WACs and RCWs
CURRENT ELEMENT:	Transportation Element: https://www.sanjuanco.com/510/Comprehensive-Plan.

Briefing Purpose: To provide a background briefing regarding Growth Management Act (GMA) requirements related to the Transportation Element, summary of existing goals and policies, and a status report. The intent is to set the groundwork for future discussions about transportation and land use policies. If you have not read the existing San Juan County Comprehensive Plan (Comprehensive Plan) Transportation Element, a link is provided above. Section B, Element 6 of the Comprehensive Plan contains the transportation goals and polices. Appendix 6, Transportation, includes the County's existing transportation system inventories and level of service assessments.

Background: The Comprehensive Plan is the County's official policy statement. It provides a long-range framework to guide decisions about growth, land uses, transportation systems, conservation of natural resources, capital expenditures, procedures and programs. The Transportation Element is a mandatory element of the Comprehensive Plan under GMA. It must be updated every ten years to reflect new population and growth forecasts and to assess transportation facility and service demands and capacity.

This element can be an effective tool for shaping future development patterns, levels of traffic congestion and the character of urban growth areas. GMA intends for it to be consistent with and implement the Land Use Element. During the update process, the County Council and Planning Commission will have the opportunity evaluate policy choices, make recommendations about updates to the goals and polices, and levels of service needed to compliment the updated Vision Statement and future land use assumptions.

The Transportation Element provides policy guidance for a variety of transportation modes. It establishes goals and policies to guide the development of air, marine, and land transportation facilities and services in the County. Its update will establish direction for the development of transportation systems and facilities, and improvement programs through the year 2036. When updated, the goals and policies should reflect current transportation system inventories, levels of service analysis, services and community desires.

Recent Updates

The last 10-year Transportation Element update was completed in Ordinance 21 -2013. Ordinance 12-2016, also updated this element by moving portions of the pedestrian and bicycle component also known as the nonmotorized transportation modes from the Transportation Element to the San Juan County Parks, Trails and Natural Areas Plan to reduce plan redundancies. Specific nonmotorized components are now in the renamed 2022 San Juan County Parks, Trails and Natural Area Plan and Nonmotorized Plan (PTNA-NM Plan). General transportation polices related to nonmotorized transportation were retained in the Transportation Element. The PTNA-NM Plan is adopted by reference in the Transportation Element.

Including nonmotorized plans in the PTNA-NM ensures more regular updates of such plans because the PTNA-NM Plan is updated every six years after an extensive public participation process. The six-year updates help the County retain eligibility for grant funding from the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Funding Board. The PTNA-NM contains a community needs assessment, inventories of nonmotorized facilities, action, funding, and capital facilities plans. It is developed by the San Juan County Parks and Fair Department, Public Works Department, and Land Bank. They use it to implement nonmotorized transportation and recreation projects.

GMA Periodic Update

During the periodic update of the Comprehensive Plan, amendments will be needed to comply with the GMA and make the Transportation Element consistent with the updated growth projections. These updates will help guide the development of, and investment in, transportation systems that meet the community vision and land use plan.

A primary objective in updating this element is to accurately define the County's existing transportation system and to identify and integrate transportation alternatives into the plan that could enhance the existing system, while promoting safe and efficient movement of people. Policies and goals supporting the philosophy and chosen direction for each mode of transportation will be reviewed and updated.

The Washington State Department of Commerce's (Department of Commerce) "Comprehensive Plan Checklist: Technical Assistance Tool" is used as an aid in reviewing the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations for consistency with the current GMA requirements (Attachment A (includes links to relevant State laws)). Attachment D also contains related WACs and RCWs.

Growth Management Act Legal Framework: The legal framework for planning under the GMA is structured on the foundation of early and continuous public participation. Other requirements are intended to ensure the development of coordinated and consistent plans that use resources efficiently, get the most out of the transportation system and that transportation investments support a thriving community. For consistency:

- All plan elements must be consistent with relevant county-wide planning policies (CWPPs) (Appendix 2 of the Comprehensive Plan) and the GMA;
- Plan elements should be internally consistent;
- Policies must be consistent with the community's development regulations;
- Plans must be coordinated with plans of adjacent jurisdictions (Friday Harbor);
- Plans must be consistent with regional plans (Regional Transportation Planning Agencies); and
- Transportation investment strategies must be consistent with state transportation plans such as:
  - Washington Transportation Plan which includes the Statewide Multimodal Plan and Statewide Policy Plan;
  - Washington State Ferries Division Final Long-Range Strategic Plan; and
  - Moving Washington.

<u>GMA Transportation Element Requirements</u>

Minimum planning requirements are established in RCW 36.70A.070 and WAC 365-196-430. RCW 36.70A.070(6) establishes the components needed in the transportation element. The Department of Commerce's GMA transportation element update checklist (Attachment A) of this report references the RCW and WAC citations for transportation element requirements. The transportation components that apply to the update are summarized below:

- **Transportation Inventory:** An inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments, state-owned transportation facilities, and general aviation airports are required to define existing capital facilities and travel levels as a basis for future planning.
- **Land Use Assumptions:** A description of land use assumptions used in estimating travel. Use of consistent land use assumptions, population forecasts, and planning periods for both the land use and transportation elements is recommended.
- **10-year Traffic Forecast:** A forecast of traffic for at least 10 years, based on the Land Use Element, to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth. The inclusion of bicycle, pedestrian or planned transit services are recommended in a multimodal forecast.
- **Transportation Demand Management** (**TDM) Strategies:** A description of existing and planned TDM strategies such as parking policies, etc.
- **Levels of Service for All Facilities: Local, Regional, and State:** A regionally coordinated level of service (LOS) standard **for all locally owned arterials** and transit routes is required to gauge the performance of the system, LOS for highways of statewide significance, and LOS for other state highways consistent with the regional transportation plan.
- **Future Needs**: Identification of state and local system expansion needs to meet current and future demands. It is recommended that bicycle, pedestrian or planned transit service be included in the needs assessment.
- **Funding Analysis:** An analysis of the funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources.

- **Funding Program:** A multiyear financing plan based on the needs identified in the comprehensive plan, the appropriate parts of which serve as the basis for the six-year street, road, or transit programs, and public transportation systems.
- **Funding Shortfall Strategy:** A discussion of how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that LOS standards will be met if possible funding falls short of meeting identified needs.
- **Intergovernmental Coordination**. A discussion of intergovernmental coordination efforts, including an assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions.
- **Goals and Policies:** Goals and policies for roadways; fixed route and demand response public transit; bicycle and pedestrian travel; water, rail, air, and industrial port and intermodal facilities; freight rail; and truck, rail, and barge freight mobility.

Note: The bicycle and pedestrian planning requirement was completed in the PTNA-NM Plan update.

Level of Service: The WA. Department of Commerce's guidebook: *Your Community's transportation System* explains that:

> "The Growth Management Act (GMA) **requires local governments to adopt level-of-service (LOS) standards for transit routes and locally owned arterial streets.** Adopted LOS standards are found in the Transportation Element of the local Comprehensive Plan. These LOS standards are used to identify future system needs. **The GMA does not mandate any particular LOS or any particular way of measuring LOS.**
>
> **Instead, LOS standards should reflect transportation goals such as access, mobility, mode-split or capacity in relation to the land use goals of your community.** As your goals for your community's transportation system vary depending upon the surrounding land use context, so should your LOS standards.
>
> Higher-density urban areas well served with sidewalks, bike lanes, transit and arterial streets should have different LOS standards from lower-density rural areas served only by rural roads and state highways, and having limited or no transit service, sidewalks or bicycle lanes. LOS standards should be developed in consultation with other transportation agencies serving your community, such as the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), your Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO), transit agencies and ports."

The GMA Transportation Element checklist (Items c and d) require that:

> **The element includes regionally coordinated level of service (LOS) standards for all arterials and transit routes, LOS for highways of statewide significance, and LOS for other state highways consistent with the regional transportation plan.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B).
>
> WAC 365-196-430(2)(e)(v) recommends LOS be set to reflect access, mobility, mode-split and capacity goals. WAC 365-196-430(2)(e)(vi) recommends that measurement methodology and standards vary based on the urban or rural character of the surrounding area. Also, balance community character, funding capacity, and traveler expectations. In urban areas, WAC 365-196-430(2)(e)(vii) recommends methodologies for analyzing the transportation system from a comprehensive, multimodal perspective.

The element identifies specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance locally owned transportation facilities and services that are below an established LOS standard. RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D) and WAC 365-196-430(2)(g)

Concurrency policies must be consistent with RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b), and consider multimodal improvements RCW 36.70A.108. Strategies such as increased public transit, ride sharing programs, and other multimodal strategies may be used to ensure that development does not cause service to decline on a locally owned facility below adopted levels of service.

Traffic Level of Service: This is a method of using data to measure operational conditions with a traffic stream by using factors such as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience. The analysis is a set of procedures for estimating traffic carrying ability of facilities over a range of defined operational conditions. It is a tool used to assess facilities and to plan and design improved facilities. Factors affecting level of service include lane and shoulder width, speed, road geometry, vehicle type and terrain. The principal objective is to estimate the maximum number of vehicles that a facility or roadway can accommodate with reasonable safety during a specified period of time. It is usually measured on a scale from A to F.

Under the GMA, only roads classified as arterials (San Juan County collectors) are subject to monitoring for level of service and adequate capacity. Local access roads are not subject to the GMA. Level of service for County arterials is measured in terms of 24-hour volumes representing Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT).

The Washington Department of Commerce's guidebook, *Your Community's Transportation System* explains that:

"LOS standards translate transportation and land use goals and policies into specific, measureable operational expectations. The development of a method to measure and maintain adopted LOS standards reflects values and policy decisions that are based on public participation. The primary purpose of adopting LOS standards is to ensure that:

- The community has set realistic, measurable and attainable goals.
- Impacts of growth and development on the system are accounted for.
- Values and policy decisions are expressed in the transportation planning and program decisions of the community.

Adopting LOS standards allows local governments to set expectations for various modes of travel. These expectations are then compared to population projections and the GMA-required ten-year travel forecast to identify future transportation system needs.

Through the travel forecast, communities differentiate between existing deficiencies and future needs necessary to support growth. Counties and cities can then ensure that transportation improvement investments keep pace with development, so that actual system performance does not fall below adopted standards."

