



proud past, promising future

**PUBLIC WORKS  
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING PROGRAM**

**AGENDA  
DEVELOPMENT and ENGINEERING ADVISORY BOARD**

Thursday, April 13, 2017

2:30 – 4:30 p.m.  
Public Service Center  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Training Room

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>TIME</u>		<u>FACILITATOR</u>
	<u>Start</u>	<u>Duration</u>	
1. Administrative Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Introductions</li><li>• DEAB meeting is being recorded and the audio will be posted on the DEAB's website</li><li>• Review/Adopt minutes</li><li>• DEAB Annual Report and Work Plan/Follow-up</li><li>• Review upcoming events</li><li>• DEAB member announcements</li></ul>	2:30	15 min	Wriston
2. TIP Evaluation System	2:45	30 min	Wilson
3. Residential Bldg Permits/Bonding/DA/Updates	3:15	30 min	Horne/Madsen
4. Public Comment	3:45	30 min	All

**Next DEAB Meeting:**

**Thursday, May 4, 2017**  
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.  
Public Service Center  
6th Floor, Training Room

**Agenda:**  
Utility Joint Trench - Shadix



proud past, promising future

**PUBLIC WORKS  
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING PROGRAM**

---

**BOCC Work Sessions and Hearings**

BOCC Work Session – every Wednesday at 9 a.m. \*

BOCC Hearing – every Tuesday at 10 a.m. \*\*

BOCC Hearing – Developer Agreement - Hidden Crest Development and Parkers Abby –  
Tuesday, April 18, 10:00 a.m.

BOCC Work Session – Clean Water Funding; Leichner Landfill Annual Budget Procedure and  
CREDC's Land for Jobs Presentation – Wednesday, April 19, 9:15 a.m.

BOCC Work Session – 2017 Spring Supplemental – Wednesday, April 26, 10:30 a.m.

**PC Work Sessions and Hearings**

PC Work Session – Open Public Meetings Act & Public Records – Thursday, April 20, 5:30  
p.m.

PC Hearing – Open Public Meetings Act & Public Records and CPZ2017-00005 - Shoreline  
Master Program – Thursday, April 20, 6:30 p.m.

*Note: Work sessions are frequently rescheduled. Check with the BOCC's office to confirm date/time of  
scheduled meetings.*

*PC – Planning Commission*

*BOCC – Board of Clark County Commissioners*

\* Unless cancelled, which some are if there are no topics

\*\* Except first Tuesday when the hearing is typically in the evening

**Development and Engineering Advisory Board Meeting**  
**March 2, 2017**  
**2:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m.**  
**Public Service Center**

Board members in attendance: Steve Bacon, Ott Gather, Eric Golemo, Andrew Gunther, Don Hardy, Mike Odren, Terry Wollam, Jeff Wriston

Board members not in attendance: James Howsley

County staff: Brent Davis, Matt Hermen, Chris Horne, David Jardin, Greg Shafer, Marty Snell, Nicole Snider

Public: Houston Aho, Steve Madsen

**Administrative Actions**

- Introductions
- DEAB meeting is being recorded and the audio will be posted on the DEAB's website, we are using the microphones today to improve quality of recording.
- Review/Adopt minutes: Minutes were approved.
- Review upcoming events
  - BOCC Work Session – Speed Limit adjustments on Various County Roadways - Wednesday, March 8, 9:30 a.m.
  - BOCC Work Session –Comcast & Century Link Franchise Agreements - Wednesday, March 22, 10:30 a.m.
  - BOCC Work Session – DEAB's 2016 Annual Report and 2017/2018 Work Plan presentation - Wednesday, March 29, 10:30 a.m.
  - BOCC Work Session – Sustainable Forestry Program - Wednesday, April 12, 12:30 a.m.
  - BOCC Work Session – Spring Supplemental - Wednesday, April 26, 10:30 a.m.
  - PC Work Session – Transportation Concurrency Management - Thursday, March 2, 5:30 p.m.
  - PC Hearing – Transportation Concurrency Management - Thursday, March 16, 6:30 p.m.
- DEAB member announcements
  - Eric Golemo gave an update on the subcommittee for driveway spacing handed off to Jan for Spring biannuals
  - Mike Odren shared a package from CPU regarding spacing and transformers, concern with new determination regarding; hardiplank siding is no longer considered non-combustible. This is affecting builders and location of buildings.
  - Greg Shafer stated that Dean Shadix had discussed having the utilities join the meeting. CPU will be here for the May 4<sup>th</sup> meeting – Jeff Wriston will contact CPU and start the dialogue before the meeting.

