PRTPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

March 20, 2025 | 10:00 – 12:00
Zoom Meeting – Login Below

1. 10:00 **Welcome and Introductions**

2. 10:05 **Consent Calendar** ACTION
   - *Approval of Agenda*
   - *Approval of Recap from January 16, 2025 (Attachment)*

3. 10:10 **Determination of Consistency Between RTP and Local Plans** DISCUSSION
   The TAC will review draft language concerning the determination of consistency between local and regional plans. The proposed approach will result in a standing determination that remains in effect until such time that the Executive Board needs to revise it.

4. 10:40 **Complete Street Candidates – Local Review** DISCUSSION
   Over the past year, the TAC has investigated the Tough Topic presented when "Main Street is a state highway" and heard from WSDOT about the challenges it faces in responding to the Legislature's 2022 Complete Streets Proviso. The TAC will review an online tool developed to tap local insights about specific locations previously identified by members where land use is generating transit, walk, and bike trips that are not supported by the adjacent state highway. The aim is to provide useful input to WSDOT regarding areas of known or emerging conflicts where complete streets treatments may be warranted. This information will be just one input to a robust screening and documentation process that WSDOT conducts. The inclusion of a site on this list does not imply a future complete street investment.

5. 11:10 **Peninsula RTP Online – TAC Access** PRESENTATION
   A primary objective of this RTP update is to establish an online presence that is easier to update and keep current and is more representative of 21st century means of communication. This briefing will introduce the TAC to the new online format and grant members access to the working platform, before it is completed and released for public review and comment in May. Members may review and comment on draft materials over the next two months as they are posted.

6. 11:20 **PRTPO Coordinator Updates** BRIEFING
   Short updates to keep members apprised about matters of potential interest.

7. 11:25 **Member Roundtable** ALL
   An opportunity to share information on activities and other topics of interest to members.

NEXT TAC MEETING – May 15, 2025
RTP: Review and Recommendation on Draft RTP Update
Input on Work Program for SFY 2026-2027

Join Zoom Meeting
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83059373878?pwd=YMCIM2saDnaXkaaZPUXbtbmJSdn7EN.1
Or by phone: 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma). Meeting ID: 830 5937 3878 Pass Code: 4780

Meeting Recap

PRTPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
January 16, 2025
10:00 – 12:00
Via Zoom

Call to Order
Chair Jayme Brooke called the meeting to order at 10:00.

ATTENDEES

Technical Advisory Committee:

Clallam County	Steve Gray
Kitsap County	Melissa Mohr
City of Bremerton	Vicki Grover
City of Port Angeles	Tim Hayes
City of Poulsbo	Michael Bateman
City of Sequim	Katie Cole
City of Shelton	Glenn Chouinard
Port of Allyn	Judy Scott
Port of Bremerton	Arne Bakker
Port of Port Angeles	Katharine Frazier
Port of Shelton	Dick Taylor
Clallam Transit	Jim Fetzer
Jefferson Transit	Jayme Brooke
Kitsap Transit	Steffani Lillie
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	Wendy Clark-Getzin
Squaxin Island Tribe	Chad Bedlington
WSDOT Olympic Region	Nazmul Alam

Staff:
Thera Black, PRTPO Coordinator

Other Attendees:

Welcome and Introductions
Chair Brooke welcomed attendees and conducted introductions.

Approval of Consent Calendar

ACTION: Melissa moved, and Tim seconded to approve the Consent Calendar. The motion passed unanimously.

Consent Calendar

- ***Agenda***
- ***Recap of November 21, 2024 Meeting***

RTP: Framing Complete Street Opportunities for Future Funding

Thera clarified the purpose of the work session as being a first discussion on how to effectively address complete street candidates in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to support WSDOT, members, and others in their efforts to improve multimodal access and safety in select locations.