Which County Transportation Facilities Have Been Assigned a Level of Service? Levels of service are established in the existing Transportation Element for:

- Docks (Appendix 6, Table 8), and

- Collector roads (Appendix 6, Table 9 (Based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual)

The County has not adopted levels of service for County road intersections in UGAs and has no land based highways or transit systems to set service levels for. The County's highway is the ferry system which has a level of service set by the State.

What Levels of Service Policies Are in the Existing Transportation Element? The following goals and policies address level of service:

6.2.C General Level of Service (LOS) Goal and Policies

Goal:

To ensure that those public transportation facilities and services necessary to support development including, but not limited to roads and docks are adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.

Policies (6.2.C.1-5):

1. Assign LOS standards to provide a basis upon which to evaluate public transportation facilities adequacy which over-time are measurable, understandable, and appropriate to the services and/or facilities being considered.

2. Identify transportation LOS standards and response mechanisms which balance the need for the facility or service with the possible environmental, economic and aesthetic impacts of those facilities and services.

3. Establish a monitoring program for transportation LOS, in which the Public Works Department will annually evaluate demand and capacity of transportation concurrency facilities and other components of transportation management, and will work cooperatively with the Planning Department to review on a three-year basis the consistency of the six-year transportation facilities plan with this Comprehensive Plan and the Growth Management Act. This monitoring program should include cooperation with the Town of Friday Harbor to analyze the correlation between traffic volume increases on County roads and on town streets.

4. Require concurrency in accordance with the goals and policies of this Element. For the purposes of this Element, "concurrent with development" means that improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years.

5. Encourage County departments to work together and coordinate with other jurisdictions to develop a comprehensive level of service standard that includes nonmotorized and transit services.

6.4.C Policies for County Docks, Barge Landing Sites, Ramps and Associated Parking Areas (6.4.C.1-10):

Public marine facilities serve as extensions of the County road system, provide access for kayaks and other boats, create access to popular water trails and recreation areas, are essential components of a thriving economy and are a significant element of the transportation system in an island community.

Appendix 6, Section I.B.4.c of this Comprehensive Plan provides an analysis of LOS for County docks. Tables 7 and 8 in Appendix 6 provide detailed dock inventories and LOS information for three types of docks and dock service areas in the County.

Type 1 docks are located on ferry-served islands and provide primary access for non-ferry served islands. Type 2 docks are located on non-ferry served islands that have County roads. Type 3 docks serve recreational uses or provide access between ferry-served islands. Appendix A indicates that the current LOS for Types 1, 2 and 3 docks are C, D and F based upon lineal feet per seasonally adjusted dwelling unit in a service area. This measurement has not been found to be significantly useful and warrants an investigation of alternative methods of determining LOS standards for docks.

The availability of sufficient barge landing sites and storage areas and their safe use, and development will be needed through the planning period to accommodate business development and road building especially if materials for road building must come from off-island providers. Barge landing sites are also critical for emergency situations.

Policies (6.4.C.1-9):

1. County and state responsibilities for inter-island services and docks, barge landing sites, ramps and their associated parking area facilities differ but should be coordinated. The County should:

    a. Work with the port districts, island communities, and WSF when applicable to coordinate the planning, development, and maintenance of docks, barge landing sites, ramps and associated parking areas.

    b. Provide public docks, barge landing sites, ramps and parking areas as essential public facilities and components of the County road system that are available for public use to facilitate inter-island transport of goods and people and coordinate these facilities with potential passenger-only ferry service operations. Support development of one barge landing site per island when consistent with the Shoreline Master Program.

    c. Place emphasis on first providing adequate load/unload space, and secondly on short-term tie up space. Overnight moorage for recreational use should not be allowed until a feasibility study is conducted that includes an analysis of individual dock usage characteristics, costs and benefits, strategies to minimize user conflicts, implementation and enforcement measures, and a pilot program has been implemented and assessed.

    d. Include freight lifting equipment where necessary or appropriate to facilitate.

    e. Encourage WSF to install load/unload floats or reasonable alternatives to them at all ferry terminals, including the Anacortes terminal, to enhance inter-island travel and promote efficient and convenient use of passenger-only ferry service.

    f. Work with developers of small boat docks (load/unload floats) at ferry terminals designed to improve access to the terminals from islands not served by ferries.

    g. Work with the local utilities to improve service to all marine locations where possible.

2. Locate County docks and ramps only on islands served by County roads. Barge landing sites should be located as needed. Preference should be given to locations where public shoreline access is available and where there is adequate parking space to serve the type of use anticipated. Potential connection to public vehicular transport should also be considered in establishing dock, ramp and

barge landing site locations. Prioritize the use of existing County owned or private barge landings. Limit barge landings in critical areas unless no other option is viable.

3. Prioritize County dock projects as follows:

    a. Modifications and maintenance necessary for the safe usage of existing Type 2 County Docks. Type 2 County Docks are those County docks located on non-ferry served islands;

    b. Modifications and maintenance necessary for the safe usage of existing Type 1 County Docks. Type 1 County Docks are those County docks, located on ferry-served islands, which provide primary access to ferry-served islands from non-ferry served islands;

    c. Modifications and maintenance necessary for the safe usage of existing Type 3 County Docks. Type 3 County Docks are those County docks located on ferry-served islands which are primarily used for recreational purposes or are used for access between ferry-served islands;

    d. New Type 1 County docks within service areas which have no existing County dock pursuant to the LOS policies for County docks;

    e. Capacity improvements to existing Type 1 County docks pursuant to the LOS policies for County docks;

    f. New Type 2 County docks within service areas which have no existing County dock pursuant to the LOS policies for County docks;

    g. Capacity improvements to existing Type 2 County docks pursuant to the LOS policies for County docks; and

    h. New or improved Type 3 County docks.

4. Establish LOS C as adequate for existing and new Type 1 County docks and LOS D as adequate for existing and new Type 2 County docks. Dock level of service is addressed in section B.4 of Appendix 6 of this Comprehensive Plan.

5. For islands and locations where no County dock currently exists, establish LOS F as adequate. Annually evaluate demand and capacity of County docks, and review the LOS standards and capital needs every three years as part of the development of the six-year transportation facilities plan.

6. When the level of service for existing and new County docks falls below the LOS standards in Policy 4, above, initiate the following response mechanisms:

    a. Re-evaluate the LOS standard to determine if changes in available data, and/or community needs or desires, make modification of the LOS standards appropriate; and/or re-evaluate the defined service areas to determine if they still accurately reflect the majority of the users. If changes are appropriate, amend this Element to revise the LOS standards. Identification of how new data, changes in community needs or desires, or changes in the designated service areas make changes appropriate should accompany any proposal to amend this Element.

    b. Evaluate alternative means of increasing capacity or decreasing demand. Include in the evaluation the costs, benefits, and environmental impacts of expanding the existing dock(s), leasing facilities, requiring new development to provide access at private joint moorage facilities, or adding additional public docks to serve the service area(s).

    c. Implement an appropriate mix of capacity improvements and/or demand management strategies to bring the service back to a level identified as adequate by this Element.

7. Adopt and enforce concurrency standards which would prohibit development approval if it can be shown that the development would cause the level of service for Type 1 and Type 2 County docks to decline below the standards adopted in Policy 4, above, unless transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development are made concurrent with the development. Transportation improvements or strategies may include, but are not limited to those identified in Policy 6 above.

8. Provide parking at Type 1 County docks where appropriate and necessary. In general, the number of spaces to be provided should be based on the number of dwelling units in the service area or the more detailed parking utilization study proposed in item 10 below.

9. Complete a dock utilization study which considers the availability of private and public dock space and other dock use characteristics including typical dwell time, useable dock space, peak period use, dock parking amenities, the percentage of non-resident users and other pertinent factors. Use the study results to revise the dock LOS methodology and standards and to and to consider the adoption of a dock parking LOS.

6.5.C <u>Policies for Land Transportation Level of Service</u> (6.5.C.1-7):

1. Establish LOS standards and response mechanisms for land transportation facilities and services which balance the needs of the community for land transportation with the impacts of those facilities and services.

2. Establish LOS standards for collector roads and UGA and Activity Center Intersections based upon Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes. For San Juan County, the maximum AADT levels are provided in Appendix 6, Transportation of this Comprehensive Plan.

3. Establish LOS D as adequate for County collector roads. LOS D can be described as that condition during the peak hour when average vehicle operating speeds drop to 35 miles per hour, platoon sizes are typically 5-10 vehicles, and 75 percent of the motorists are delayed by congestion or slower vehicles. For Urban Growth Areas and Activity Centers, conduct intersection studies to determine the current LOS and evaluate future needs.

4. Initiate the following response mechanism when a County collector road falls below LOS D, based on the AADT:

   a. Perform a traffic study to evaluate a collector road outside of an activity center by calculating the LOS using the methods described in the most current edition of the Highway Capacity Manual, and data for the specific section of a collector road outside of an activity center;

   b. Re-evaluate the LOS standard to determine if changes in available data, and/or community needs or desires, make modification of the LOS standards appropriate. If changes are appropriate, amend this Element to revise the LOS standards. Identification of how new data or changes in community needs or desires make changes appropriate should accompany any proposal to amend this Element;

   c. Initiate an evaluation of alternatives for increasing capacity and/or decreasing demand. The alternatives considered should:

      (1) include demand management strategies and other non-structural improvements,

(2) be cost effective,

(3) not significantly increase adverse impacts of the transportation facility on surrounding land uses or the natural environment,

(4) be consistent with the goals and policies of this Element and the other elements of the Comprehensive Plan, and

(5) include the evaluation of the goals and policies contained in the Land Use Element and Shoreline Master Program that affect the rate and amount of residential, commercial, recreational, and industrial growth allowed;

d. Begin implementation of an appropriate mix of capacity improvements and/or demand management strategies to bring the facility(s) back to a level identified as adequate by this Element within one year.

5. Adopt and enforce concurrency standards which would prohibit development approval if the development causes the level of service for the collector roads to decline below the standard adopted in Policy 3, *above*, unless transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development are made concurrent with the development. Transportation improvements or strategies may include, but are not limited to those identified in Policy 4, above.

