Chapter 5: Land and Facility Demand

2010 Plan Update: The following update discusses the public involvement processes that Jefferson County conducted for the development of the 2002 Plan and the 2010 Plan update. Following the update, background information evaluating demand for non-motorized transportation facilities and recreational trails has been retained in the original 2002 Plan format.

Assessing demand in the 2002 Plan

Jefferson County's priorities for developing non-motorized transportation and multi-purpose trail facilities reflect the public's interest expressed during the development of the 2002 Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan. One of the purposes of the 2010 Plan update was to determine whether the public continues to support these priorities or they should be revised.

Jefferson County conducted an extensive public outreach process for the development of the 2002 Plan to determine the demand for non-motorized transportation facilities and recreational trails.

First, the County considered standard measurements of demand such as population ratios and level of service standards (LOSS). The County prepared an inventory of the available facilities and compared it with other jurisdictions in Washington State and nationally. This assessment is presented below in 5.1 Methodologies from the 2002 Plan.

Second, the County conducted an extensive public outreach process to notify citizens, engage them in development of the Plan, and determine their demand and priorities for developing non-motorized transportation facilities and recreational trails. This included placing articles and advertisements in local newspapers, placing posters in public facilities and commercial establishments throughout the County, and conducting a well-attended series of fourteen public forums in seven locations throughout the County. Forum participants discussed the types and locations of non-motorized transportation and recreational facilities that they currently used and that they wanted the County to develop. Based on this process an unconstrained 20-Year Vision of Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails was developed and presented in Chapter 5 of the 2002 Plan. It is discussed on Page 10 of this updated chapter and depicted in the accompanying table. The 20-Year Vision helps guide Jefferson County's longrange planning.

Third, the County convened a Task Force to provide stakeholder input, technical expertise, and policy guidance for the Plan. Task Force members included representatives from bicycle and trail advocacy groups, chambers of commerce, the Economic Development Council, the City of Port Townsend, the Washington State Department of Transportation, and Washington State Parks.

Fourth, Jefferson County conducted a survey of 114 County households to obtain a random sampling of the demand and priorities of the general public for non-motorized transportation facilities, recreational trails, parks, and open space. The results of this survey were presented in Chapter 10 Public opinion of the 2002 Plan.

Based on this process, the County developed the following list of priority non-motorized transportation and multi-purpose trail projects that had significant public support and would achieve the goals and objectives of the Plan. These projects were presented in Chapter 11 Implementation of the 2002 Plan.

- Larry Scott Trail from the Port of Port Townsend to Four Corners on SR 20,
- Olympic Discovery Trail from Four Corners around Discovery Bay to Clallam County,
- Chimacum Trail (now named the Rick Tollefson Trail) from Port Hadlock across the Chimacum Creek valley and through HJ Carroll County Park to Chimacum School.
- Quilcene Village Center sidewalks, crossing, and pedestrian route to the Community Center.
- **Brinnon pedestrian route** from Brinnon School to Dosewallips State Park along County Roads and parallel to Highway 101,
- Multi-purpose trail from HJ Carroll Park and the Chimacum School campus to the Olympic Discovery Trail at Anderson Lake State Park,
- Larry Scott Trail Extension from Four Corners to Port Hadlock via Irondale Road and to Glen Cove, and
- Construction of trailheads with parking, benches, and restrooms to provide services to trail users.

Implementing the 2002 Plan

Jefferson County's implementation of the 2002 Plan has focused on the top priorities, the Larry Scott Trail, the Rick Tollefson Trail (formerly the Chimacum Trail), and the Olympic Discovery Trail.

Larry Scott Trail

Jefferson County has acquired 7.5 miles of trail easement from numerous property owners that extends the trail from the Port of Port Townsend to S. Discovery Road near Four Corners at SR 20. The County has constructed 4.4 miles of trail from the Port to beyond the Cape George Road trailhead. Volunteers have constructed an additional 1.6 miles of primitive trail that extends the trail to S. Discovery Road at the Discovery Bay Golf Course. Construction of the remaining trail to Four Corners at SR 20 is proposed for 2010 – 2012.

In order to confirm anecdotal knowledge regarding trail use, the Jefferson County began taking counts of trail users on the initial segment of the Larry Scott Trail between the Port of Port Townsend and the Port Townsend Paper Company. There were an average 310 daily trail trips on this segment during the first weekend of April 2010 and an average 276 daily trips during the week of April 12, 2010.

The significant use of the existing trail segments and the volunteer trail construction clearly demonstrate the public support for completing the development of the Larry Scott Trail.

Rick Tollefson Trail

In 2008 Jefferson County began planning, design, easement acquisition, and grant applications for the first phase of the Rick Tollefson Trail from Old Hadlock Road across the Chimacum Creek valley to HJ Carroll County Park. This project was proposed as the Chimacum Trail in the 2002 Plan. When completed, it will

achieve a significant goal of the 2002 Plan: a non-motorized transportation link between the residential and commercial center of Port Hadlock and HJ Carroll Park, Chimacum School, and the Tri-Area Community Center. The County has conducted outreach to the community and stakeholders to gauge support for the trail and to obtain input on its design and management. The community and stakeholders have shown strong support.

In 2010 the County in partnership with Chimacum School District and the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department applied for a Safe Routes to School grant for the design and construction of a signalized crossing of SR 19 for the trail at the Chimacum School campus. The grant would also fund traffic safety and bicycle education programs that would be conducted by the School District and the Sheriff's Department.

Olympic Discovery Trail

The Olympic Discovery Trail (ODT) will extend from the end of the Larry Scott Trail at Four Corners on SR 20 around the southern end of Discovery Bay to Clallam County. From Four Corners through Anderson Lake State Park to Discovery Bay, the Trail would be a back country route that uses existing utility easements, logging roads, and constructed trails. Trail advocates have taken the lead in planning this segment of the route. From the west side of Discovery Bay to Clallam County, the Trail could be on or adjacent to County Roads and Highway 101.

