

SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASHINGTON

AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 08-050

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT OF SNOHOMISH COUNTY'S GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (GMACP); CHANGING THE STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING LEVEL OF SERVICE ON COUNTY ARTERIALS AND CLARIFYING CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATING ARTERIALS AT ULTIMATE CAPACITY (GPP 9 ULTIMATE CAPACITY)

WHEREAS, RCW 36.70A.130 and .470 direct counties planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) to adopt procedures for interested persons to propose amendments and revisions to the GMACP or development regulations; and

WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council adopted chapter 30.74 SCC, "Growth Management Act Public Participation Program Docketing," to comply with the requirements of RCW 36.70A.130 and .470; and

WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council has determined that the consideration of the proposed amendments and revisions to the GMACP and development regulations would promote a county purpose as established under RCW 36.70A.130, RCW 36.70A.470 and chapter 30.74 SCC; and

WHEREAS, on May 21, 2007, and May 29, 2007, the Snohomish County Council held public hearings to receive public testimony on proposed county and non-county initiated amendments to the GMACP for consideration on the 2007 Final Docket XII; and

WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council, on June 25, 2007, approved, by Motion No. 07-182, a list of proposed comprehensive plan amendments for inclusion on Final Docket XII and authorized the County Executive, through the Department of Planning and Development Services (PDS), to process Final Docket XII consistent with chapters 30.73 and 30.74 SCC; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to chapter 30.74 SCC, PDS completed final review and evaluation of Final Docket XII, including the proposals to amend the map and text of the GMACP, and forwarded recommendations to the Snohomish County Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Planning Commission held a public hearing and received public testimony on Final Docket XII on January 22, 2008, and January 29, 2008; and

AMENDED ORDINANCE 08-050

WHEREAS, on January 29, 2008, the Snohomish County Planning Commission deliberated on Final Docket XII at the conclusion of the public hearing and voted to recommend adoption of the proposed GMACP and regulatory amendments as enumerated in its recommendation letter of February 26, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Snohomish County Council held a public hearing on April 30, 2008, continued to May 12 and June 3, 2008, to consider the entire record, including the Planning Commission recommendations on Final Docket XII, and to hear public testimony on this Amended Ordinance No. 08-050.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED:

Section 1. The county council makes the following findings:

- A. The county council adopts and incorporates the foregoing recitals as findings as if set forth fully herein.
- B. The proposed amendment to the Transportation Element (TE) of the GMACP increases the Average Daily Trip (ADT) thresholds for roads designated as being at ultimate capacity in Table 11(Average Daily Trip Thresholds) for both rural and urban arterial units
- C. The amendments to the TE pertaining to ultimate capacity will help assure that the efficiency of those roads is maintained or increased through active, ongoing road system management.
- D. The proposed amendment to the TE allows the county to allocate its limited public resources efficiently by focusing on improvements that will have the most effect for the most citizens. The amendment of a measure of ADT to the level of service standard helps assure that public resources are used to maintain concurrency are not used on roads with low volumes or on roads that have been designated ultimate capacity.
- E. The level of service and ADT threshold amendments to the TE comply with RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a) by providing level of service standards for all locally owned arterials and transit routes to serve as a gauge to judge performance of the county's transportation system.
- F. The TE is consistent with GPP Goal TR 1 and plans for transportation systems (highways, arterials, transit and nonmotorized) that serve and complement the future land use map (FLUM) of the GMACP.
- G. The TE is consistent with TR Policy 1.B.2 and provides for types and levels of transportation facilities within the county based on the types and levels of future development intensity adopted in the GMACP.