6. Develop specific LOS standards for collector roads when needed inside of urban growth areas or activity centers as part of the planning for individual activity centers.

7. Do not require concurrency for any other land transportation facilities.

<u>Intersection Level of Service</u>

Intersection level of service is not required by the GMA although it requires that there should be a planning connection between land use development and transportation levels of service. **The choice of whether or not to set an intersection level of service in urban growth areas is a local choice.** This and other policy choices will be presented to the County Council, Planning Commission and public for consideration.

Consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and the development regulations is important. The County's concurrency regulations in SJCC 18.60.200 reference an intersection level of service but the County has not set one. Road standards in SJCC 18.60.090(A)(6) require a traffic study including assessment of impacts to intersections for any proposed development in an activity center or urban growth area that will result in an increase of 100 or more round trips per day onto a County road:

> "A traffic study based on the most current edition of the Highway Capacity Manual shall be performed for any proposed development that will result in an increase of 100 or more one-way trips per day onto a County road, inside or outside of an activity center or urban growth area. **Inside of an activity center or urban growth area, all intersections that may be affected by the proposed development must be included in the traffic study.** The number of one-way trips to be generated by the development shall be as is defined in the most current edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual."

Last year, proposed development in the UGAs triggered traffic studies that assessed impacts to intersections and roadway functionality. Sometimes these studies included recommendations for improvements such as a turn lane. However, without policy and an adopted level of service, DCD does not have much standing to require developer improvements to address impacts from development.

Many communities set intersection levels of service to assign an acceptable standard for intersection circulation after analyzing the forecasted impacts of future growth and development. Population projection growth rates, demographic data, land use factors, trends in development, travel forecasts and other information are generally used to assess level of service needs in UGAs. This information is useful in assessing growth impacts due to possible buildout, a community concern, and in policy decision-making.

If intersection levels of service are established in UGAs, traffic improvements could be required if a proposed development is predicted to create traffic impacts that would cause an intersection to fall below the assigned service level. This requirement would be implemented through road and concurrency regulations to help ensure that traffic improvements are made concurrently with development impacts.

Concurrency: One of the primary transportation goals of GMA is the provision of public facilities and services sufficient to meet the demand for them. Local governments are charged with ensuring that adequate public facilities are in place to meet the needs of development as it occurs or within a specified time period. This process brings locally owned facilities and services that fall below an established level of service standard into compliance when development permits are proposed. Existing concurrency definitions and regulations are adopted in Chapter 18.20 of the San Juan County Code (SJCC) and SJCC 18.60.200:

> **"Concurrency"** means a condition in which an adequate capacity of capital and transportation facilities and services is available to support development at the time that the impacts of development occur. (See also "adequate capacity (adequate capital facilities)," "available capital facilities (available capacity)," and "level of service (LOS).")
>
> **"Concurrency facilities"** means the public facilities and services for which concurrency is required in accordance with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan. These <u>currently include</u> transportation facilities (ferry service and parking areas, Types 1 and 2 public docks, **intersections in activity centers or urban growth areas**, and collector public roads), and
>
> **"Category A"** capital facilities (County solid waste and recycling facilities); community water systems that serve urban growth areas, AMIRDs (village, hamlet, and residential activity centers and island centers), or master planned resort activity centers; and community sewage treatment facilities that serve village and master planned resort activity centers.
>
> **"Concurrency test"** means the comparison of a project's impact on concurrency facilities to the available capacity, including existing and planned capacity, of the concurrency facilities.

Existing Levels of Service Summarized in the Concurrency Regulations

San Juan County's levels of service are summarized in the concurrency regulations in SJCC 18.60.220 (C) and (D):

C. Concurrency Facilities. The public facilities and services for which concurrency is required in accordance with the provisions of this section are facilities for which LOS standards have been set in the Comprehensive Plan. These are:

1. Transportation facilities (ferry service, Types 1 and 2 County docks, and collector public roads and activity center **or urban growth area intersections*);** and

2. "Category A" capital facilities (County solid waste and recycling facilities; community water systems that serve village, hamlet, and master planned resort activity centers; and community sewage treatment facilities that serve village and master planned resort activity centers).

D. Level of Service (LOS) Standards. The concurrency facilities identified in the Comprehensive Plan, and the levels of service established as adequate for San Juan County are listed in Tables 6.6 and 6.8.

*** The existing code mentions intersection levels of service although none are set.**

Table 6.6. Concurrency Requirements for Transportation Facilities(1)

Concurrency Facility	Standard for Adequate Level of Service (LOS)
Washington State Ferry Service	WSF Level 2
County Collector Roads	Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)(2, 3)
Rolling Terrain	D – 2,790 to 4,380
Level Terrain	D – 3,500 to 6,170
County Docks – Type 1(4)	C – 0.60 to 1.19 lineal feet/seasonally adjusted (6)dwelling units in service area(5)
– Type 2(4)	D – 0.40 to 0.59 lineal feet/seasonally adjusted(6)dwelling units in service area(5)

Notes:
1. Levels of service are set forth in Section B, Element 6 (Transportation) of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. These thresholds are based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) calculations, using average annual daily traffic counts (AADT) and assuming: 40 percent no-passing zones for level terrain, 80 percent no-passing zones for rolling terrain, 60/40 directional split, 10-foot lane width with no shoulders, 10 percent trucks, four percent recreational vehicles, one percent bus. Peak hour factors vary from 0.91 to 1.00 and are taken from Table 8-3 of the HCM. The K-factor used is 0.10 to convert peak hour capacity to a daily volume capacity.
3. AADT is the average daily traffic volume count on a two-way road during a 24-hour period divided by a seasonal fluctuation factor. AADT estimates for collector County roads are available from the public works department.
4. "Type 1 County docks" are those docks located on ferry-served islands that provide primary access to ferry-served islands from non-ferry-served islands. "Type 2 County docks" are those docks located on non-ferry-served islands.
5. See Table 6.7.
6. Derived by formula by the County engineer and reviewed periodically as a part of the Six-Year Transportation Facilities Plan.

Transportation Element Work Tasks: Christine Coray, Public Works' Project Engineer, has completed **preliminary** drafts of parts of the Transportation Element. Internal staff review of the preliminary drafts will begin later this month. Completed tasks are:

- Updated inventories of physical transportation facilities;
- Updated references to the WSDOT Ferry 2040 Long Range Plan
- Updated information about the long range plans of County ports;
- Updated information integrating the Complete Streets Program (Attachment B);
- Updated traffic count information;
- Drafted proposed adjustments to existing level of service criteria to make it better reflect conditions (future policy discussion);
- Revised the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) sections to reflect dissolution of the Skagit/Island RTPO into individual county organizations; and
- Integrated some of the public comments received in Comprehensive Plan public outreach events.

Next Steps: The next steps are to:

- Finish assessing public comments received to date;
- Finish reviewing relevant data;
- Complete internal review of draft documents;
- Provide a briefing on the draft updates to the inventories and basic information;
- Prepare for transportation and land use policy discussions;
- Engage the public and committees in the review of policies and drafts;
- Incorporate Planning Commission and Council recommendations on preliminary drafts; and
- Prepare draft updates to the concurrency code if necessary to ensure policy and code consistency;

ATTACHMENT A

Department of Commerce
Innovation is in our nature.

Expanded Comprehensive Plan Checklist

A Technical Assistance Tool From Growth Management Services – update: July 2014

Instructions:	**Checklist Topics:**	
This checklist is intended to help jurisdictions update their comprehensive plan, as required by RCW 36.70A.130(4 & 5). We encourage but do not require jurisdictions to complete the checklist and return it to Growth Management Services (GMS). This checklist is for local governments fully planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA), not for those planning for resource lands and critical areas only. For general information on update requirements, refer to *Keeping your Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations Current: A Guide to the Periodic Update Process under the Growth Management Act* and WAC 365-196-610. **Bold items are a GMA requirement**. Other items may be requirements of other state or federal laws, best practices, or ideas to consider. Highlighted items are links to Internet sites. Dates are included for recent additions or amendments to the GMA. If you have questions, call GMS at (360) 725-3066.	Land Use	1
	Housing	6
	Capital Facilities	7
	Utilities	10
	Rural	10
	Transportation	11
	Economic Development	14
	Park and Recreation	15
	Shoreline	16
	Essential Public Facilities	16
	Optional Elements	17
	Consistency	17
	Public Participation	17