Developing a route around the southern end of Discovery Bay is a critical connection between these segments. In 2010 Jefferson County initiated development of the ODT Discovery Bay estuary connection by requesting a trail easement from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) on the abandoned railroad grade. The County is also applying for grants for trail design and construction. The County is working with partners including the WDFW, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, Jefferson County Conservation District, Jefferson Land Trust, Jefferson Trails Coalition, and North Olympic Salmon Coalition to develop the trail route, conduct environmental restoration, and provide public viewing and interpretive facilities. The concept of a trail on the railroad grade is supported in the WDFW's Draft North Olympic Wildlife Management Plan.

The Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail (PNT), established by Congress in 2009, will extend from the Continental Divide in Montana to Cape Alava on Washington's Pacific Coast. The US Forest Service has been designated as the agency responsible for developing the PNT. It is anticipated that the PNT will use the Larry Scott Trail from the Port of Port Townsend to Four Corners and the ODT route from Four Corners to Discovery Bay. Jefferson County will consider a partnership with the Forest Service and trail advocate to develop this route.

Additional facility concepts

Since the adoption of the 2002 Plan, Jefferson County has continued long-range planning for non-motorized transportation and multi-purpose trails. In addition to the priority projects listed in Chapter 11 Implementation of the 2002 Plan, the County has developed the following list of facility concepts for consideration by the public through the 2010 Plan update process. Some of these concepts were originally listed in the 2002 Plan 20-Year Vision. They could be developed in a longer time frame than the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program.

- Tri-Area Active Transportation Network:
 - **SR 116 pedestrian and bicycle improvements** from Port Hadlock Crossroads to the County Library,
 - Cedar Avenue pedestrian and bicycle improvements,
 - Lower Hadlock Trail from Port Hadlock Crossroads to Waterfront,
 - SR 19 pedestrian and bicycle improvements from SR 116 to Irondale Road.
 - Irondale Road crossing for connection to Irondale County Park,
 - **SR 116 pedestrian and bicycle improvements** from County Library to SR 19.
 - SR 19 pedestrian and bicycle improvements from SR 116 to HJ Carroll Park.
 - SR 19/20 bicycle route from Tri-Area to Port Townsend,
- Oak Bay & Paradise Bay Roads pedestrian and bicycle improvements in Port Ludlow.
- Swansonville Road pedestrian and bicycle improvements from Oak Bay Road to Pioneer Drive,
- Cross-State Trail segment from Hood Canal Bridge to Olympic Discovery Trail at Discovery Bay.

2010 Plan Update: Reaffirming the 2002 Plan vision

Jefferson County conducted a public outreach process for the 2010 Plan update to determine whether there is continuing public support for the priorities in the 2002 Plan. It also provided the opportunity to identify additional projects that have public support. This process included:

- Posting the Plan update and the draft 2010 Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan on the County's website,
- Press releases to local newspapers,
- Posting a link to the Plan update on the Public Works Department's Visionary Transportation blog,
- Discussing the Plan update with the County Planning Commission's Transportation Subcommittee,
- Notifying stakeholders,
- Conducting two public workshops with the Board of County Commissioners,
- Receiving public comments throughout the 2010 Plan update process, and
- Conducting a public hearing before the Board of County Commissioners to take testimony on the update.

The Six-Year Non-motorized Transportation and Multi-purpose Trails Capital Improvement Program 2010 – 2015 presented in updated Chapter 11 reflects the public's continued support expressed through the 2010 Plan update process.

The remainder of this chapter was not revised for the 2010 Plan update. It has been retained in the original 2002 Plan format.

5.1 Methodologies

This chapter evaluates the demand for non-motorized transportation and recreational trail land and facilities using various methodologies, including population ratios, participation models, level-of-service (LOS) measurements, and state and national comparisons. These methodologies illustrate potential means of estimating demand. No one methodology should be seen as the only appropriate one.

Estimating demand is only one aspect of providing additional non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities. Demand must be considered in the context of the County's financial capacity, public support, and other competing County priorities. Chapter 6 Finance discusses the County's financial capacity and potential revenue sources. Chapter 10 Public Opinion discusses the findings of the public opinion survey, including public support for various facilities, revenue sources, levels of funding, and priority projects. Chapter 11 Implementation considers all these factors and presents alternative capital facility programs with priority projects, funding levels, and revenue sources.

When considering the non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities needed to meet the estimated demand, the total inventory available to Jefferson County residents and visitors should be considered. (See Chapter 3 Existing facilities.) This includes, not only Jefferson County facilities, but also an extensive inventory provided by the City of Port Townsend, Port of Port Townsend, and State and Federal agencies, including the Washington State Department of Transportation, Washington State Parks, US Forest Service, and National Park Service.

<u>Ratios</u> – the demand for non-motorized transportation and trail land can be estimated using a ratio of a required facility to a standard unit of population, such as 0.5 miles of multipurpose trail corridor per 1,000 residents. The ratio method is relatively simple to compute and can be compared with national or other local non-motorized transportation and recreational trail measurements.

However, the method cannot account unique age, social, or interest characteristics that may affect the non-motorized transportation and recreational trail activity patterns within a specific community. Nor can the method compensate for unique climatic or environmental features that may cause seasonal or geographical variations in non-motorized transportation and recreational trail use patterns.

The ratio method is frequently used to estimate land requirements. However, a number of factors may significantly influence the amount of land a community may wish to set-aside for non-motorized transportation and trail purposes. Such factors may include the presence of sensitive environments, scenic viewpoints, historical or cultural assets, trailheads, and other features that may increase land set-asides along a non-motorized transportation or trail corridor.

The most widely used trail land and facility ratios have been formulated by the National Recreation & Park Association (NRPA) using comparisons that have been developed over time by cities across the country. The ratios may not, however, include all non-motorized transportation and trail land and facilities that are provided by all local, state, and federal sponsors within each measuring jurisdiction. The ratios also may not accurately reflect the preferences of a rural population

<u>Existing level-of-service (ELOS)</u> – is the ratio of the existing supply of non-motorized transportation and recreational trails facilities to the current resident population (as a unit ratio per 1,000 persons). For example, a jurisdiction with an existing inventory of 20 miles of multipurpose trail and a current population of 20,000 residents has an ELOS of 1.0 mile per 1,000 residents.