She reviewed the WSDOT impetus stemming from a legislative proviso in 2022 requiring the department to address complete street deficiencies when doing any state highway project that costs $500,000 or more. That proviso came without extra funding, though. In discussing this with WSDOT in late 2023 and early 2024, TAC members agreed that it would be helpful to identify those rural hamlets and other areas where the highway infrastructure is not well adapted to the land use and associated walk and bike trips. These may be areas where complete street design features may be warranted.

At the Executive Board retreat in October, members engaged in a mapping exercise to identify areas that merit a closer look for need. Members identified over three dozen locations across the region. Some locations are site specific while others indicate need along a corridor. They also identified some categories of place types that should always be considered for complete street treatments including fishing and shellfish harvest areas, and state parks and campgrounds.

Before walking through examples of potential candidates, Thera presented some factors or characteristics that may be appropriate for inclusion on the list. This included: location on a state route; whether it is in or out of a UGA (for context); whether there is a mix of land use activities to generate walk or bike trips; population characteristics with an eye towards identifying areas with a concentration of vulnerable or under-served communities; the Active Transportation office designation of Level of Traffic Stress (LTS), particularly those rated LTS 3 or 4; presence of a designated transit stop, hub, or park-and-ride; presence of a trail crossing or alignment; and documented area of concern in a local plan or study.

Thera then walked members through a range of examples from the October retreat. This was intended to convey the wide range of need and place types: site-specific locations and lengthy corridor segments; highly rural to small urban land use patterns; and “simple” low-cost needs like paint, signage and beacons as well as expensive or complex capital needs. The aim is to develop evaluation factors or site characteristics for use in the RTP that can accommodate the diverse range of need across the region.

She also posed some questions to consider when thinking about the format and how to present the information. This included questions regarding magnitude-of-scale costs ($, $$, $$$) for context, opportunities to call out separately “future issues” associated with yet-to-be-built projects such as a trail crossing of US 101, and relationship of these projects to local plans and studies. She advised that feedback from the TAC is needed to help her develop an effective template for sharing this information and collecting their feedback as well as presenting the final results within the RTP.

Jayme observed that all of these locations – from the most rural to the most urban – are important to the people who live there. Rural places often have a hard time competing for these kinds of projects because funding programs tend to favor urban places. It would be good if the RTP can help to highlight the importance of some of these rural needs so that those projects have a better chance of attracting funding. Others agreed that the RTP should feature the range of needs.

Steffani advised that some kind of factors should be weighted more heavily to assess importance though. Limited funding is best directed at projects that generate the most benefit. Land use characteristics is a good measure, since it is the mix of land uses that generates walk and bike trips. Members discussed pros and cons of

looking at numbers of trips generated and sought to balance the need to generate maximum benefit with the need to address relevant issues in a more rural context that doesn't generate comparable numbers. Thera offered to work on a way of conveying this context for rural areas that are often competing against much more urban communities for projects that are important to their communities. Population characteristics is an important factor in state and federal grants and may be a way to highlight rural needs that would otherwise be lost behind trips generated.

Melissa provided more context on the SR 104 issue in the vicinity of the Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park. Lack of a shoulder and guardrails on the short bridge over a creek means that pedestrians are very nearly walking on the fog line to get from the parking area to the park entrance. This is a popular park and the combination of inadequate facilities, lack of signage, and a high posted speed all contribute to a hazardous condition.

Members discussed the possibility of local agencies pursuing smaller projects in the WSDOT right-of-way, if desired. Michael advised that local agencies working within the WSDOT right-of-way need to be cognizant of the rules. WSDOT has a more complex process than local agencies may be accustomed to. He observed that the state's Franchise Agreement governing utility relocations may be a useful model to look at for streamlining the ability of local agencies to make non-capital improvements within the right-of-way. This may be an area to explore with WSDOT Olympic Region at some point.

PRTPO Coordinator Updates

Thera reminded everyone that Ed left Kitsap Transit to work at FTA. Crystal Culbertson is the new point person for matters related to the TIP and STIP. Kitsap Transit is recruiting to replace Ed and hopes to have that position filled late winter or early spring.