6. The Transportation Element should be consistent with relevant CWPPs and RCW 36.70A.070(6), RCW 36.70A.108, and should consider WAC 365-196-430 and Your Community's Transportation System: A Guide to Updating and Implementing your Transportation Element (2012)		
a. The element includes goals and policies for roadways; fixed route and demand response public transit; bicycle and pedestrian travel; water, rail, air, and industrial port and intermodal facilities; passenger and freight rail; and truck, rail, and barge freight mobility. WAC 365-196-430(2)(b)] The element should include policies and provisions consistent with regional efforts to reduce criteria pollutants from mobile sources. WAC 173-420-080 If the planning area is within a National Ambient Air Quality Standards nonattainment area, WAC 365-196-430(2)(d) recommends including a map of the nonattainment area, severity of the violation, and measures to be implemented consistent with the state implementation plan for air quality.		
b. **An inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments, state-owned transportation facilities, and general aviation airports to define existing capital facilities and travel levels as a basis for future planning.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A). WAC 365-196-430(2)(c) provides recommendations for meeting inventory requirements.	☐ Transportation inventory	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in plan	Update action, if needed
c. **The element includes regionally coordinated level of service (LOS) standards for all arterials and transit routes, LOS for highways of statewide significance, and LOS for other state highways consistent with the regional transportation plan.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) WAC 365-196-430(2)(e)(v) recommends LOS be set to reflect access, mobility, mode-split and capacity goals. WAC 365-196-430(2)(e)(vi) recommends that measurement methodology and standards vary based on the urban or rural character of the surrounding area. Also, balance community character, funding capacity, and traveler expectations. In urban areas, WAC 365-196-430(2)(e)(vii) recommends methodologies for analyzing the transportation system from a comprehensive, multimodal perspective.	☐ Levels of service for all facilities; local, regional, and state	
d. **The element identifies specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance locally owned transportation facilities and services that are below an established LOS standard.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D) and WAC 365-196-430(2)(g) Concurrency policies must be consistent with RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b), and consider multimodal improvements RCW 36.70A.108. Strategies such as increased public transit, ride sharing programs, and other multimodal strategies may be used to ensure that development does not cause service to decline on a locally owned facility below adopted levels of service.	☐ Concurrency	
f. **The element describes existing and planned transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, such as HOV lanes, parking policies, high occupancy vehicle subsidy programs, etc.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi). WAC 365-196-430(2)(i) provides suggested TDM strategies. If required, a commute trip reduction plan to achieve reductions in the proportion of single-occupant vehicle commute trips has been adopted consistent with the comprehensive plan and submitted to the regional transportation planning organization. RCW 70.94.527.	☐ TDM Strategies	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in plan	Update action, if needed
g. **The element includes a pedestrian and bicycle component.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii). WAC 365-196-430(2)(j) recommends jurisdictions inventory existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and identify and plan improvements for facilities. Improvements could focus on safe routes to school, hazard areas, or pedestrian-generating areas, and should be funded in capital facility or transportation improvement plans. See Bicycle and pedestrian planning information and resources at *www.wsdot.wa.gov/Walk/default.htm* and *www.wsdot.wa.gov/bike/default.htm.*	☐ Bicycle and pedestrian planning	
h. **The element includes a forecast of traffic for at least 10 years, based on the Land Use Element, to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(E). WAC 365-196-430(2)(f) suggests including bicycle, pedestrian or planned transit service in a multimodal forecast. Forecasts should be consistent with regionally adopted strategies and plans. **The forecast should be based on assumptions in the land use element.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) . WAC 365-196-430(2)(a)(i) recommends counties and cities use consistent land use assumptions, population forecasts, and planning periods for both the land use and transportation elements.	☐ 10-year Traffic forecast ☐ Land use element assumptions used to forecast travel	
i. **The element identifies state and local system expansion needs to meet current and future demands.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(F). WAC 365-196-430(2)(f) recommends including bicycle, pedestrian or planned transit service in needs. **WSDOT's Ten-Year Capital Improvement and Preservation Program for state-owned facilities (Required by RCW 47.05.030) is detailed in the Transportation Executive Information System** http://www.transinfo.state.wa.us/ Click on the current projects list, select the most recent legislative final project list and you can select projects by county.	☐ Future needs	
j. **A multiyear financing plan is included in the element based on the needs identified in the comprehensive plan, the appropriate parts of which serve as the basis for the six-year street, road, or transit program required by RCW 35.77.010 for cities, RCW 36.81.121 for counties, and RCW 35.58.2795 for public transportation systems.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B). WAC 365-196-430(2)(k)(ii) recommends that the horizon year be the same as the time period for the travel forecast and identified needs. **The analysis should assess the identified needs against probable funding resources.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A). WAC 365.196-430(2)(k)(iv) recommends counties and cities consider the cost of maintaining facilities when considering new facilities.	☐ Funding program ☐ Funding analysis	

Comprehensive plan provisions	Page # and how addressed in plan	Update action, if needed
If probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs, there is a discussion of how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that LOS standards will be met. RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(C). WAC 365-196-430(2)(l)(ii) states that this review must take place, at a minimum, as part of the eight-year periodic review and update and update of UGAs [eight years per 2011 amendments to RCW 36.70A.130]. Several choices for addressing funding shortfalls are provided.	☐ Funding shortfall strategy	
k. **The element discusses intergovernmental coordination efforts, including an assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions.** RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(v). WAC 365-196-430(2)(a)(iv) recommends developing transportation elements using the county-wide planning policies to ensure they are coordinated and consistent with the comprehensive plans of other counties and cities sharing common borders.	☐ Intergovernmental coordination	
l. **The element discusses how the transportation plan implements and is consistent with the land use element, and how it is consistent with the regional transportation plan.** RCW 36.70A.070(6) and WAC 365-196-430 WAC 365-196-430(2)(a)(i) recommends that consistent land use assumptions, population forecasts, and planning periods should be used for both the land use and transportation elements. **The transportation element must be certified by the regional transportation planning organization.** RCW 47.80.23(3) and RCW 47.80.026	☐ Plan certified by RTPO	

ORDINANCE NO. 24 -2018

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING A COMPLETE STREETS PROGRAM; AMENDING SAN JUAN COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 12.03

BACKGROUND

WHEREAS, San Juan County desires to build and maintain public transportation routes that are designed to provide safe access to all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, motorists and public transportation users;

WHEREAS, the San Juan County Council desires to adopt a jurisdiction-wide complete streets ordinance that plans for the needs of all users and is consistent with sound engineering principles as required to be awarded grant funds under RCW 47.04.320;

WHEREAS, San Juan County desires to take the steps necessary to qualify for funding awarded pursuant to RCW 47.04.320;

WHEREAS, the County Council desires to rename Chapter 12.03 to provide a more general description to cover the contents of the Chapter; and

WHEREAS, the County Council conducted a duly advertised public hearing and has considered all public testimony;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the County Council of San Juan County, State of Washington, as follows:

Section 1. A new section is added to Chapter 12.03 with the heading "Complete Streets Program" to read as follows:

A. Purpose. The purpose of this section is to establish a Complete Streets Program consistent with RCW 47.04.320 by providing safe access to all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, motorists, and public transportation users.

B. Definitions.

"Complete Street" means a public transportation route designed to allow bicyclists, pedestrians, motorists, and public transportation users of all ages and abilities to move around the community safely.

"TIP" means the six-year comprehensive transportation program described by RCW 36.81.121.

C. Principles. The Complete Streets Program for San Juan County consists of the following Complete Streets principles that guide the planning, design, and construction of Complete Streets:

1. To promote healthy communities by designing walking villages and encouraging walking, bicycling, and use of public transportation; and
2. To improve safety by designing roads to accommodate all users; and
3. To reduce congestion by providing safe alternatives to single-occupancy driving; and
4. To preserve the rural character of the community by involving local citizens and stakeholders to participate in the planning and design of Complete Streets.

D. Implementation.

1. Planning. The County Engineer shall incorporate Complete Streets principles into the preparation of the TIP, as provided by RCW 36.81 and RCW 47.30, by recommending Complete Streets projects, as appropriate.

2. Application. For each project considered for inclusion on the TIP, the County Engineer shall evaluate the application of Complete Streets principles into the planned design of the project. This evaluation shall be based on sound engineering principles as defined by RCW 47.04.320(2)(c). The County Engineer may determine that Complete Streets principles should not be applied to a specific project if the project meets at least one of the following exceptions:

a. An absence of need exists as identified in a currently adopted County plan; or
b. The cost would be substantially disproportionate to the need or probable use; or
c. The project would adversely impact critical areas and cannot be reasonably mitigated.

3. Annual Report. The County Engineer shall prepare an annual report on the recommended application of Complete Streets principles. When Complete Streets principles are incorporated in the design of a project, the report shall describe any anticipated costs to the project for their provision. When Complete Streets principles are not incorporated in the design of a project, the report shall describe how an exemption was determined to be appropriate. The final report shall be available to and considered by the County Council during adoption of the TIP.

E. Construction and Funding. Construction of Complete Streets may be achieved through single projects or incrementally through a series of smaller projects over time. All sources of funding may be drawn upon to implement complete streets.

Section 2. Severability. If any provision of this act or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected.

Section 3. This ordinance shall take effect on January 1, 2019.

Section 4. Section 1 of this ordinance shall be codified.

Section 5. San Juan County Code Chapter 12.03 shall be renamed "County Roads"

ADOPTED this 27TH day of NOVEMBER 2018.

ATTEST: Clerk of the Council

11.27.2018
Ingrid Gabriel, Clerk Date

COUNTY COUNCIL
SAN JUAN COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Bill Watson, Chair
District 2

REVIEWED BY COUNTY MANAGER

11/21/18
Michael J. Thomas Date

Jamie Stephens, Vice-Chair
District 3

RANDALL K. GAYLORD
APPROVED AS TO FORM ONLY

By: 11/19/18
Date

Rick Hughes, Member
District 1

18.60.200 Concurrency. SHARE

A. Applicability. Neither the hearing examiner nor the director shall approve a project permit application or development permit application until such application has passed all applicable concurrency tests.

1. All project permit applications and development permit applications that are not exempted in subsection (A)(2) of this section are subject to a concurrency test. These include:

a. The construction or expansion of a structure or use;

b. A change in use of land or structures that creates a need for additional Category A capital or transportation facilities; or

c. A new phase of an existing planned unit development.

2. Exemptions. Project and development permit applications that are exempt from the concurrency review requirements of this section are:

a. Permits that were issued or applications that were accepted as complete before December 20, 1998. If such permit was issued and does not expire, capacity shall be considered to exist for five years after the date of the concurrency finding.

b. Any project that is a component of another proposed development and that was included in a prior application for a finding of concurrency. This does not include new phases of planned unit developments and master planned resorts which must receive new and separate approvals.

c. The first renewal of a previously issued, unexpired permit; provided, that substantial progress has been made.

d. The following actions:

i. Boundary line adjustment;

ii. Final subdivision, if a concurrency test was conducted for the corresponding preliminary subdivision application;

iii. Temporary use permit (Level II);

iv. Variance; and

v. Shoreline variance.

e. Any proposed development that creates no additional impacts on any concurrency facility. Such development includes but is not limited to:

i. Any addition or accessory structure to a residence with no change or increase in the number of dwelling units;

ii. Interior renovations with no change in use or increase in number of dwelling units;

iii. Interior completion of a structure for use(s) with the same or less intensity as the existing use or a previously approved use;

iv. A replacement structure for a structure that has a valid finding of concurrency as per subsection (J) of this section;

v. Temporary construction trailers;

vi. A driveway, resurfacing or parking lot paving;

vii. Reroofing of structures; and

viii. Demolitions.

B. Purpose. To ensure that the capital facilities and services needed to serve proposed development will be made concurrent with development; that is, the facilities must be available and adequate to maintain the LOS standards set in the Comprehensive Plan when the impacts of development occur. This analysis and conditioning is in addition to the evaluation and conditioning of environmental impacts that occurs under SEPA review.