AMENDED ORDINANCE 08-050

- H. The TE is consistent with GPP Goal TR 5 and presents transportation systems that are efficient in providing adopted levels of service.
- I. The TE is consistent with TR Policy 5.A.1 and identifies additional transportation mitigation requirements for proposed developments that impact roadways expected to be at ultimate capacity.
 - J. The TE is consistent with TR Policy 5.A.2 and provides that a level of service standard is used to manage the rate of growth in rural areas and encourage more intense development within urban areas.
- 10 K. The TE is consistent with TR Policy 5.A.5 and the most current edition of the Highway
 11 Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, Washington D.C., and adopts
 12 professionally accepted measures and methods in determining transportation level of
 13 service.
- L. The TE is consistent with TR Policy 5.A.6 and provides for a systematic, two-step method for calculating transportation level of service.
 - M. The provisions for level of service in the TE are also consistent with TR Policy 5.A.8 in ensuring that level of service will be monitored on all county arterials.
 - N. The proposed amendment of the TE is consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) by providing for multi-modal transportation facilities and services.
 - 1. Consistent with CPP TR-7, the TE provides for use of consistent and professionally accepted methodologies for determining transportation levels of service that consider development intensities for urban versus rural areas, high-occupancy vehicle use and community values as reflected by the city and county comprehensive plans.
 - 2. Consistent with CPP TR-8, the TE recommends concurrency requirements for land development by considering transportation levels of service and available financial resources to make needed transportation improvements.
 - O. An addendum to the Environmental Impact Statement completed for the GMA comprehensive plan 10-Year Update was issued for this non-project action on December 26, 2007.
 - P. The county council includes in its findings and conclusions the final review and evaluation of the proposal completed by PDS in accordance with chapter 30.74 SCC, which is hereby made a part of this ordinance as if set forth herein.

<u>Section 2</u>. The county council makes the following conclusions:

A. The proposal increases the ADT thresholds for roads designated as being at ultimate capacity in Table 11(Average Daily Trip Thresholds) for both rural and urban arterial units in the TE of the GMACP.

AMENDED ORDINANCE 08-050

3

7

Ŕ

9

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31.

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

- B. The proposed GMACP amendments are consistent with the following final review and evaluation criteria of chapter 30.74 SCC:
 - 1. The proposed amendments maintain consistency with other elements of the GMACP.
 - 2. All applicable elements of the GMACP support the proposed amendments.
 - 3. The proposed amendments meet the goals, objectives, and policies of the GMACP as discussed in the specific findings.
 - 4. The proposed amendments are consistent with the CPPs.
 - 5. The proposed amendments comply with the GMA.
 - 6. New information is available which was not considered at the time the plan or regulation was amended.
- C. The amendments are consistent with the GMA requirement that the comprehensive plan of a county or city be internally consistent document (RCW 36.70A.070).
- D. Amendment of the TE implements and supports the adopted land use element as described by the GPP.
- 15. E. The amendments maintain the GMACP's consistency with the CPPs for Snohomish County.
- F. The proposed amendments meet the goals, objectives and policies of the GMACP as discussed in the specific findings.
 - G. The amendments are consistent with and comply with the procedural and substantive requirements of GMA.
 - H. All SEPA requirements with respect to this non-project action have been satisfied.
 - I. The County complied with state and local public participation requirements under the GMA and chapter 30.73 SCC.
 - <u>Section 3</u>. The county council bases its findings and conclusions on the entire record of the county council, including all testimony and exhibits. Any finding, which should be deemed a conclusion, and any conclusion which should be deemed a finding, is hereby adopted as such.
 - <u>Section 4</u>. Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element last amended by Amended Ordinance No. 05-070, is amended as indicated in Exhibit A to this ordinance which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference into this ordinance as if set forth in full.
 - Section 5. The county council directs the Code Reviser to update SCC 30.10.060 pursuant to SCC 1.02.020(3).
 - <u>Section 6.</u> Severability and savings. If any section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance shall be held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the Growth Management Hearings