Thera sent messages out in late December to cities and counties with facilities designated as truck routes. WSDOT Freight Mobility Office is looking for updated freight data. The due data for PRTPO submittal is in May. Tim asked about that data collection. Only Bremerton and Shelton have collected this data. Members discussed what that entails.

Finally, the invite for the TAC's March meeting is wrong. The TAC will meet on Thursday, March 20 and not March 14 as indicated. Expect updated invites shortly.

Member Updates

Melissa reported that AASHTO just released the 5th Edition of the bike facilities design manual and plans to update the Green Book shortly to reflect the new manual.

Adjourn

Jayme adjourned the meeting at 12:00.

DRAFT

DISCUSSION ITEM

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Thera Black, PRTPO Coordinator
Date: March 13, 2025
Subject: **Determination of Consistency Between RTP and Local Plans**

REQUESTED ACTION:
No action is requested. TAC input is very helpful in developing a standing statement of regional consistency to be adopted with this RTP update.

Background
Requirements in RCW 47.80 and WAC 468-86 include a determination of consistency between the Regional Transportation Plan and locally adopted Countywide Planning Policies and Comprehensive Plans. In a nutshell, locally adopted Countywide Planning Policies and Comp Plans must be compatible with the direction laid out in the RTP and the RTP must be compatible with those local plans. Those rules also stipulate that each RTPO is to develop a process for monitoring and ensuring ongoing consistency between its RTP and local plans that is appropriate for its region.

Technically, PRTPO completed this back in the 1990s, when those first local plans and policies were drafted and adopted by local agencies and subsequently reviewed and approved by the Department of Commerce. These "GMA start-up rules" were meant to guide development of those first plans, as local and regional agencies applied the new GMA rules adopted in 1990. On-going regional coordination would keep them consistent. Over the last three decades, coordinated planning practices and periodic state reviews have indeed ensured on-going consistency between local and regional plans. Regional and local plans have been tweaked and refined through mandated updates, but no major shifts in direction have occurred that invalidate the original findings.

Some of the rules that PRTPO must comply with are outdated, and this is one of them. Given the limited authorities granted to PRTPO by RCW 47.80 and the unbroken history of regional collaboration since 1991, it is hard to think of a situation that would cause the RTP and a local agency plan to be inconsistent as long as those local plans continue to comply with GMA requirements as determined by the Department of Commerce. Still, documentation of this regional consistency is helpful to local agencies and PRTPO in fulfilling some requirements with state agencies.

To that end, this RTP update intends to establish a standing determination of consistency between the RTP and local plans that is efficient to administer and appropriate to the region. The attached draft brief lays out the approach.

It clarifies that as long as local plans remain in good standing with GMA requirements and regional coordination continues, this statement of consistency remains in effect until it is revised by the Board in the future. It identifies two situations whereby the Executive Board may revise its determination. If relevant sections of either the Countywide Planning Policies or a local Comprehensive Plan are deemed out of compliance with GMA requirements and the responsible agency does not address the discrepancy, then PRTPO will investigate and determine if its consistency determination for that agency should be revoked. Additionally, every two years when PRTPO conducts its biennial RTP review process, any member or community interest can request that the Board consider the relevant section(s) of a local plan with supporting evidence that the local plan and RTP are inconsistent. PRTPO's statutory authority is limited to certain sections of Countywide Planning Policies and Comp Plans. After an investigation the Board will determine if it needs to rescind the consistency determination for that agency.

The statement acknowledges that Kitsap members must also comply with significantly different requirements for PSRC. Since 1990 Kitsap County agencies have maintained consistency with both RTPOs. PRTPO's determination is specific to the statutory authorities granted to it in RCW 47.80 and is specific to rural RTPO considerations. PRTPO defers all consistency decisions regarding urban-specific factors to PSRC. PRTPO's determination has no bearing on PSRC's process.

This approach will replace the cumbersome, time-consuming checklists that have accompanied past routine updates. The final statement will include a revised background brief accompanied by a resolution for each city and county to be approved by the Board in June, when it adopts the RTP update.