C. Concurrency Facilities. The public facilities and services for which concurrency is required in accordance with the provisions of this section are facilities for which LOS standards have been set in the Comprehensive Plan. These are:

1. Transportation facilities (ferry service, Types 1 and 2 County docks, and collector public roads and activity center or urban growth area intersections); and

2. "Category A" capital facilities (County solid waste and recycling facilities; community water systems that serve village, hamlet, and master planned resort activity centers; and community sewage treatment facilities that serve village and master planned resort activity centers).

D. Level of Service (LOS) Standards. The concurrency facilities identified in the Comprehensive Plan, and the levels of service established as adequate for San Juan County are listed in Tables 6.6 and 6.8.

Table 6.6. Concurrency Requirements for Transportation Facilities[1]

Concurrency Facility	Standard for Adequate Level of Service (LOS)
Washington State Ferry Service	WSF Level 2
County Collector Roads	Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)[2, 3]
Rolling Terrain	D – 2,790 to 4,380
Level Terrain	D – 3,500 to 6,170
County Docks – Type 1[4]	C – 0.60 to 1.19 lineal feet/seasonally adjusted [6]dwelling units in service area[5]
– Type 2[4]	D – 0.40 to 0.59 lineal feet/seasonally adjusted[6]dwelling units in service area[5]

Notes:

1. Levels of service are set forth in Section B, Element 6 (Transportation) of the Comprehensive Plan.

2. These thresholds are based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) calculations, using average annual daily traffic counts (AADT) and assuming: 40 percent no-passing zones for level terrain, 80 percent no-passing zones for rolling terrain, 60/40 directional split, 10-foot lane width with no shoulders, 10 percent trucks, four percent recreational vehicles, one percent bus. Peak hour factors vary from 0.91 to 1.00 and are taken from Table 8-3 of the HCM. The K-factor used is 0.10 to convert peak hour capacity to a daily volume capacity.

3. AADT is the average daily traffic volume count on a two-way road during a 24-hour period divided by a seasonal fluctuation factor. AADT estimates for collector County roads are available from the public works department.

4. "Type 1 County docks" are those docks located on ferry-served islands that provide primary access to ferry-served islands from non-ferry-served islands. "Type 2 County docks" are those docks located on non-ferry-served islands.

5. See Table 6.7.

6. Derived by formula by the County engineer and reviewed periodically as a part of the Six-Year Transportation Facilities Plan.

Table 6.7 County Dock Level of Service

		2010				2021			
		Demand[6]	Dock Capacity[5]	Ratio	LOS	Demand[6]	Dock Capacity[5]	Ratio	LOS
					Type 1[1]				
1	Center Decatur Frost Trump	129	185	1.43	B	133	185	1.39	B
2	Blakely Obstruction	40	187	4.68	A	44	187	4.25	A
3	Waldron Wasp	69	120	1.74	B	69	120	1.74	B
4	Stuart Henry Pearl Johns Cactus	62	120	1.94	B	71	120	1.69	B

Table 6.7 County Dock Level of Service

		2010				2021			
		Demand[6]	Dock Capacity[5]	Ratio	LOS	Demand[6]	Dock Capacity[5]	Ratio	LOS
	O'Neal								
	Spieden								
					Type 2[2]				
5	Stuart	35	376	10.74	A	41	376	9.17	A
6	Waldron	69	248	3.59	A	69	248	3.59	A
7	Decatur[3]	67	0	0	F	81	0	0	F
					Type 3[4]				
8	San Juan[3]	76	0	0	F	96	0	0	F
9	Orcas	76	885	11.64	A	96	885	9.22	A
10	Lopez	76	238	3.13	A	96	238	2.48	B
11	Shaw[3]	76	0	0	F	96	0	0	F

Source: San Juan County; Transpo Group 2011

1. Level of Service (LOS) C is San Juan County's adopted LOS standard for Type 1 County docks.

2. Level of Service (LOS) D is San Juan County's adopted LOS standard for Type 2 County docks.

3. For islands and locations where no County dock currently exists, LOS F is the adopted standard.

4. There is no concurrency requirement for Type 3 County docks.

5. Dock Capacity = Estimated useable lineal feet of dock space.

6. Demand = Number of occupied housing units.

Table 6.8. Concurrency Requirements for Category A Capital Facilities[1]

Concurrency Facility	Standard for Adequate Level of Service (LOS)
Solid Waste and Recycling (Transfer Stations)	Sufficient existing capacity or planned capacity as defined by SJCC 18.60.200(G)(1)(c)[2, 3]
Community Water Systems That Serve UGAs, AMIRDs, or Master Planned Resort Activity Centers[4]	Sufficient existing capacity or planned capacity as defined by SJCC 18.60.200(G)(1)(c)[5, 6]
Community Sewage Treatment Facilities That Serve UGAs, AMIRDs, or Master Planned Resort Activity Centers[7]	Sufficient existing capacity or planned capacity as defined by SJCC 18.60.200(G)(1)(c)[6, 8]

Notes:

1. Levels of service are set forth in Section B, Element 7 (Capital Facilities) of the Comprehensive Plan.

2. Facility capacity is measured on a County-wide basis. LOS calculations therefore will take into account both public and private facilities. For San Juan Island facilities the calculations should include the demand generated by the town of Friday Harbor and its residents.

3. LOS is calculated as follows: AFC = LHD/SWG, where AFC is the available facility capacity at solid waste transfer stations, LHD is the long-haul disposal capability and planned capacity, and SWG is the solid waste generated by County population.

4. These systems are: Eastsound Water User's Association; Fisherman Bay Water User's Association; Roche Harbor Water System, Inc.; Deer Harbor; Doe Bay Water User's Association; Olga Water User's, Inc.; Orcas Landing, Inc.; Westsound Water Users Association; and Rosario Water System.

5. All of the water systems listed in Note 4 have been assigned the same LOS capacity standard in the Comprehensive Plan.

6. LOS is calculated as follows: OC = EC/AC, where OC is the operating capacity for water distribution or sewage treatment facilities, EC is existing connections and memberships (measured in equivalent residential units), and AC is approved connections and planned capacity (measured in equivalent residential units).

7. These systems are: Eastsound Sewer District; Orcas Landing Sewer System; Roche Harbor Sewer System; Rosario Sewer System; and Fisherman Bay Sewer System.

8. All of the sewage treatment facilities listed in Note 7 have been assigned the same LOS capacity standard in the Comprehensive Plan.

E. General Procedures.

1. Concurrency Inquiry Application. Prior to submitting an application, an applicant may inquire from the director or service facilities provider whether or not adequate concurrency facilities exist and if concurrency would be met without an accompanying application for a development permit. The results of any such preliminary test shall be informational only and are not binding on the County. Available capacity shall not be reserved on the basis of this preliminary test, and a finding of concurrency shall not be made. Capacity reservations and findings of concurrency will only be made in conjunction with project permit and/or development permit approvals.

2. The applicant shall, as part of a project permit or development application:

a. Describe the proposal in a manner adequate for each of the facilities and service providers to determine the demands on concurrency facilities that are likely to be generated by the proposal; and

b. Describe any improvements and/or noncapital alternative strategies that are proposed in conjunction with the facility and service providers which may reduce the demand on facilities or increase available capacity.

3. A concurrency test will be performed by the facility and service providers as part of the processing of a project permit or development permit. The director will make a finding of concurrency or a finding of no concurrency based on the results of the concurrency test.

4. If a proposal will make demands on more than one concurrency facility, a separate concurrency test will be conducted for each facility.

F. Concurrency Test Methodologies. The County engineer and the non-County service providers shall develop the methodologies that will be used for conducting the concurrency tests, and shall report them to the director by a date to be arranged with the director.

1. Individual Single-Family Homes, and Simple Land Divisions – Cumulative Review by the County. All nonexempted individual single-family residential development permit applications (except water and sewage service in village, hamlet, and master-planned resort activity centers; see subsection (F)(5) of this section), and applications for simple land divisions, will be reviewed for concurrency

for County-provided facilities, but this review and the development and apportionment of any necessary concurrency mitigation will be done using a cumulative methodology.

2. Short and Long Subdivisions – Special Provisions.

a. The concurrency test will be performed for each subdivision for the specific property uses, densities, and intensities of uses described in the preliminary subdivision application.

b. The County may conduct a particular concurrency test for subdivisions as part of the cumulative assessment for single-family residences that is described in subsection (F)(1) of this section, if the County engineer determines that this would be a more appropriate assessment methodology. The results of any individual analyses and reviews of subdivisions will also be included in the reviews of cumulative impacts and trends for single-family residential development.

3. Where Capacity is Adequate for a Future Period. If the County engineer or a non-County service provider can demonstrate that capacity will be adequate for a period of at least one year, the director shall use this determination in making a finding of concurrency for the particular concurrency facility. The County engineer or service provider shall monitor the continuing appropriateness of this determination.

4. Concurrency Test – Alternative Methodology or Calculation. An applicant may request an alternative calculation for a concurrency test, or the director, County engineer, or service facilities provider may determine that an alternative calculation is required due to the size, scale, or other unusual characteristics of the proposal. In these cases a fee for the alternative calculation shall be paid by the applicant prior to the initiation of review. Final determination of which test or calculation is used shall be within the sole discretion of the director; provided, that the standards for adequate levels of service that are set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and represented in Tables 6.6 and 6.8 must be used and alternatives cannot be substituted for them.

5. Other Nonexempted Development. For all other nonexempted development, including water and sewage service to single-family residential development in activity centers (see subsections (C) and (F)(1) of this section), the concurrency test will be performed only for the specific property uses, densities, and intensities of uses described on the project permit or development permit application, or for the particular phase being proposed for a master planned resort or other planned unit development.