Jefferson County currently has 31.5 acres of right-of-way and easements for multi-purpose trail. The County's current population is 25,953. Its ELOS for multipurpose trail land is 1.21 acres per thousand population. Jefferson County currently has 47.5 miles of composite non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities. Its composite ELOS for non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities is 1.83 miles per thousand population.

ELOS ratios can also be calculated for specialized types of non-motorized transportation facilities and recreational trails for which there are no comparable national or state standards, such as beach walks along public tidelands, or inlane bicycling routes on local county roads.

The existing level-of-service (ELOS) can be simply an expression of the existing facility supply per 1,000 population. It can also be adopted as the jurisdiction's standard that it wishes to maintain in the future as the population grows. In this case, future facility requirements can be estimated using the existing (ELOS) ratio and future population estimates. For the example above, if the population were projected to increase by 10,000 in 10 years, then an additional 10 miles of multipurpose trails would be required in order to maintain the ELOS.

The Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) forecasts that the population of Jefferson County will increase from 25,953 persons in 2000 to 44,822 persons by the year 2020 – an increase of 18,869 persons or 72%. In order to maintain its ELOS for multipurpose trail land, Jefferson County would need to acquire 22.9 acres for rights-of-way and easements. In order to maintain its composite ELOS for non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities, Jefferson County would need to develop 35.0 miles of non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities.

Section 5.4 Future growth implications of this chapter discusses the value of Jefferson County existing inventory of non-motorized transportation and recreational land and facilities and the financial implications for maintaining Jefferson County's ELOS.

Existing level-of-service standards (ELOS) / Maintaining ELOS - Local / Regional Facilities

2001 population:	25,953
2020 population:	44,822
Ingrasa	10.000

Increase: 18,869				2002 inv	entory		ELOS / 1,000	population	Facility additions to		IAC		NRPA
			County	All	All	County	All	All	maintain County ELOS				Stndrds
		units		public	public/		Public	public/	for estimated 2020	per 1,000			/1000
					private			private	population	1990	2000	2010	1983
1 land	linear trails	acres	31.5	unk	unk	1.21	unk	unk	22.9				4.85
Facilities													
	a a a la a la tura il	and a n	1			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.45	0.15	0.14	0.50
1 multipurpose	asphait trail	miles	4.0		4.0	0.00 0.15	0.00	0.00		0.15	0.15	0.14	0.50
	dirt trail	miles miles	4.0		4.0	0.15	0.00 0.00	0.15 0.00					
0				0.7	0.7								
2 streetscape	brick paver streetscape	miles		0.7	0.7	0.00 0.00	0.03 0.00	0.03 0.00					
	concrete streetscape	miles each	1	2	2	0.00	0.00	0.00					
3 urban	gateways concrete sidewalk		0.7			0.04	0.00	0.08					
sidewalk		miles miles	0.7			0.03	0.00	0.00					
	asphalt sidewalk									0.10	0.10	0.10	
4 park trail	asphalt trail dirt trail	miles miles	9.7	40.1	65.0	0.00 0.37	0.00 1.55	0.00 2.50		0.13	0.13	0.13	na
E al accide il cica ac			9.7	40.1	65.0					0.15	0.15	0.14	0.50
5 dayhiking	rock trail dirt trail	miles		10.0	10.0	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.15	0.15	0.14	0.50
0 - 1 1'		miles	4.4	10.0	10.0	0.00	0.39	0.39					
6 shoreline	beach trail	miles	1.1	5.2	5.2	0.04	0.20	0.20					
7 backpacking	dirt trail w/campsites	miles		unk	unk	0.00	0.00	0.00					
	road shoulder - urban	miles				0.00	0.00	0.00					na
9 on-road bike	road shoulder - county	miles	28.3	28.3	28.3	1.09	1.09	1.09		0.03	0.03	0.03	
	road shoulder - hwy	miles		33.1	33.1	0.00	1.28	1.28					
	in-lane - back country	miles				0.00	0.00	0.00					
11 off-road bike	•	miles				0.00	0.00	0.00		0.30	0.30	0.29	0.50
	dirt trail	miles		10.0	10.0	0.00	0.39	0.39					
	BMX course	miles	0.2			0.01	0.00	0.00	0.1				
12 horse trails	riding areas	miles	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.1	0.12	0.11	0.11	na
	dirt trail	miles	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.15	0.15	0.15					
	back country	miles		unk	unk	0.00	0.00	0.00					
13 water trails	freshwater pond hand launch	each	3	9	9	0.12	0.35	0.35					
	freshwater river hand launch	each	1	11	11	0.04	0.42	0.42					
	river runs	miles		52.8	52.8	0.00	2.03	2.03					
	saltwater hand launch	each	9	34	39	0.35	1.31	1.50					
	saltwater access water side	each		15	15	0.00	0.58	0.58					
	saltwater overnight campsites	each		5	5	0.00	0.19	0.19					
		Miles	48.2					Miles	35.0				

<u>Participation models</u> - non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facility requirements can be determined using variations of participation models that are refined, statistical variations of a questionnaire or survey method of determining recreational behavior. Participation models are usually compiled using activity diaries, where a person or household records their participation in specific recreational activities over a measurable period of time. The diary results are then compiled to create a statistical profile that can be used to project the non-motorized transportation and trail behavior of comparable persons, households or populations.

Participation models are most accurate when the participation measurements are determined for a population and area that is local and similar enough to the population that is to be projected by the model. The most accurate participation model is usually controlled by climatic region and age, and periodically updated to measure changes in recreational behavior in activities or areas over time.

Properly done, participation models can be very accurate predictors of an area's facility requirements in terms that are specific and measurable. However, though accurate, participation models can be somewhat abstract, and if not combined with other methods of gathering public opinion, the method can fail to determine the qualitative issues of an area's facility demands in addition to a facility's quantitative requirements.