Next Steps

This is the first time the TAC is seeing the proposed approach, which will go to the Board in April. Feedback from the TAC now on the approach and working draft language will shape what goes to the Board and what comes back to the TAC for final review in May.

Attachments:

Working Draft – PRTPO Determination of Regional Consistency

For More Information:

Thera Black | 360.878.0353 | TheraB@PeninsulaRTPO.org

2025 REPORT: PRTPO Determination of Regional Consistency [WORKING DRAFT]

Finding

The Peninsula RTPO Executive Board finds the GMA-compliant Countywide Planning Policies and Comprehensive Plans of the following PRTPO members to be consistent with and supportive of the long-range Regional Transportation Plan for the Peninsula Region:

Clallam County
City of Forks
City of Port Angeles
City of Sequim

Jefferson County
City of Port Townsend

Kitsap County
City of Bainbridge Island
City of Bremerton
City of Port Orchard
City of Poulsbo

Mason County
City of Shelton

This formal finding of regional consistency remains in effect until such time that the PRTPO Executive Board revises this determination in the future.

GMA Background

The need to document consistency between the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and locally adopted Comprehensive Plans pertains to requirements in the Growth Management Act, or GMA.

Passage of the GMA in 1990 fundamentally changed the way comprehensive land use and transportation planning is carried out in Washington State. GMA requires cities and counties to develop and maintain comprehensive land use plans that are consistent, and which meet minimum standards established in statute. GMA introduced the practice of coordinating transportation and land use planning within each local Comprehensive Plan, which includes an integrated Transportation element. It also requires coordination among local and state jurisdictions within a region. These practices GMA introduced in 1990 are fundamental to both transportation and land use planning in Washington today.

The foundation of these coordinated local plans are Countywide Planning Policies (CWPP) developed and maintained at the county level by each county with its affiliated cities and others as appropriate. CWPPs support consistency between the local growth plans and investments of different jurisdictions within a county. They address mandatory topics established in state law and serve as frameworks for the evaluation and periodic updates of local Comprehensive Plans. CWPP

DRAFT

and Comprehensive Plans must adhere to rigorous statutory requirements overseen by the Department of Commerce. Transportation is an important feature all CWPP and Comprehensive Plans must address.

To ensure the transportation elements of local Comprehensive Plans work together across a region to meet statewide transportation goals as well as local needs, they must also be consistent with regional aims and policies established in the long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This helps to ensure that land use and transportation decision-making across the region works together to meet three inter-related transportation goals of the GMA:

- Provide a multimodal transportation system that supports the efficient, clean, safe movement of people, goods, and services within the Peninsula region and between adjacent regions.
- Reduce sprawl, conserve land and make more efficient use of infrastructure.
- Preserve air and water quality, the natural environment, and address impacts contributing to climate change.

RTP Consistency in the Peninsula Region

Regional consistency is a two-way street. Local plans must be consistent with the RTP. At the same time, the RTP must maintain consistency with Countywide Planning Policies and with local Comprehensive Plans.

The first Regional Transportation Plan that PRTPO adopted, in 1995, established a framework for coordinated transportation and land use planning that was embedded in the CWPPs adopted by Clallam, Jefferson, Kitsap and Mason Counties. That direction is carried out through the individual Comprehensive Plans that guide local decision-making today.

In this way, consistency between the long-range Regional Transportation Plan for the Peninsula Region and local transportation plans is hard wired into GMA-compliant institutional processes which have been in place for over three decades. One cannot set a new direction for growth and transportation without concurrence from and coordination with others. To do otherwise would be inconsistent.

The 1995 Regional Transportation Plan for the Peninsula Region spelled out a transportation strategy that was, and continues to be, multimodal in nature. It described a regional land use pattern supportive of the aims of GMA, one that fosters efficient multimodal travel options and strong economies, reduces impacts, and which preserves rural lands for rural purposes. It defined minimum level of service (LOS) standards to be applied consistently across the region to assess operational capacity of the regional roadway system. Policies clarified not only the multimodal ambitions of the regional transportation system but established the importance of safety, preservation, and efficiency measures in system performance and other considerations that are routine in regional policy and locally adopted practices and standards today.