G. Available Capacity – Calculation, Accounting and Reporting.

1. Calculation. The available capacity of concurrency facilities will include both the capacity that currently exists or is finished and in place for use, plus planned capacity.

a. The County, and facility and service providers who are not controlled by the County and who do not require a membership or other commitment as a condition of service, shall account for their "available capacity," which is the existing capacity of the concurrency facility, plus the planned capacities from subsections (G)(1)(c) and (d) of this section, reduced by the capacity that is already used or that is reserved or committed for use in the future.

b. The facility and service providers who are not controlled by the County and who require a membership or other commitment as a condition of service shall account for their available capacity in both of the following ways:

i. "Available capacity," as provided in subsection (G)(1)(a) of this section; and

ii. "Available capacity minus potential demand by approved projects," which is the available capacity of subsection (G)(1)(b)(i) of this section minus the capacity that potentially would be used by approved new development projects. This accounting is to be done in order to reflect the potential additional demand that will be made by the developments when they subsequently apply for memberships and/or meet the conditions of service prior to the time of occupancy or use.

c. "Planned capacity" for County facilities consists of capacity for which the necessary facility improvements and/or noncapital alternative strategies are contained in the County's six-year capital financing plan, the County's six-year transportation improvement program, noncapital programs and strategies budgeted or implemented by the County, and capital and noncapital facilities and programs for which a satisfactory financial commitment is in place. In the case of other service providers, "planned capacity" consists of capacity for which the necessary facility improvements and/or noncapital alternative strategies are contained in a comparable capital plan, addressed in an expansion plan approved by the appropriate regulatory authority, and capital and noncapital facilities and programs for which a satisfactory financial commitment is in place.

d. "A satisfactory financial commitment" for the purposes of calculating planned capacity is a financial guarantee in the form of a savings account assignment of no less than 100 percent of the cost of construction of necessary capital facilities prior to occupancy or use of the development, or of necessary transportation facilities within six years, or a financial plan approved by the appropriate regulatory authority.

2. Accounting. Each service provider shall keep account of its available capacity, and shall monitor this capacity on a continuing basis.

a. For the County, and facility and service providers who are not controlled by the County who do not require a membership or other commitment as a condition of service:

i. Reduce the "available capacity" by the additional capacity needed for new development as determined per subsection (H)(2)(c) of this section;

ii. Reduce the "available capacity" by the capacity for each application exempted from the concurrency test which uses capacity; and

iii. Reinstate any capacity for expired project permits or development permits, unused capacity, or other action resulting in an applicant no longer needing capacity which has been reserved.

b. For facility and service providers who are not controlled by the County and who require a membership or other commitment as a condition of service:

i. Reduce the "available capacity" by the additional capacity needed for new memberships, connections, or other commitments;

ii. Reduce the "available capacity minus potential demand by approved projects" by the additional capacity needed for new development as determined per subsection (H)(2)(d) of this section;

iii. Reduce the "available capacity minus potential demand by approved projects" by the capacity for each application exempted from the concurrency test which will potentially use capacity; and

iv. Account for the reduction of potential service and capacity demands resulting from expired project permits or development permits, unused capacity, or other action resulting in an applicant no longer needing capacity which has been accounted for in subsections (G)(2)(b)(i) through (iii) of this section.

3. Reporting.

a. Each service provider shall report to the director annually the current total available and planned capacities per subsection (G)(1) of this section, of its facility or service. The report

shall be submitted by December 31st of each year, so that capacity changes may be assembled before January 31st for inclusion in the amendment process of the Comprehensive Plan.

b. Failure of facility and service providers to properly report available and planned capacity shall be interpreted by the director as equivalent to a reporting of no available capacity at those providers, until such time as the available capacity is properly reported.

c. If a community water or sewage treatment system serving a UGA, AMIRD, or master planned resort activity center has less than 15 percent available and planned capacity remaining, or if a non-County solid waste and recycling facility and service provider has less than 25 percent available and planned capacity remaining, the annual report shall include a description of any formal plans for expansion of the distribution capacity.

H. Concurrency Test. A concurrency test shall be made for each concurrency facility upon which a proposal will make demands. The concurrency test is applied only to address the added demand placed by a proposal. The costs of needed improvements to address existing deficiencies of transportation and capital facilities are not addressed by concurrency (but by other means, as is provided in the Comprehensive Plan), although such deficiencies are germane to evaluations of the availability and adequacy of facilities.

1. Director. The director will provide the overall coordination of the concurrency test. The director shall notify the:

a. Facility and service providers of all applications requiring a concurrency test and provide the application materials for review, except where either of the following conditions hold:

i. If a service provider has demonstrated that capacity will be adequate for a period of at least one year (see subsection (F)(3) of this section), the director shall use this determination in making a finding of concurrency for the particular concurrency facility;

ii. If a facility and service provider has not properly reported its available and planned capacity (see subsection (G)(3)(b) of this section), the director shall consider there to be no available capacity, and the concurrency test to not be passed, until such time as the available capacity is properly reported. The director shall make a finding of no concurrency;

b. Facility and service providers of all applications exempt from concurrency testing which use capacity;

c. Applicant of the concurrency test results and finding;

d. Facility and service providers of the final outcome (approval or denial) of the project permit or development permit; and

e. Facility and service providers of any expired project permits, development permits or unused capacity (i.e., capacity that is not used either because the developer decides not to develop or the permit expires).

2. Facility and Service Providers. All facility and service providers shall conduct the concurrency test for their individual facilities for all project permit or development permit applications referred by the director. The facility and service provider shall:

a. Calculate the additional capacity needed for the proposal;

b. Review any capital improvements or noncapital demand or load management or reduction strategies that are proposed by the applicant (per subsection (E)(2) of this section and the Comprehensive Plan) to reduce the demand for capacity, and make appropriate adjustments to the capacity needs of the proposal. The facility and service provider may also include in this consideration any additional improvement or strategy proposed by the service provider and accepted by the applicant;

c. For the County, and facility and service providers who are not controlled by the County who do not require a membership or other commitment as a condition of service:

i. Reduce the available capacity of subsection (G)(1)(a) of this section by the additional capacity needed for the proposal as determined in subsections (H)(2)(a) and (b) of this section;

ii. Account for the capacity for each application exempted from the concurrency test which uses capacity; and

iii. Reinstate any capacity for expired project permits or development permits, unused capacity, or other action resulting in an applicant no longer needing capacity which has been reserved;

d. For facility and service providers who are not controlled by the County who require a membership or other commitment as a condition of service: Reduce the "available capacity minus potential demand by approved projects" of subsection (G)(1)(b)(ii) of this section by the additional capacity needed for the proposal as determined in subsections (H)(2)(a) and (b) of this section;

e. Compare the adjusted available capacity from subsections (H)(2)(c) or (d) of this section, with the capacity required to maintain an adequate level of service. The required standards from the Comprehensive Plan are repeated in Tables 6.6 and 6.8.

i. If the adjusted available capacity of a concurrency facility is greater than or equal to the capacity required to maintain an adequate level of service, the concurrency test is passed for that concurrency facility;

ii. If the adjusted available capacity of a concurrency facility is less than the capacity required to maintain an adequate level of service, the concurrency test is not passed for that concurrency facility;

f. Notify the director of the results of the test.

I. Decision-Making Authority.

1. The director is vested with the authority to make a finding of concurrency or a finding of no concurrency.

2. Concurrency facilities providers have authority to conduct concurrency tests for their facilities or services and for determining the appropriate methodologies. The County engineer has authority to conduct the concurrency tests for County-provided facilities, and for determining the appropriate methodologies.

J. Criteria for a Finding of Concurrency. The director shall make a finding of concurrency only if:

1. A facility and service provider has properly reported its available and planned capacity (see subsection (G)(3) of this section);

2. A facility and service provider:

a. Conducts a concurrency test for a project permit or development permit application and determines that the test is passed; or

b. Demonstrates that capacity will be adequate for a period of at least one year (see subsection (F)(3) of this section);

3. The director shall make a finding of concurrency only if the concurrency test is passed for each and every concurrency facility upon which the proposal would have an impact;

4. Any demand- or load-management or reduction strategies that are proposed by the applicant and accepted by the service providers as part of the concurrency calculation are included in the permit conditions; and

5. Any measures, including the provision of new capacity, that are required by the service providers to maintain adequate capacity and which are accepted by the applicant are included in the permit conditions.

K. Term.

1. A finding of concurrency shall be valid for the same time period as the underlying permit, including any extensions thereof, and shall expire if such permit expires or is revoked, and may require a new concurrency test if modified. If such permit does not expire, the finding shall be valid for five years from the date of finding of concurrency.

2. Transferability. A finding of concurrency is not transferable to other land, but may be transferred to new owners of the original land. A finding of concurrency shall only apply to the specific land uses, densities, intensities and proposal described in the project permit application or development application and permit.

L. Facility Capacity and Review Fees. Facility and service providers may charge fees based on their existing fee schedules. This section does not independently authorize the collection of any new fees. Any new capacity fees must be authorized through another authority.

M. Appeals. The director's finding of concurrency or finding of no concurrency may be appealed only as part of an appeal of the underlying permit, according to the procedures in SJCC 18.80.140 for project permits, or the procedures for development permits in the applicable titles of the San Juan County Code.

N. Provisions for Ferry Service and Ferry Service Parking. Concurrency is not required for ferry service or ferry terminal parking. Except for individual single-family residential development, project proposals will be evaluated and conditioned for transportation impacts through the SEPA process. (Ord. 21-2013 § 5; Ord. 26-2002 § 4; Ord. 14-2002 § 1; Ord. 12-2001 § 6; Ord. 2-1998 Exh. B § 6.18)

Related RCWs and WACs: Following are some of the more significant RCWs and WACs. Attachment A has links to each Transportation Element RCW and WAC.

RCW 36.70A.108

(a) Comprehensive plans—Transportation element—Multimodal transportation improvements and strategies.

(1) The transportation element required by RCW **36.70A.070** may include, in addition to improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development authorized under RCW **36.70A.070**(6)(b), multimodal transportation improvements or strategies that are made concurrent with the development. These transportation improvements or strategies may include, but are not limited to, measures implementing or evaluating:

(a) Multiple modes of transportation with peak and nonpeak hour capacity performance standards for locally owned transportation facilities; and

(b) Modal performance standards meeting the peak and nonpeak hour capacity performance standards.

(2) Any county located to the west of the crest of the Cascade mountains that has both a population of at least four hundred thousand and a border that touches another state, and any city in such county, may include development of freight rail dependent uses on land adjacent to a short line railroad in the transportation element required by RCW **36.70A.070**. Such counties and cities may also modify development regulations to include development of freight rail dependent uses that do not require urban governmental services in rural lands.

(3) Nothing in this section or RCW **36.70A.070**(6)(b) shall be construed as prohibiting a county or city planning under RCW **36.70A.040** from exercising existing authority to develop multimodal improvements or strategies to satisfy the concurrency requirements of this chapter.