For example, an area might provide the exact facility quantities that are required to meet the resident population's non-motorized transportation and trail demands, such as a mile of walking trail. However, the facility might not be provided with the proper destination, in a quality or safe corridor, or other important, but less measurable aspect that make the facility quantity effective and the activity a pleasurable experience. The walking trail, for example, might be located in an area of uninteresting scenery and/or in an inaccessible location.

This planning effort utilizes the results of the Washington State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation surveys for six age groups (male and female) for the northeast region of the state (east of the Cascade Mountains). Estimates were developed for non-motorized transportation and trail activities that were determined to be of most interest to the residents of the Jefferson County.

The estimates were developed for each activity demand for the peak season periods that would most impact facility capacities and thereby the level of service to local residents. The estimated demands were calculated in facility unit terms based on an assumed <u>high</u> capacity and turnover rate common to the findings of the diary surveys. The projected facility unit requirements were then converted into a simple facility unit per 1,000 residents ratio to allow comparison with similar ratios developed by the NRPA and found to be the existing facility level-of-service (ELOS) for each activity.

Participation models can account for facility capacity ratios that may be expressed through management polices or local population preferences concerning volume of use or the degree of crowding that is satisfactory. However, the model cannot account for all possible variations in crowding or volume of use that may vary over the length of a trail, season, or by a different user population at the same time.

Economic development strategy

Based on a unique set of factors, a community could decide to provide an inventory of non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities that is different than typically reflected in LOS ratios or participation models.

For example, tourism contributes significantly to Jefferson County's economy. In addition to attracting tourists, the County's many recreational opportunities and scenic and historic amenities are factors that encourage new residents and businesses to locate here.

Considering this, Jefferson County could decide to develop a larger inventory of non-motorized transportation and recreational trails facilities as part of an overall economic development strategy.

Proposed level-of-service (PLOS)

The ELOS can also be compared to national or state standards and local conditions to help the jurisdiction determine whether it wants a higher or lower ratio than it currently has. After considering national and state standards and local preferences for specific facilities, local decision-makers can adopt appropriate proposed level-of-service (PLOS) ratios for the jurisdiction. A comparison of the existing inventory, and current population will indicate whether there is a surplus or deficit of a particular facility. By considering future population projections, decision-makers can determine the quantity of additional facilities required to meet the PLOS in the future and make plans to provide sufficient additional facility units at specified future times to meet the PLOS.

For example, if the existing supply of beach trails in a jurisdiction of 20,000 population were 20 miles, the existing level-of-service (ELOS) standard would be 1.0 mile per 1,000 population. However, the public may feel that existing trails are overcrowded and located in areas that are of little interest. The public could express the desire to add 10 more miles to the existing inventory in order to reduce crowding and provide access to more interesting sites. The proposal would require an increase in the overall supply to 30 miles. The proposed level-of-service (PLOS) standard would be 1.5 miles per 1,000 population.

Comprehensive Plan level-of-service (LOS)

During the development of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan (1998), the Board of County Commissioners adopted level-of-service standards for public facilities, including a LOS for trails of 0.52 miles per 1,000 population. Trails are defined in the Parks and Recreation Element as "a system of separated cross-country linkages that connect major environmental assets, park and recreation facilities, community centers, and historical features." The Capital Facilities Element, Parks and Recreation section (Page 12-32) states that the 1997 County facility inventory includes 15 miles of trails. A detailed description of that inventory is not provided.

Based on the projected 2003 County population of 30,012 and the adopted LOS of 0.52 miles per 1,000 population, a total of 15.6 miles of trails would be needed to maintain the LOS. (See Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Capital Facilities Element, Parks section, Trails subsection, Table 12-PR-2d.) Since the adoption of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, Jefferson County has constructed 4.8

miles of the Larry Scott Trail, 1.5 miles of trails at HJ Carroll Park, and 5.0 miles of trails at Gibbs Lake County Park.

Trails are also discussed in the Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element. Figure 10-4 depicts Bike Trails on State highways and County roads. The discussion of capacity-related and non-capacity-related needs for the non-motorized transportation system (Comprehensive Plan, Page 10-34) refers the reader to the Capital Facilities Element, Parks section, Trails subsection.

Although it is not explicitly stated in the Comprehensive Plan, it is evident from this discussion that the LOS for trails is a composite LOS for several types of non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities. Chapter 3 of this Plan provides a detailed inventory of existing non-motorized transportation facilities and recreational trails that includes:

- Multipurpose trails 4.0 miles,
- Urban sidewalks 0.7 miles
- Park walking trails 9.7 miles,
- Shoreline trails 1.1 miles,
- On-road bicycle routes 28.3 miles,
- Off-road bicycle trails 0.2 miles, and
- Horse riding trails 4.2 miles

The total trail inventory is 48.2 miles. Based on this inventory, Jefferson County currently exceeds its LOS for trails.

This Plan does not propose to modify the existing Comprehensive Plan trail LOS standard or to adopt LOS standards for each specific type of non-motorized transportation facility and recreational trail.

20-Year Vision of non-motorized transportation and recreational trails

In order to provide citizen involvement in preparing this Plan and the Parks and Recreation Plan, Jefferson County conducted a series of public forums and convened a citizens advisory group, the Non-motorized Transportation Task Force. Participants were asked the types of activities that they participated in and the facilities they used. They were also asked to list the additional non-motorized transportation, park, and recreation facilities that they desired without consideration for financial constraints. The list included multipurpose trails, commuter and touring bicycle routes, mountain bike trails and BMX courses, park and day hiking trails, urban sidewalks and streetscapes, and shoreline trails. It also included support facilities, such as trailheads, parking, and restrooms. All of these facilities together comprise Jefferson County's 20-Year Vision for non-motorized transportation and recreational trails.

After the 20-Year Vision was compiled, typical unit costs for each type of facility were developed, such as cost per acre for land acquisition or cost per mile for trail construction. These unit costs were used to calculate a total cost for each proposed facility and Jefferson County's share for facilities that might be jointly developed with other public and private agencies. All of the individual facility costs were aggregated to yield a total cost. The 20-Year Vision is shown on the following seven pages.