DRAFT

PRTPO's consistency determination is based on GMA-compliant Countywide Planning Policies and local Comprehensive Plans that include:

- Coordinated transportation and land use policies which aim to promote compact, contiguous urban development in designated urban growth areas with an array of urban transportation options while preserving rural lands for rural uses and lifestyles
- Policies and investments that seek to increase access to safe and convenient multimodal transportation alternatives appropriate for the intended land use
- Advancement of safety, preservation, and efficiency as priority concerns for local and state investments in all modes of travel
- Consideration of freight and other economic needs and including specific measures regarding marine terminals, airports, and industrial areas
- Measures to reduce per capita growth in vehicle miles traveled and other strategies to reduce transportation's impacts on the natural environment and human health
- Policies that promote coordination and collaboration across sectors and with other regional stakeholders

The locally adopted plans of PRTPO members address these concerns in varying degrees of specificity in accordance with the size and complexity of each jurisdiction and in consideration of the many other facets of municipal services each is responsible for providing.

Maintaining Consistency Going Forward

As long as locally adopted CWPP and Comprehensive Plans continue to adhere to GMA-compliance standards administered by the Department of Commerce, regional consistency is inherent in established processes PRTPO is authorized by RCW 47.80 to carry out. This section clarifies the circumstances by which inconsistency between local plans and the RTP may be triggered, possibly resulting in a change in consistency determination by the PRTPO Executive Board.

PRTPO will consider a local plan potentially inconsistent with the RTP and its underlying aims under the following circumstances:

- The transportation element of a local Comprehensive Plan is found by the Dept. of Commerce to be out of compliance with GMA requirements, and the responsible local agency fails to address the issue.

  This issue pertains to willful disregard of a notice from Commerce that changes to state law or local plans caused some part of a formerly compliant transportation element to no longer meet GMA requirements. This recognizes that periodic changes in state law may take some time to implement at the local level and is thereby focused on a disregard for compliance with state requirements in addressing the concern.

DRAFT

- A proposed amendment to the land use or transportation sections of adopted Countywide Planning Policies is determined by Commerce to be out of compliance with GMA requirements and the responsible County fails to address the issue.

  Fundamental changes to land use assumptions in any CWPP and associated Comprehensive Plans entail a rigorous regional coordination process. Any abandonment of multimodal aims in local transportation policy would contradict long-established regional and statewide policy. Making such changes would undermine established land use practices and corresponding transportation policies in place since the early 1990s. This in turn would conflict with regional transportation objectives if not addressed.

Note that urban and rural communities are often subject to different GMA requirements and standards. PRTPO is a rural RTPO and its RTP is concerned with GMA requirements pertaining to rural regions. PRTPO relegates oversight of metropolitan matters to PSRC as they pertain to Kitsap County agencies.

In addition to the GMA compliance factors, above, every two years any PRTPO member or other community stakeholder can request the Executive Board to consider whether the transportation element of a specific local Comprehensive Plan warrants reconsideration of its consistency status, during the RTP Biennial Review Process. The Board will review the issue upon request as well as any evidence provided before determining whether the regional consistency determination for that agency needs to be revised.

Relationship to PSRC Planning Policies

Kitsap members belong to two very different RTPOs, rural PRTPO and urban PSRC, each with statutorily different requirements and planning resources. Kitsap members must satisfy PSRC planning and consistency requirements in addition to PRTPO requirements. They have done this since passage of the Growth Management Act in 1990. This section clarifies the relationship between PRTPO's consistency review process and PSRC's process.

PSRC planning and consistency requirements differ significantly from PRTPO's in terms of scope and regulatory authority. PRTPO's determination is independent of PSRC's determination and adheres strictly to its statutory authority established in RCW 47.80 and as reflected in the currently adopted RTP and regional work program. Nothing in PRTPO's planning process or consistency determinations is inconsistent with, or contradicts, the policies and determination of PSRC in its metropolitan planning processes. PRTPO consistency findings for its Kitsap members have no bearing on PSRC findings.