(4) Nothing in this section is intended to affect or otherwise modify the authority of jurisdictions planning under RCW **36.70A.040**.

(b) WAC 365-196-430

(c) Transportation element.

(1) Requirements. Each comprehensive plan shall include a transportation element that implements, and is consistent with, the land use element. The transportation element shall contain at least the following subelements:

(a) Land use assumptions used in estimating travel;

(b) Estimated traffic impacts to state-owned transportation facilities resulting from land use assumptions to assist the department of transportation in monitoring the performance of state facilities, to plan improvements for the facilities, and to assess the impact of land-use decisions on state-owned transportation facilities;

(c) Facilities and services needs, including:

(i) An inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments and general aviation airports facilities, to define existing capital facilities and travel levels as a basis for future planning. This inventory must include state-owned transportation facilities within the county's or city's jurisdictional boundaries;

(ii) Level of service standards for all locally owned arterials and transit routes to serve as a gauge to judge performance of the system. These standards should be regionally coordinated;

(iii) For state-owned transportation facilities, level of service standards for highways, as prescribed in chapters **47.06** and **47.80** RCW, to gauge the performance of the system. The purposes of reflecting level of service standards for state highways in the local comprehensive plan are to monitor the performance of the system, to evaluate improvement strategies, and to facilitate coordination between

the county's or city's six-year street, road, or transit program and the department of transportation's ten-year investment program. The concurrency requirements of RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(b) do not apply to transportation facilities and services of statewide significance except for counties consisting of islands whose only connection to the mainland are state highways or ferry routes. In these island counties, state highways and ferry route capacity must be a factor in meeting the concurrency requirements in RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(b);

(iv) Specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance locally owned transportation facilities or services that are below an established level of service standard;

(v) Forecasts of traffic for at least ten years based on the adopted land use plan to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth;

(vi) Identification of state and local system needs to meet current and future demands. Identified needs on state-owned transportation facilities must be consistent with the statewide multimodal transportation plan required under chapter **47.06** RCW;

(d) Finance, including:

(i) An analysis of funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources;

(ii) A multiyear financing plan based on the needs identified in the comprehensive plan, the appropriate parts of which shall serve as the basis for the six-year street, road, or transit program required by RCW **35.77.010** for cities, RCW **36.81.121** for counties, and RCW **35.58.2795** for public transportation systems. The multiyear financing plan should be coordinated with the ten-year improvement program developed by the department of transportation as required by RCW **47.05.030**;

(iii) If probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs, a discussion of how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that level of service standards will be met;

(e) Intergovernmental coordination efforts, including an assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions;

(f) Demand-management strategies;

(g) Pedestrian and bicycle component to include collaborative efforts to identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles;

(h) The transportation element, and the six-year plan required by RCW **35.77.010** for cities, RCW **36.81.121** for counties, RCW **35.58.2795** for public transportation systems, and the ten-year plan required by RCW **47.05.030** for the state, must be consistent.

(2) Recommendations for meeting element requirements.

(a) Consistency with the land use element, regional and state planning.

(i) RCW **36.70A.070**(6) requires that the transportation element implement and be consistent with the land use element. Counties and cities should use consistent land use assumptions, population forecasts, and planning periods for both elements.

(ii) Counties and cities should refer to the statewide multimodal transportation plan produced by the department of transportation under chapter **47.06** RCW to ensure consistency between the transportation element and the statewide multimodal transportation plan. Local transportation elements should also reference applicable department of transportation corridor planning studies, including scenic byway corridor management plans.

(iii) Counties and cities should refer to the regional transportation plan developed by their regional transportation planning organization under chapter **47.80** RCW to ensure the transportation element reflects regional guidelines and principles; is consistent with the regional transportation plan; and is consistent with adopted regional growth and transportation strategies. Considering consistency during the development and review of the transportation element will facilitate the certification of transportation elements by the regional transportation planning organization as required by RCW **47.80.023**(3).

(iv) Counties and cities should develop their transportation elements using the framework established in county-wide planning policies, and where applicable, multicounty planning policies. Using this framework ensures their transportation elements are coordinated and consistent with the comprehensive plans of other counties and cities sharing common borders or related regional issues as required by RCW **36.70A.100** and **36.70A.210**.

(v) Counties and cities should refer to the six-year transit plans developed by municipalities or regional transit authorities pursuant to RCW **35.58.2795** to ensure their transportation element is consistent with transit development plans as required by RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(c).

(vi) Land use elements and transportation elements may incorporate commute trip reduction plans to ensure consistency between the commute trip reduction plans and the comprehensive plan as required by RCW **70.94.527**(5). Counties and cities may also include transportation demand management programs for growth and transportation efficiency centers designated in accordance with RCW **70.94.528**.

(b) The transportation element should contain goals and policies to guide the development and implementation of the transportation element. The goals and policies should be consistent with statewide and regional goals and policies. Goals and policies should address the following:

(i) Roadways and roadway design that provides safe access and travel for all users, including motorists, transit vehicles and riders, bicyclists, and pedestrians;

(ii) Public transportation, including public transit and passenger rail, intermodal transfers, and multimodal access;

(iii) Bicycle and pedestrian travel;

(iv) Transportation demand management, including education, encouragement and law enforcement strategies;

(v) Freight mobility including port facilities, truck, air, rail, and water-based freight;

(vi) Transportation finance including strategies for addressing impacts of development through concurrency, impact fees, and other mitigation; and

(vii) Policies to preserve the functionality of state highways within the local jurisdiction such as policies to provide an adequate local network of streets, paths, and transit service so that local short-range trips do not require single-occupant vehicle travel on the state highway system; and policies to mitigate traffic and stormwater impacts on state-owned transportation facilities as development occurs.

(c) Inventory and analysis of transportation facilities. RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(iii)(A) requires an inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments and general aviation airport facilities. The inventory defines existing capital facilities and travel levels as a basis for future planning. The inventory must include state-owned transportation facilities within the city's or county's jurisdictional boundaries. Counties and cities should identify transportation facilities which are owned or operated by others. For those facilities operated by others, counties and cities should refer to the responsible agencies for information concerning current and projected plans for transportation facilities and services. Counties, cities, and agencies responsible for transportation facilities and services should cooperate in identifying and resolving land use and transportation compatibility issues.

(i) Air transportation facilities.

(A) Where applicable, counties and cities should describe the location of facilities and services provided by any general aviation airport within or adjacent to the county or city, and should reference any relevant airport planning documents including airport master plans, airport layout plans or technical assistance materials made available by the Washington state department of transportation, aviation division.

(B) Counties and cities should identify supporting transportation infrastructure such as roads, rail, and routes for freight, employee, and passenger access, and assess the impact to the local transportation system.

(C) Counties and cities should assess the compatibility of land uses adjacent to the airport and discourage the siting of incompatible uses in the land use element as directed by RCW **36.70A.510** and WAC **365-196-455**.

(ii) Water transportation facilities.

(A) Where applicable, counties and cities should describe or map any ferry facilities and services, including ownership, and should reference any relevant ferry planning documents. The inventory should identify if a ferry route is subject to concurrency under RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(b). A ferry route is subject to concurrency if it serves counties consisting of islands whose only connection to the mainland are state highways or ferry routes.

(B) Counties and cities should identify supporting infrastructure such as parking and transfer facilities, bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicle access to ferry terminals and assess the impact on the local transportation system.

(C) Where applicable, counties and cities should describe marine and inland waterways, and related port facilities and services. Counties and cities should identify supporting transportation infrastructure, and assess the impact to the local transportation system.

(iii) Ground transportation facilities and services.

(A) Roadways. Counties and cities must include a map of roadways owned or operated by city, county, and state governments.

(I) Counties and cities may describe the general travel market (i.e., commuter, tourist, farm to market, etc.) served by the transportation network. The inventory may include information such as: Traffic volumes, truck volumes and classification, functional classification, strategic freight corridor designation, preferred freight routes, scenic and recreational highway designation, and ownership.

(II) For state highways, counties and cities should coordinate with the regional office of the Washington state department of transportation to identify designated high occupancy vehicle or high occupancy toll lanes, access classification, roadside classification, functional classification, and whether the highway is a state-designated highway of statewide significance, or state scenic and recreational highway designated under chapter **47.39** RCW. These designations may impact future development along state highway corridors. If these classifications impact future land use, this information should be included in the comprehensive plan along with reference to any relevant corridor planning documents.

(B) Public transportation and rail facilities and services.

(I) RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(iii)(A) requires an inventory of transit alignments. Where applicable, counties and cities must inventory existing public transportation facilities and services. This section should reference transit development plans that provide local services. The inventory should contain a description of regional and intercity rail, and local, regional, and intercity bus service, paratransit, or other services. Counties and cities should include a map of local transit routes. The inventory should also identify locations of passenger rail stations and major public transit transfer stations for appropriate land use.

(II) Where applicable, such as where a major freight transfer facility is located, counties and cities should include a map of existing freight rail lines, and reference any relevant planning documents. Counties and cities should assess the adequacy of supporting transportation infrastructure such as roads, rail, and navigational routes for freight, employee, and passenger access, and the impact on the local transportation system.

(d) If the planning area is within a National Ambient Air Quality Standards nonattainment area, compliance with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 is required. Where applicable, the transportation element should include: A map of the area designated as the nonattainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5); a discussion of the severity of the violation(s) contributed by transportation-related sources; and a description of measures that will be implemented consistent with the state implementation plan for air quality. Counties and cities should refer to chapter **173-420** WAC, and to local air quality agencies and metropolitan planning organizations for assistance.

(e) Level of service standards. Level of service standards serve to monitor the performance of the system, to evaluate improvement strategies, and to facilitate coordination between city, county and state transportation investment programs.

(i) RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(iii)(B) requires the transportation element to include level of service standards for all locally owned arterials. Counties and cities may adopt level of service standards for other locally owned roads or travel modes at their discretion.

(ii) RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(iii)(C) requires level of service standards for highways, as reflected in chapters **47.06** and **47.80** RCW, to gauge the performance of the transportation system. The department of transportation, in consultation with counties and cities, establishes level of service standards for state highways and ferry routes of statewide significance. Counties and cities should refer to the state highway and ferry plans developed in accordance with chapter **47.06** RCW for the adopted level of service standards.