**Residential Building Permits/Bonding/Development Agreement**

Chris Horne, Steve Madsen, and Houston Aho regarding issue of bonding for final plat; a lot of unknowns and rather than write a code that would need amendments. A decision was made to do this with Development agreements at this time, this will help to avoid additional delays.

Discussion followed; most jurisdictions allow this, there has been a move to push this into a Code based revision, this is the desired outcome. Chris Horne gave examples of how this can fall apart in practice, too many unknowns. Houston Aho gave examples of other jurisdictions where the bonding process is standard practice and working well for them.

DEAB requests a follow up at April 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **Concurrency Code Revisions**

David Jardin and Matt Herman presented; power point provided in your packet.

“Clark County Code (CCC) 40.350.020 Transportation Concurrency Management System, implements the requirements found in RCW 36.70A.070 that establish level of service standards for arterial and transit routes. The initial concurrency code was written so that all development “triggered” mitigation improvements on failing intersections. This resulted in the inability for small developments to receive permit approvals, because of the sizeable mitigation requirements. Concurrency code amendments adopted by the BOCC in 2010 allowed development exemptions, from the intersections mitigation requirements, to be applied for smaller developments. The approved code was approved with a threshold that was believed to resolve intersection delay. Unfortunately, the threshold does not apply to all types of intersections universally; therefore allowing exemptions for large developments Staff is proposing to amend CCC40.350.020(G)(1)(c); permanently removing a de Minimis exemption threshold.”

### **Motion made – To support the Code language revisions as presented.**

### **Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

Meeting adjourned: 4:25 pm

Meeting minutes prepared by: Nicole Snider

Reviewed by: Greg Shafer

# Clark County 2018-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

## Project Evaluation System

**Clark County DEAB**  
April 13, 2017, 2:30PM  
BOCC Hearing Room

Presented by Susan Wilson and Michael Derleth  
Clark County Public Works

# Agenda

- Guiding Principals and Legal Requirements
- Evaluation System Goals
- Ranking Criteria Details
- Other Suggestions

# Guiding Principles and Legalities

## BOCC Guiding Principles:

Debt Service Payment

Safety

Preservation of Roadways & Assets

Capital Projects

## Legal Requirements:

RCW 36-81-121 and WAC 136-16-010.

All capital road projects are to be in ACP/TIP.

County Engineer to **“develop and apply”** priority programming. WAC 136-14

Board adopts before budget - Board action required to later amend TIP.  
RCW 36-81-130

TIP follows adopted policies and Comprehensive Plan via the Capital Facilities Plan.

# Evaluation System Goals:

Safety 33%	Economic Development 29%	Mobility 24%
<div data-bbox="63 476 566 574" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b><u>Safety Rating</u></b> 30 Points HSM, Physical road features</p> </div>	<div data-bbox="610 476 1336 574" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b><u>Support for Economic Development</u></b> 20 Points VBLM Potential future jobs created.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="610 743 1870 841" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 20px;"> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Concurrency</u></b> 10 Points Level of Service, Volume/Capacity. Evaluates Congested areas</p> </div>	<div data-bbox="1375 476 1877 574" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b><u>Route Connectivity</u></b> 10 Points Atlas, Links to other roadways</p> </div> <div data-bbox="1375 612 1877 709" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 20px;"> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Multimodal</u></b> 6 Points Access to alternative transportation</p> </div>
<div data-bbox="63 886 1870 983" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;"> <p><b><u>Comparison to Arterial Atlas</u></b> 10 Points Evaluates the existing roadway section with standard arterial cross-sections specified in the County's Arterial Atlas.</p> </div>		
<p><b>Other 14%</b> Environmental Impacts    Public &amp; Outside Agency Support    Leveraging of Outside Funding</p>		



# Ranking Criteria

- Objective, data-based, best practices
- Nine different criteria: 

	Points
○ Safety	30
○ Economic Development	20
○ Arterial Atlas	10
○ Concurrency	10
○ Route Connectivity	10
○ Multimodal Needs	6
○ Environmental Impact	6
○ Funding Leverage	6
○ Public & Outside Support	<u>2</u>
Total: 100 Points	

# Safety:

- Performance Score 20 Points
    - 5 year Crash History
    - Highway Safety Manual (HSM) Analysis
  - Risk Exposure Score 10 Points
    - Shoulder Widths
    - Roadside Drop-off
    - Pedestrian Trips
    - Sight Distance, Alignment, etc.
    - Fixed Objects
    - Bike Lanes
    - Sidewalks
- Total: 30 Points

# Economic Development:

## Potential Jobs: Geographic Information Systems analysis

Vacant Buildable Lands Model

Consistency with CFP, Growth Plans

Considers non-buildable land (net jobs)

- **Potential Industrial Jobs** **0-7 Points**
  - 9 jobs per net-buildable acre
  - Projects listed in increasing order of jobs 0-7 pts
- **Potential Commercial Jobs** **0-4 Points**
  - 20 jobs per net-buildable acre
  - Projects listed in increasing order of jobs 0-4 pts

# Economic Development (#2):

- Potential Industrial Jobs 0-7 Points
- Potential Commercial Jobs 0-4 Points
- Development Potential: Within 1 mile of:
  - Focused Public Investment Area? 4 Points
  - Development Ready Site? 4 Points
  - State Highway/Interchange? 1 Points

Max: 20 Points

# Comparison to Arterial Atlas:

Atlas describes current and future road needs and official classifications: Circulation!