[This consistency brief will be accompanied by a resolution recognizing the consistency between the RTP and local plans]

DRAFT

DISCUSSION ITEM

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Thera Black, PRTPO Coordinator
Date: March 13, 2025
Subject: **Complete Street Candidates – Local Review**

REQUESTED ACTION:
Formal action is not requested but TAC members are asked to review draft content related to potential complete street candidates being highlighted for closer consideration and make any refinements online by March 31st.

Background
A Tough Topic being addressed in this update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) concerns those locations where "Main Street is a state highway" and the existing transportation system no longer supports the multimodal travel demand that the current land use is generating or is expected to generate. In such areas a "complete streets treatment" employing one or more design elements may be able to mitigate conflicts, making the available alternatives to driving more accessible and creating a safer travel environment for everyone.

The Legislature passed a Complete Streets proviso in 2022 that requires WSDOT to apply Complete Streets principles on all projects with a cumulative budget of $500,000 or more for all phases of work that are:

> *… in incorporated cities, or in areas where active transportation network gaps have been identified in WSDOT (or local) plans, or overburdened communities exist, unless there is a compelling reason to not implement, and as approved by the Region Administrator.*

The Legislature did not provide WSDOT with any funding to carry out these improvements, though. WSDOT already faces chronic underfunding for essential preservation and maintenance activities across the Peninsula Region. The Complete Streets proviso greatly exacerbates those deficits and forces difficult decisions and deferrals.

There are many locations across the region where complete street treatments may be desired by local or state partners. While WSDOT may want to implement measures, it must defer most of these since it received no funding for this work.

To support WSDOT in its efforts to recognize priority locations where the underlying local land use and the existing highway infrastructure are not compatible, particularly outside of traditional urban areas, this RTP update is developing a short list of complete streets candidates. It is intended to be input to the screening process that WSDOT conducts in its assessment of complete street needs when scoping its projects. It aims to identify select locations that are the highest concern, not all locations where improvements may be desired.

Site inclusion on this list does not imply that WSDOT will be able to implement treatments in these locations, just that PRTPO has flagged them for a closer look, if and when a state project triggers a screening.

The List of Candidates
At the Executive Board retreat in October, members mapped locations of potential complete street candidates for further review. In January the TAC received a list of the candidates that emerged from that mapping exercise and discussed some proposed factors we might use to do an initial scan of potential sites. Those factors included:

- Location on a state highway[1]
- Existing land use in the surrounding area (aerial map view)
- Concentrations of vulnerable or under-served populations (Census data)
- Level of Traffic Stress (LTS, determined by WSDOT Active Transportation Office)
- Designated transit stop, transit hub, or park-and-ride
- Trail crossing or alignment
- Documentation of a local agency concern or established project need

We are also looking at the likelihood of this entailing a non-capital versus a capital project, and very rough approximations of likely cost.

No additional factors were identified by the TAC for the initial assessment.

An interactive mapping tool was developed and populated, using the initial locations identified in October. They range from some of the most urban areas in the region to the most rural, illustrating the challenges that WSDOT faces as it tries to target its limited investments where they will do the most good. It is this information presented in the online mapping tool the TAC is asked to review and help refine by the end of March.

Assessing Regionally Significant Concerns

This link will take you to the Complete Streets Candidates site we will work on together. We'll walk through it at your meeting on March 20th, but you are encouraged to take a look at it before then. I am developing illustrated guidance that I will get out to you before the TAC meets, but I suspect many of you will find navigation to be fairly intuitive.

Each location has been mapped and most of the site information has already been input into its corresponding form. With few exceptions, the field that is incomplete is any evidence that the state highway in this location has been identified previously by a local agency as a problem in need of improved multimodal access. Evidence of a pre-existing concern – through a local plan or study, a project, a request from transit or a school district, or other means - gives added emphasis to a location, indicating there is a recognized conflict between the highway and adjacent land uses. Local knowledge is needed to complete that field.