(iii) Regional transportation planning organizations and the department of transportation jointly develop level of service standards for all other state highways and ferry routes. Counties and cities should refer to the regional transportation plans developed in accordance with chapter **47.80** RCW for the adopted level of service standards.

(iv) RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(iii)(B) requires the transportation element to include level of service standards for all transit routes. To identify level of service standards for public transit services, counties and cities should include the established level of service or performance standards from the transit provider and should reference any relevant planning documents.

(v) Adopted level of service standards should reflect access, mobility, mode-split, or capacity goals for the transportation facility depending upon the surrounding development density and community goals, and should be developed in consultation with transit agencies serving the planning area.

(vi) The measurement methodology and standards should vary based on the urban or rural character of the surrounding area. The county or city should also balance the desired community character, funding capacity, and traveler expectations when selecting level of service methodologies and standards. A county or city may select different ways to measure travel performance depending on how a county or city balances these factors and the characteristics of travel in their community. For example, counties and cities may measure performance at different times of day, week, or month (peak versus off-peak, weekday versus weekend, summer versus winter). Counties and cities may also measure performance at different geographic scales (intersections, road or route segments, travel corridors, or travel zones), or in terms of the supply of multimodal capacity available in a corridor.

(vii) In urban areas RCW **36.70A.108** encourages the use of methodologies analyzing the transportation system from a comprehensive, multimodal perspective. Multimodal levels of service methodologies and standards should consider the needs of travelers using the four major travel modes (motor vehicle, public transportation, bicycle, and pedestrian), their impacts on each other as they share the street, and their mode specific requirements for street design and operation. For example, bicycle and pedestrian level of service standards should emphasize the availability of facilities and safety levels for users.

(f) Travel forecasts. RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(iii)(E) requires forecasts of traffic for at least ten years based on the adopted land use plan to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth. Counties and cities must include at least a ten-year travel forecast in the transportation element. The forecast time period and underlying assumptions must be consistent with the land use element. Counties and cities may forecast travel for the twenty-year planning period. Counties and cities may include bicycle, pedestrian, and/or planned transit service in a multimodal forecast. Travel forecasts should be based on adopted regional growth strategies, the regional transportation plan, and comprehensive plans within the region to ensure consistency.

(g) Identify transportation system needs.

(i) RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(iii)(D) requires that the transportation element include specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance locally owned transportation facilities or services that are below established level of service standards.

(ii) System needs are those improvements needed to meet and maintain adopted levels of service over at least the required ten-year forecasting period. If counties and cities use a twenty-year forecasting period, they should also identify needs for the entire twenty-year period.

(iii) RCW **47.80.030**(3) requires identified needs on regional facilities or services to be consistent with the regional transportation plan and the adopted regional growth and transportation strategies. RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(iii)(F) requires identified needs on state-owned transportation facilities to be consistent with the statewide multimodal transportation plan.

(iv) Counties and cities should cooperate with public transit providers to analyze projected transit services and needs based on projected land use assumptions, and consistent with regional land use and transportation planning. Coordination may also include identification of mixed use centers, and consider opportunities for intermodal integration and appropriate multimodal access, particularly bicycle and pedestrian access.

(v) Counties and cities must include state transportation investments identified in the statewide multimodal transportation plan required under chapter **47.06** RCW and funded in the Washington state department of transportation's ten-year improvement program. Identified needs must be consistent with regional transportation improvements identified in regional transportation plans required under chapter **47.80** RCW. The transportation element should also include plans for new or expanded public transit and be coordinated with local transit providers.

(vi) The identified transportation system needs may include: Considerations for repair, replacement, enhancement, or expansion of vehicular, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities; enhanced or expanded transit services; system management; or demand management approaches.

(vii) Transportation system needs may include transportation system management measures increasing the motor vehicle capacity of the existing street and road system. They may include, but are not limited to signal timing, traffic channelization, intersection reconfiguration, exclusive turn lanes or turn prohibitions, bus turn-out bays, grade separations, removal of on-street parking or improving street network connectivity.

(viii) When identifying system needs, counties and cities may identify a timeline for improvements. Identification of a timeline provides clarity as to when and where specific transportation investments are planned and provides the opportunity to coordinate and cooperate in transportation planning and permitting decisions.

(ix) Counties and cities should consider how the improvements relate to adjacent counties or cities.

(h) Local impacts to state transportation facilities. RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(ii) requires counties and cities to estimate traffic impacts to state-owned transportation facilities resulting from land use assumptions to assist the Washington state department of transportation in monitoring the performance of state facilities, to plan improvements for the facilities, and to assess the impact of land-use decisions on state-owned transportation facilities. Traffic impacts should include the number of motor vehicle, and, as information becomes available, bicycle, public transit, and pedestrian trips estimated to use the state highway and ferry systems throughout the planning period.

(i) Transportation demand management.

(i) RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(vi) requires that the transportation element include transportation demand management strategies. These strategies are designed to encourage the use of alternatives to single occupancy travel and to reduce congestion, especially during peak times.

(ii) Where applicable, counties and cities may include the goals and relevant strategies of employer-based commute trip reduction programs developed under RCW**70.94.521** through **70.94.555**. All other counties and cities should consider strategies which may include, but are not limited to ridesharing, vanpooling, promotion of bicycling, walking and use of public transportation, transportation-efficient parking and land use policies, and high occupancy vehicle subsidy programs.

(j) Pedestrian and bicycle component. RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(vii) requires the transportation element to include a pedestrian and bicycle component that includes collaborative efforts to identify and

designate planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles.

(i) Collaborative efforts may include referencing local, regional, and state pedestrian and bicycle planning documents, if any. Designated shared use paths, which are part of bicycle and pedestrian networks, should be consistent with those in the parks, recreation and open space element.

(ii) To identify and designate planned improvements for bicycle facilities and corridors, the pedestrian and bicycle component should include a map of bicycle facilities, such as bicycle lanes, shared use paths, paved road shoulders. This map should identify state and local designated bicycle routes, and describe how the facilities link to those in adjacent jurisdictions.

(iii) To identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian facilities and corridors, the pedestrian and bicycle component should include a map of pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks, pedestrian connectors, and other designated facilities, especially in areas of high pedestrian use such as designated centers, major transit routes, and route plans designated by school districts under WAC **392-151-025**.

(iv) The pedestrian and bicycle component should plan a network that connects residential and employment areas with community and regional destinations, schools, and public transportation services.

(v) The pedestrian and bicycle component should also review existing pedestrian and bicycle collision data to plan pedestrian facilities that improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.

(k) Multiyear financing plan.

(i) RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(iii)(B) requires that the transportation element include a multiyear financing plan based on the needs identified in the comprehensive plan, the appropriate parts of which develop a financing plan that addresses all identified transportation facilities and strategies throughout the twenty-year planning period. The identified needs shall serve as the basis for the six-year street, road, or transit program required by RCW **35.77.010** for cities, RCW **36.81.121** for counties, and RCW **35.58.2795**for public transportation systems. The multiyear financing plan should reflect regional improvements identified in regional transportation plans required under chapter **47.80**RCW and be coordinated with the ten-year investment program developed by the Washington state department of transportation as required by RCW **47.05.030**;

(ii) The horizon year for the multiyear plan should be the same as the time period for the travel forecast and identified needs. The financing plan should include cost estimates for new and enhanced locally owned roadway facilities including new or enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities to estimate the cost of future facilities and the ability of the local government to fund the improvements.

(iii) Sources of proposed funding may include:

(A) Federal or state funding.

(B) Local funding from taxes, bonds, or other sources.

(C) Developer contributions, which may include:

(I) Impact or mitigation fees assessed according to chapter **82.02** RCW, or the Local Transportation Act (chapter **39.92** RCW).

(II) Contributions or improvements required under SEPA (RCW **43.21C.060**).

(III) Concurrency requirements implemented according to RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(b).

(D) Transportation benefit districts established under RCW **35.21.225** and chapter **36.73** RCW.

(iv) RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(iv)(A) requires an analysis of funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources. When considering the cost of new facilities, counties and cities should consider the cost of maintaining facilities in addition to the cost of their initial construction. Counties and cities should forecast projected funding capacities based on revenues that are reasonably expected to be available, under existing laws and ordinances, to carry out the plan. If the funding strategy relies on new or previously untapped sources of revenue, the financing plan should include a realistic estimate of new funding that will be supplied.

(I) Reassessment if probable funding falls short.

(i) RCW **36.70A.070** (6)(a)(iv)(C) requires reassessment if probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs. Counties and cities must discuss how additional funding will be raised or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that level of service standards will be met.

(ii) This review must take place, at a minimum, as part of the periodic review and update required in RCW **36.70A.130** (1) and (3), and as major changes are made to the transportation element.

(iii) If probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs, counties and cities have several choices. For example, they may choose to:

(A) Seek additional sources of funding for identified transportation improvements;

(B) Adjust level of service standards to reduce the number and cost of needed facilities;

(C) Revisit identified needs and use of transportation system management or transportation demand management strategies to reduce the need for new facilities; or

(D) Revise the land use element to shift future travel to areas with adequate capacity, to lower average trip length or to avoid the need for new facilities in undeveloped areas;

(E) If needed, adjustments should be made throughout the comprehensive plan to maintain consistency.

(m) Implementation measures. Counties and cities may include an implementation section that broadly defines regulatory and nonregulatory actions and programs designed to proactively implement the transportation element. Implementation measures may include:

(i) Public works guidelines to reflect multimodal transportation standards for pedestrians, bicycles and transit; or adoption of Washington state department of transportation standards or the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials standards for bicycle and pedestrian facilities;

(ii) Transportation concurrency ordinances affecting development review;

(iii) Parking standards, especially in urban centers, to reduce vehicle parking requirements and include bicycle parking;

(iv) Commute trip reduction ordinances and transportation demand management programs;

(v) Access management ordinances;

(vi) Nonmotorized transportation funding programs;

(vii) Maintenance procedures and pavement management systems to include bicycle, pedestrians and transit considerations;

(viii) Subdivision standards to reflect multimodal goals; and

(ix) Transit compatibility policies and rules to guide development review procedures to incorporate review of bicycle, pedestrian and transit access to sites.