- Current road section vs. Atlas:

- Requires additional travel lanes 1 Point
- Requires center/left turn lane 2 Points
- Requires sidewalks 1 Point
- Requires bike lanes 1 Point

Total: 5 Points

# Concurrency:

Have road capacity ready when it is needed (CCC 40.350.020)

- Improves Intersections of Regional Significance
  - Failing (LOS: E,F) 6 Points
  - Within 10% of failing (LOS: D) 4 Points
- Improves a Concurrency Corridor
  - Failing (V/C: > 0.90) 3 Points
  - Within 10% of failing (V/C 0.80>0.89) 2 Points

# Concurrency (#2):

- Improves Intersections of Regional Significance 6 Points
- Improves a Concurrency Corridor 3 Points
- Improves Congestion in Moratorium Area
  - Alleviates Congestion (improves LOS or V/C) 1 Points
  - Doesn't improve LOS or V/C 0 Points
- Improves Transportation in Urban Holding Area
  - Project Within a UH Area 4 Points
  - Project Adjacent to a UH Area 2 Points

Max: 10 Points

Total: 14 Possible

# Route Connectivity:

- How does a project link to other arterial and collector routes in the Arterial Atlas?
    - Links both Arterial(s) and Collector(s) 3 Points
    - Links two Arterials 2 Points
    - Links two collectors 1 Point
    - Completes a gap 2 Points
- Max: 5 Points  
Total: 8 Possible



# Multimodal:

- Does the project improve access to multimodal facilities?

- Improves defined bicycle route 2 Points
- Improves access to Park & Ride 2 Points
- Improves access to C-Tran route (within project limits) 2 Points
- Improves access to trail or trailhead 1 Point

Max: 6 Points

Total: 7 Possible

# Environmental:

- Impacts and the ability to obtain permits:

Concern:	Difficulty:	Low/No	Moderate	High
NEPA/SEPA				
Wetland Permits				
Habitat Permits		0.75 pts per	0.40 pts per	0.00 pts per
Shoreline Permits		Concern	Concern	Concern
Endangered Species				
Cultural Resources				
Size of Impacts				
Mitigation Site				

Total: 6 Points

# Funding Leverage:

- What non-County funds are awarded?

State/Federal grants, regional, developer fees, etc.

- 50% outside funds 6 Points
- 40% 5 Points
- 30% 4 Points
- 20% 3 Points
- 10% 2 Points
- No funds awarded 0 Points

Max: 6 Points

# Public & Other Support:

- Any other formal support for a project?
    - Regional Transportation Council (MTIP)  
State Transportation Plan  
or surrounding City Trans. Plan? 1 Point
    - Formal Public Support (e.g. adopted neighborhood circulation plan)? 1 Point
    - No formal support 0 Points
- Max: 2 Points

# Summary:

- Ranking projects for the TIP:
  - Legally required
  - Supports other county long-range plans
  - Detailed, objective, best-practices criteria.
- Ranked list is a starting point for decisions

Other Suggestions?

Thank you,  
We appreciate your interest!

Any other questions?

More information:

<https://www.clark.wa.gov/public-works/transportation-improvement-program>

# Jobs Points Example

TIP - Excel Industrial Economic Data Import - Step 3

CRP	JobsPerAc	Score
342422	448.650000	7.000000
900084	383.939991	7.000000
323322	383.489991	7.000000
333122	379.619982	7.000000
900120	279.539973	5.000000
900184	250.200000	5.000000
901004	170.280000	5.000000
350722	153.899991	3.000000
900282	54.719991	1.000000
390222	27.809991	1.000000
351022	22.949991	0.000000
900255	3.690000	0.000000
351522	0.000000	0.000000
900032	0.000000	0.000000
900256	0.000000	0.000000
900258	0.000000	0.000000
900259	0.000000	0.000000

+

Min Jobs	Max Jobs	Score
300	450	7
156	299	5
100	155	3
25	99	1
0	24	0

Note: Jobs entered above must cover all possible ranges that are in the spreadsheet jobs per acre.

Preview