Since the Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan is a planning level document, it was not necessary to determine the preferred facility

or route for specific corridors. As a result, many facilities on the 20-Year Vision provide duplicate service. For example, a separated multipurpose trail, an onroad bicycle route, and urban sidewalks are all potential components that could connect the Port Hadlock population center to the school, parks, and community center in Chimacum. However, most likely, not all of these facilities would be constructed. As another example, there are multiple routes for the Olympic Discovery Trail from Four Corners to Discovery Bay, but, most likely, not all of those routes will be developed. The 20-Year Vision is therefore significantly larger and more expensive than would be necessary to provide a comprehensive non-motorized transportation and recreational trail system for Jefferson County. Nonetheless, it is an important planning tool since it provides a comprehensive vision of potential facilities and estimated costs.

Projects from the 20-Year Vision are the basis for the alternative capital facility programs discussed in Chapter 11 Implementation.

In order to provide a reality check on the 20-Year Vision and assist the Board of County Commissioners in decision-making regarding specific projects to construct, funding sources, and overall funding levels, the planning process included a statistically valid, random survey of County voters. The survey questions and responses are discussed in Chapter 10 of this Plan.

20-Year Vision Non-Motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails: 2003-2022

Units Land acquacres-40 acres-40 acres-30 acres-30 acres-40 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40	Rgnl/local uisition rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgn	18.4 12.3 17.5 12.0 34.2 43.6 4.8 13.1 17.0	\$16,000 \$6,000 \$6,000 \$10,000 \$10,000 \$100,000	\$294,400 \$73,800 \$105,000 \$120,000 \$222,182 \$698,182	70% 100% 85% 10% 20%	\$73,800 \$89,250 \$12,000 \$44,436		Partner ROW
Land acq acres-40 acres-40 acres-30 acres-30 acres-40 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40	rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl	18.4 12.3 17.5 12.0 34.2 43.6 4.8 13.1	\$16,000 \$6,000 \$6,000 \$10,000 \$6,500 \$16,000 \$100,000	\$294,400 \$73,800 \$105,000 \$120,000 \$222,182 \$698,182	70% 100% 85% 10% 20%	\$206,080 \$73,800 \$89,250 \$12,000 \$44,436	ODT Larry Scott Trail: Rumage-4 Corners ODT Utility Route: 4 Corners-Anderson Lake Road ODT Utility Route: Anderson Lake Road-Discovery Bay ODT Forest and Lakes: 4 Corners-Anderson Lake SP	
acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-30 acres-30 acres-40 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40	rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl	12.3 17.5 12.0 34.2 43.6 4.8 13.1	\$6,000 \$6,000 \$10,000 \$6,500 \$16,000 \$100,000	\$73,800 \$105,000 \$120,000 \$222,182 \$698,182	100% 85% 10% 20%	\$73,800 \$89,250 \$12,000 \$44,436	ODT Utility Route: 4 Corners-Anderson Lake Road ODT Utility Route: Anderson Lake Road-Discovery Bay ODT Forest and Lakes: 4 Corners-Anderson Lake SP	ROW
acres-40 acres-40 acres-30 acres-30 acres-40 acres-20 acres-40 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40	rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl	12.3 17.5 12.0 34.2 43.6 4.8 13.1	\$6,000 \$6,000 \$10,000 \$6,500 \$16,000 \$100,000	\$73,800 \$105,000 \$120,000 \$222,182 \$698,182	100% 85% 10% 20%	\$73,800 \$89,250 \$12,000 \$44,436	ODT Utility Route: 4 Corners-Anderson Lake Road ODT Utility Route: Anderson Lake Road-Discovery Bay ODT Forest and Lakes: 4 Corners-Anderson Lake SP	ROW
acres-40 acres-30 acres-40 acres-20 acres-40 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40	rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl	17.5 12.0 34.2 43.6 4.8 13.1	\$6,000 \$10,000 \$6,500 \$16,000 \$100,000	\$105,000 \$120,000 \$222,182 \$698,182	85% 10% 20%	\$89,250 \$12,000 \$44,436	ODT Utility Route: Anderson Lake Road-Discovery Bay ODT Forest and Lakes: 4 Corners-Anderson Lake SP	ROW
acres-30 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40	rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl	12.0 34.2 43.6 4.8 13.1	\$10,000 \$6,500 \$16,000 \$100,000	\$120,000 \$222,182 \$698,182	10% 20%	\$12,000 \$44,436	ODT Forest and Lakes: 4 Corners-Anderson Lake SP	ROW
acres-30 acres-40 acres-20 acres-40 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl	34.2 43.6 4.8 13.1	\$6,500 \$16,000 \$100,000	\$222,182 \$698,182	20%	\$44,436		ROW
acres-40 acres-20 acres-40 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	rgnl rgnl rgnl rgnl	43.6 4.8 13.1	\$16,000 \$100,000	\$698,182				
acres-20 acres-40 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	rgnl rgnl rgnl	4.8 13.1	\$100,000	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	20%		ODT Forest and Lakes: Anderson Lake SP-Discovery Bay	Forestland
acres-40 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	rgnl rgnl	13.1		\$404 O40	2070	\$139,636	ODT Discovery Bay-Clallam County	ROW
acres-40 acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	rgnl		ΦΕΟ ΟΟΟ	\$484,848	0%	\$0	Port Townsend Waterwalk	ROW
acres-20 acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	_	17 ∩	\$50,000	\$654,545	0%	\$0	Port Townsend-Portage	Park/ROW
acres-20 acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	ranl	17.0	\$30,000	\$509,091	100%	\$509,091	Port Townsend-Winona	ROW/easements
acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	. a	4.1	\$30,000	\$123,636	20%	\$24,727	McCurdy Point Trail	ROW/easements
acres-20 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	rgnl	6.1	\$30,000	\$181,818	0%	\$0	Cape George Trail	ROW/easements
acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	rgnl	10.2	\$30,000	\$305,455	50%	\$152,727	4 Corners/Airport/Old Fort Townsend/Glen Cove	ROW/park land
acres-40 acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	rgnl	9.0	\$30,000	\$269,091	10%			Airport/DOT/ROW
acres-40 acres-40 acres-20	rgnl	6.2	\$12,000	\$74,400	15%			ROW/Park
acres-40 acres-20	rgnl	8.8	\$12,000	\$105,600	15%		Chimacum Trail: Chimacum School-Anderson Lake SP	Utility easements
acres-20	rgnl	1.9	\$25,000	\$47,500	0%	\$0	Lower Hadlock Trail	WoodenBoatSchool
	rgnl	24.2	\$1,000	\$24,242	0%	\$0	Timberton Loop Trail	
agrae 20	rgnl	2.4	\$20,000	\$48,485	0%	\$0	Quilcene Trail	
acies-20	rgnl	0.5	\$7,000	\$3,394	0%		,	WSDOT
acres-20	rgnl	1.2	\$7,000	\$8,485	30%	. ,		ROW
acres-40	rgnl	14.5	\$3,100	\$45,091	50%		Teal Lake/Bywater/Shine Trail	
acres-40	rgnl	53.3	\$2,000	\$106,667	0%	•		WSDOT
acres-40	rgnl	36.4	\$2,000	\$72,727	10%			WSDOT
acres-40	rgnl	43.6	\$2,000	\$87,273	25%		Quilcene-Brinnon Trail	
acres-20	rgnl	4.8	\$10,000	\$48,485	10%	· · · · · ·	Brinnon-Black Point Trail	
Acre		400.3		\$4,714,397		\$1,364,688		