Each site has a unique identifier, indicated on the attached list. It is sorted by county to facilitate reviews.

Some of these locations may not belong on this list, perhaps because the land use does not generate much demand for walking, biking, or transit trips or the issue to be addressed is associated with a future project, for example, adding a trail segment along the highway. We are really trying to get at those locations that have existing problems due to conflicts with land use. This will help WSDOT focus on those areas where the land use is generating transit, walk, and bike trips but the highway only accommodates vehicles. Your insights will be helpful in refining this list for that purpose.

Next Steps

TAC members are asked to review these locations and correct any information that is incomplete or inaccurate. Input received by March 31st will be shared during a Board review in April.

Attachments:

[3.15.25] Complete Streets Candidates Map Identification

For More Information:
Thera Black | 360.878.0353 | TheraB@PeninsulaRTPO.org

[1] Locations mapped in October include two sites not located on a state highway, one in Port Angeles and the other in Port Townsend. Given the intent of this list to inform WSDOT assessments in its complete street screenings, I am unsure they belong here, but we will discuss this.

Complete Street Candidates [3.13.25]

Initial locations identified during October Board retreat.

Further assessment needed to determine which are carried forward into the RTP.

Map #	Specific Locations Meriting a Closer Look	County
CC020	US 101 through Forks north UGA	Clallam
CC021	US 101 in vicinity of Lauridsen - west of highway	Clallam
CC022	US 101 in Blyn, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe crossing	Clallam
CC023	US 101 at Sunny Farms - pedestrian crossing	Clallam
CC023?	US 101 at Carlsborg (ODT crossing too)	Clallam
CC024	US 101 at SR 110, future ODT crossing	Clallam
CC025	US 101 at Beaver	Clallam
CC026	US 101 at ODT xing west of Lake Crescent	Clallam
CC027	US 101 at Sol Duc (Ped xing and EB bus stop)	Clallam
CC028	US 101 at Laird's Corner (LEKT)	Clallam
CC029	SR 117 / Tumwater Truck Route at US 101	Clallam
CC030	SR 112 through Sekiu	Clallam
CC031	SR 112 through Clallam Bay	Clallam
CC032	SR 112 through Joyce	Clallam
CC033	SR 112 through Neah Bay	Clallam
CC034	SR 110 from US 101 - future ODT alignment	Clallam
CC035	SR 110 at Moria Road - Three Rivers Community	Clallam
CC037	Marine Drive (Port of Port Angeles) [Not on state highway]	Clallam
HELP!	US 101 at Barnes Creek (bus stop location)	Clallam
JC011	SR 116 at Irondale Road	Jefferson
JC012	SR 19 at Center Road	Jefferson
JC013	SR 19 at Olympic Gateway Visitor's Center	Jefferson
JC014	SR 19 through Hadlock	Jefferson
JC015	SR 20 at 4 Corners	Jefferson
JC016	SR 20 at US 101 intersection	Jefferson
JC017	SR 20 north of US 101 - bike access	Jefferson
JC018	US 101 at Quilcene	Jefferson
JC019	US 101 in Brinnon	Jefferson
JC036	Mill Road at Discovery Bay Road - ODT [Not on state highway]	Jefferson
KC007	SR 3 in vicinity of Bremerton Airport	Kitsap
KC008	SR 305 through Poulsbo	Kitsap
KC009	SR 104 at Port Gamble Heritage Park	Kitsap
MC001	SR 106 at Reservation Road - lighting	Mason
MC002	Hwy 106 in Union, at the marina	Mason
MC003	SR 3 through Allyn	Mason
MC004	SR 300 from State Park to Belfair	Mason
MC005	SR 108 at US 101 interchanges - pedestrian safety	Mason
MC006	US 101 through Hoodsport	Mason
MC010	SR 106 at US 101	Mason