AMENDED ORDINANCE 08-050

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35 36

37 38

1		jurisdiction, such invalidity or unconstitutionality shall ty of any other section, sentence, clause or phrase of this
3		ny section, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance
4		urt of competent jurisdiction, then the section, sentence,
5		fective date of this ordinance shall be in full force and
6		ace, clause or phrase as if this ordinance had never been
7	adopted.	,
8	and P.	
9		
10	PASSED this 3rd day of June, 2008	
11	•	
12		SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL
13		Snohomish County, Washington
14		·
15		
16		James -
17		Chairperson
18	ATTEST:	
19		
20	11 :- 500(66000 :	
21	Shula Millestin	
22	Clerk of the Council	
23		·
4	() APPROVED	
_25	() EMERGENCY	
26	() VETOED	
27	DATE:, 2008	
28		
29		
30	L COORT OFF	Snohomish County Executive
31	ATTEST:	PETER B. CAMP
32		Executive Director
33	Approved as to form only:	
34		
35		
36	Daniel Daniel Adding	
37	Deputy Prosecuting Attorney	

AMENDED ORDINANCE 08-050

Amended Ordinance No. 08 –050 Final Docket XII, Adopting Text Amendments to the Transportation Element of the GMACP GPP 9 Ultimate Capacity

EXHIBIT A

Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan – Transportation Element, page 30, Table 11 Average Daily Trip (ADT) Thresholds.

i. Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Thresholds

Two-way, weekday, 24-hour volumes are used as the measure of ADT on arterial units, consistent with rules establishing details on the methodology, frequency and validity of counts. Thresholds vary by urban/rural, number of lanes, and whether or not arterial units have been designated as ultimate capacity by the county council. For ultimate capacity arterial units, the thresholds are based upon maximizing the use of the roadway with volumes at or near capacity from early morning to late evening. For arterial units not designated as ultimate capacity, the thresholds are based upon the minimum volumes for which the roads are designed. Typically, roads with volumes below these thresholds have peak-hour average travel speeds reflecting uncongested conditions. Also, volumes below the thresholds typically characterize roads functioning as local roads rather than as arterials.

In some cases, roads with volumes below the thresholds are classified as arterials for purposes of system continuity or to establish a base arterial system in areas of the County that will experience future growth. In aggregate, these arterial roads carry a small percentage of total daily travel demand and therefore do not contribute significantly to travel delay experienced on the arterial system. The ADT thresholds are established in Table 11.

Table 11

Average Daily Trip (ADT) Thresholds

	Road Not Designated as Ultimate Capacity		Road Designated as Ultimate Capacity	
Number of Lanes	Rural Arterial Unit	Urban Arterial Unit	Rural Arterial Unit	Urban Arterial Unit
2	4,000	7,000	((17,000)) <u>18,000</u>	((19,000)) <u>22,000</u>
3	5,000	9,000	((26,000)) <u>27,000</u>	((29,000)) <u>33,000</u>
4	7,000	12,000	((33,000)) <u>36,000</u>	((37,000)) <u>44,000</u>
5	n/a	15,000	((12,000)) <u>45,000</u>	((47,000)) <u>55,000</u>
6	n/a	16,000	((48,000)) <u>54,000</u>	((54,000)) <u>66,000</u>
7	n/a	21,000	((57,000)) <u>63,000</u>	((64,000)) <u>77,000</u>

AMENDED ORDINANCE 08-050

ii. Average Travel Speed

 Existing or forecasted, average, weekday, directional travel speed during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour is used as the measure of average travel speed on arterial units. This method is consistent with rules establishing details on the methodology and validity of evaluations. The <u>Highway Capacity Manual</u> is used as the basis for determining the correspondence between travel speed and LOS letter grades. In the most recent <u>Highway Capacity Manual</u>, published in 2000, Exhibit 15-2 shows the travel speed thresholds for urban roads for different classes of roads.

Most urban arterial units in the County are categorized as Class II, with free flow speeds typically ranging from 35 to 45 mph. The threshold between "E" and "F" for these roads is 13 mph. The most urbanized arterial units can be categorized as Class III, with free-flow speeds typically ranging from 30 to 35 mph and a threshold between "E" and "F" of 10 mph. The letter

AMENDED ORDINANCE 08-050