Facility development

Multipurpo 10-rock								
10-rock								
	mile	rgnl	4.1	\$185,000	\$758,500	100%	\$758,500 ODT Larry Scott Trail: Rumage-4 Corners	
10-rock	mile	rgnl	3.2	\$185,000	\$592,000	100%	\$592,000 ODT Utility Route: 4 Corners-Anderson Lake Rd	
10-rock	mile	rgnl	4.7	\$185,000	\$869,500	100%	\$869,500 ODT Utility Route: Anderson Lake Road-Discovery Bay	
10-rock	mile	rgnl	3.2	\$185,000	\$592,000	10%	\$59,200 ODT Forest and Lakes: 4 Corners-Anderson Lake SP	Use agreements
10-rock	mile	rgnl	8.5	\$185,000	\$1,572,500	10%	\$157,250 ODT Forest and Lakes: Anderson Lake SP-Discovery Bay	Use agreements
10-rock	mile	rgnl	9.0	\$185,000	\$1,665,000	100%	\$1,665,000 ODT Discovery Bay-Clallam County	
10-asphalt	mile	rgnl	2.0	\$305,662	\$611,324	100%	\$611,324 Port Townsend Waterwalk	
10-rock	mile	rgnl	2.7	\$185,000	\$499,500	100%	\$499,500 Port Townsend Loop - Portage	
10-rock	mile	rgnl	3.5	\$185,000	\$647,500	100%	\$647,500 Port Townsend Winona Wetlands	
B-rock	mile	rgnl	1.7	\$157,075	\$267,028	100%	\$267,028 McCurdy Point Trail	
B-rock	mile	rgnl	2.5	\$157,075	\$392,688	100%	\$392,688 Cape George Trail	
10-rock	mile	rgnl	4.2	\$185,000	\$777,000	100%	\$777,000 4 Corners/Airport/Old Fort Townsend/GlenCove	
8-asphalt	mile	rgnl	3.7	\$253,456	\$937,787	100%	\$937,787 Irondale Trail	
B-rock	mile	rgnl	1.3	\$157,075	\$204,198	100%	\$204,198 Chimacum Trail: Elkins Road-Chimacum School	
8-rock	mile	rgnl	1.8	\$157,075	\$282,735	100%	\$282,735 Chimacum Trail: Chimacum School-Anderson Lake SP	
8-rock	mile	rgnl	0.4	\$157,075	\$62,830	10%	\$6,283 Lower Hadlock Trail	WoodenBoatSchoo
4-dirt	mile	rgnl	5.0	\$41,681	\$208,405	0%	\$0 Timberton Loop Trail - Volunteer	HOA
4-dirt	mile	rgnl	3.0	\$41,681	\$125,043	100%	\$125,043 Teal Lake-Hood Head Trail	
8-asphalt	mile	rgnl	1.0	\$253,456	\$253,456	100%	\$253,456 Quilcene Trail	
8-rock	mile	rgnl	0.2	\$157,075	\$31,415	100%	\$31,415 Brinnon Trail: Brinnon Lane-Dosewallips State Park	
8-rock	mile	rgnl	0.5	\$157,075	\$78,538	100%	\$78,538 Brinnon Trail: Brinnon Lane to Brinnon School	
6-rock	mile	rgnl	11.0	\$88,806	\$976,866	0%	\$0 SR-104 Trail	WSDOT
6-rock	mile	rgnl	7.5	\$88,806	\$666,045	0%	\$0 SR-104-Quilcene Trail	WSDOT
4-dirt	mile	rgnl	9.0	\$41,681	\$375,129	100%	\$375,129 Quilcene-Brinnon Trail	
6-rock	mile	rgnl	2.0	\$88,806	\$177,612	100%	\$177,612 Brinnon-Black Point Trail	
Trailheads	;							
permanent	each	rgnl	1	\$237,008	\$237,008	0%	\$0 Discovery Bay	WDFW
	each	rgnl		included	\$0	100%	\$0 Fort Worden State Park	
	each	rgnl		included	\$0	100%	\$0 County Fairgrounds	
	each	rgnl		included	\$0	100%	\$0 Kah Tai Lagoon Nature Park	
permanent		_	1	\$237,008	\$237,008	100%	\$237,008 Rumage Property	
sanican	each	rgnl	1	\$104,869	\$104,869	100%	\$104,869 Four Corners	
	each	rgnl		included	\$0	100%	\$0 Anderson Lake State Park	
Chapter 5	NMT.	syste	m dem	and			13	

	each	rgnl		included	\$0	100%	\$0 Gibbs or Beausite Lake County Park			
permanent	each	rgnl		included	\$0	100%	\$0 Gardiner Community Center			
sanican	each	-	1	\$104,869	\$104,869	100%	\$104,869 McCurdy Point Access			
sanican	each	rgnl	1	\$104,869	\$104,869	100%	\$104,869 Cape George Access			
sanican	each	rgnl	1	\$104,869	\$104,869	100%	\$104,869 Airport Cut-off Road			
	each	_		included	\$0	100%	\$0 Old Fort Townsend State Park			
	each	rgnl		included	\$0	100%	\$0 Irondale Park			
	each	rgnl		included	\$0	100%	\$0 Bob Bates Park			
	each	rgnl		included	\$0	100%	\$0 HJ Carroll Park			
	each	_		included	\$0	100%	\$0 Port Ludlow RV Park			
	each	_		included	\$0	100%	\$0 Olympic Peninsula Visitors Center			
sanican	each	_	1	\$104,869	\$104,869	100%	\$104,869 Quilcene River Access			
	each	rgnl		included	\$0	100%	\$0 Dosewallip State Park			
sanican	each	_	1	\$104,869		0%	\$0 Shine Tidelands State Park			
sanican	each	_	1	\$104,869	\$104,869	100%	\$104,869 US-101 at Center Road			
sanican	each	_	1	\$104,869	\$104,869	100%	\$104,869 Spencer Creek at US-101			
permanent		_	1	\$237,008	\$237,008	100%	\$237,008 Brinnon Elementary School			
	Miles	;	95.7		\$15,174,573		\$10,976,783			
Urban Side	walks	;								
6-concrete	mile	rgnl	2.0	\$253,456	\$506,912	100%	\$506,912 Hadlock - Irondale Road			
6-concrete	mile	rgnl	0.7	\$253,456	\$177,419	100%	\$177,419 Irondale - Cedar Street/Market Street			
6-concrete	mile	rgnl	1.2	\$253,456	\$304,147	0%	\$0 Hadlock - Ness' Corner Road	WSDOT		
6-concrete	mile	rgnl	0.5	\$253,456	\$126,728	100%	\$126,728 Hadlock - Chimacum Road/Elkins Road			
6-concrete	mile	rgnl	0.4	\$253,456	\$101,382	50%	\$50,691 Hadlock - Oak Bay Road/Lower Hadlock Road	WSDOT		
6-concrete	mile	rgnl	0.2	\$253,456	\$50,691	100%	\$50,691 Hadlock - Matheson Street/Masonic Hall Road			
6-concrete	mile	rgnl	0.5	\$253,456	\$126,728	100%	\$126,728 Quilcene - US 101			
6-concrete	mile	rgnl	0.5	\$253,456	\$126,728	100%	\$126,728 Brinnon: Brinnon Lane, Schoolhouse Rd			
Streetscap	es									
12-conc	mile	rgnl	2.0	\$750,000	\$1,500,000	0%	\$0 Port Townsend - Water Street	City of P		
10-conc	mile	rgnl	0.1	\$500,000	\$50,000	100%	\$50,000 Hadlock business district			
10-conc	mile	rgnl	0.1	\$500,000	\$50,000	100%	\$50,000 Quilcene business district			
10-conc	mile	rgnl	0.1	\$500,000	\$50,000	100%	\$50,000 Brinnon business district			

Gateways								
	each	rgnl	1	\$50,000	\$50,000	0%	\$0 Water Street Ferry Landing	City of PT
	each	rgnl	1	\$50,000	\$50,000	100%	\$50,000 SR-104 - Hood Canal Bridge	
	each	rgnl	1	\$50,000	\$50,000	100%	\$50,000 US-101 Old Gardiner Road	
	each	rgnl	1	\$50,000	\$50,000	100%	\$50,000 Brinnon business district	
	Miles	3	8.3		\$3,370,736		\$1,465,898	
Day hiking	trails							
6-rock		rgnl	2.0	\$88,806	\$177,612	100%	\$177,612 Quimper Wildlife Corridor Trails	
4-dirt		rgnl	2.0	\$31,394	\$62,788	100%	\$62,788 Anderson Lake/Gibbs Lake Loop	
4-dirt		rgnl	8.0	\$41,681	\$333,448	100%	\$333,448 Anderson Lake South: DNR/ORM Trails	
4-dirt		rgnl	1.5	\$41,681	\$62,522	100%	\$62,522 Hadlock/South Indian Island Trail	
4-dirt		rgnl	0.7	\$41,681	\$29,177	100%	\$29,177 Mount Walker Trail	
4-dirt		rgnl	1.5	\$41,681	\$62,522	100%	\$62,522 Whitney Point Trail	
4-dirt		rgnl	4.0	\$41,681	\$166,724	100%	\$166,724 Brinnon-Black Point Trail	
4-dirt		rgnl	1.0	\$41,681	\$41,681	100%	\$41,681 Indian Island	
Shoreline t				, ,	. ,			
Markers	mile	rgnl	6.8	\$14,593	\$99,232	100%	\$99,232 North Beach-Cape George-Beckett Point	
Markers	mile	rgnl	6.0	\$14,593	\$87,558	100%	\$87,558 Marrowstone Island Shoreline	
Markers		rgnl	10.0	\$14,593	\$145,930	100%	\$145,930 Indian Island Shoreline	
Park trails								
10-asphalt	mile	rgnl	2.5	\$305,662	\$764,155	25%	\$191,039 Airport Perimeter Trail	Port PT
4-dirt	mile	rgnl	0.5	\$41,681	\$20,841	100%	\$20,841 Chimacum Beach Park	
4-dirt	mile	rgnl	0.5	\$41,681	\$20,841	100%	\$20,841 Rumage Property	
4-dirt	mile	rgnl	2.0	\$41,681	\$83,362	100%	\$83,362 Beausite County Park	
4-dirt	mile	rgnl	1.0	\$41,681	\$41,681	100%	\$41,681 Gibbs Lake County Park	
Trailheads				included	\$0	100%	\$0 all routes above	
	Miles	•	50		\$2,200,072		\$1,626,956	
Mountain b	ike tra	ails						
10-asphalt	mile	rgnl	2.0	\$305,662	\$611,324	0%	\$0 Airport Perimeter Trail	Port PT
4-dirt		rgnl	2.0	\$31,394	\$62,788	0%	\$0 Anderson Lake/Gibbs Lake Loop	Dayhiking trail
4-dirt		rgnl	8.0	\$41,681	\$333,448	0%	\$0 Anderson Lake South: DNR/ORM Trails	Dayhiking trail
4-dirt		rgnl	1.5	\$31,394	\$47,091	0%	\$0 Hadlock/South Indian Island Trail	Dayhiking trail
4-dirt		rgnl	0.7	\$31,394	\$21,976	0%	\$0 Mount Walker Trail	Dayhiking trail
Chapter 5	NMT	systei	m dem	and			15	

4-dirt	mile	rgnl	1.5	\$31,394	\$47,091	0%	\$0 Whitney Point Trail	Dayhiking trail
4-dirt	mile	rgnl	4.0	\$31,394	\$125,576	0%	\$0Binnon/Black Point Trail	Dayhiking trail
Bike cours	es							
6-dirt	mile	rgnl	0.2	\$48,487	\$9,697	100%	\$9,697 County Fairgrounds	
6-dirt	mile	rgnl	0.2	\$48,487	\$9,697	100%	\$9,697 Rumage Property	
6-dirt	mile	rgnl	0.2	\$48,487	\$9,697	100%	\$9,697 Airport BMX course	Port PT
Trailheads	each	rgnl	ļ	ncluded	\$0	100%	\$0 included in all above	
	Miles	}	20.3		\$1,278,386		\$29,092	_
								_
Bicycle rou	ıtes							
Shldr imprv	mile	rgnl	2.5	\$356,999	\$892,498	0%	\$0 Hood Canal Bridge	WSDOT
Shldr imprv	mile	rgnl	6.0	\$356,999	\$2,141,994	0%	\$0 SR-20 - 4 Corner to US-101	WSDOT
Shldr imprv	mile	rgnl	42.0	\$356,999	\$14,993,958	0%	\$0US-101 - Mason County to Clallam County	WSDOT
Shldr imprv	mile	rgnl	28.5	\$356,999	\$10,174,472	0%	\$0 US-101 - West End	WSDOT
Shldr imprv		rgnl	1.1	\$356,999	\$392,699	0%	\$0 SR-116 - Ness's Corner Road	WSDOT
Shldr imprv	mile	rgnl	3.0	\$356,999	\$1,070,997	0%	\$0 SR-116 Oak Bay/Flagler Road to Marrowstone Island	WSDOT
Shldr imprv	mile	rgnl	5.0	\$356,999	\$1,784,995	0%	\$0 SR-116 Flagler Road Scow Bay to Fort Flagler State Park	WSDOT
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	3.2	\$252,587	\$808,278	0%	\$0 Jefferson/Tyler/F/Hastings	City
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	2.8	\$252,587	\$707,244	100%	\$707,244 Hastings Avenue West	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	2.0	\$252,587	\$505,174	100%	\$505,174 South Jacob Miller Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	7.6	\$252,587	\$1,919,661	100%	\$1,919,661 Cape George Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	1.6	\$252,587	\$404,139	100%	\$404,139 Discovery Road	City
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	4.8	\$252,587	\$1,212,418	100%	\$1,212,418 South Discovery Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	1.3	\$252,587	\$328,363	100%	\$328,363 Four Corners Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	1.4	\$252,587	\$353,622	100%	\$353,622 Prospect Avenue	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	1.5	\$252,587	\$378,881	100%	\$378,881 Chimacum Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	10.0	\$252,587	\$2,525,870	100%	\$2,525,870 Oak Bay Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	2.8	\$252,587	\$707,244	100%	\$707,244 Anderson Lake Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	5.5	\$252,587	\$1,389,229	100%	\$1,389,229 West Valley Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	3.2	\$252,587	\$808,278	100%	\$808,278 Swansonville Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	0.6	\$252,587	\$151,552	100%	\$151,552 Teal Lake Road	Road Fund
4-shlder		rgnl	5.7	\$252,587	\$1,439,746	100%	\$1,439,746 Old Gardiner Roads - North & South	Road Fund
Urban bike	ways							
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	unk	\$252,587	\$0	0%	\$0 Port Townsend NMT plan	City
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	1.1	\$252,587	\$277,846	100%	\$277,846 SR-116 Ness' Corner Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	1.9	\$252,587	\$479,915	100%	\$479,915 Irondale - Irondale Road	Road Fund

4-shlder	mile	rgnl	0.6	\$252,587	\$151,552	100%	\$151,552 Irondale - Cedar Avenu	е	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	1.0	\$252,587	\$252,587	100%	\$252,587 Irondale - Mason Street	to 5th Avenue	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	0.6	\$252,587	\$151,552	100%	\$151,552 Port Hadlock - Chimacu	ım Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	0.2	\$252,587	\$50,517	100%	\$50,517 Port Hadlock - Oak Bay	[,] Road	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	0.1	\$252,587	\$25,259	100%	\$25,259 Port Hadlock - Masonic	Hall Rd	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	0.1	\$252,587	\$25,259	100%	\$25,259 Port Hadlock - Matheso	n St	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	0.1	\$252,587	\$25,259	100%	\$25,259 Port Hadlock - Elkins Ro	d	Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	0.5	\$252,587	\$126,294	100%	\$126,294 Quilcene - US 101		Road Fund
4-shlder	mile	rgnl	0.8	\$252,587	\$202,070	100%	\$202,070 Brinnon - Brinnon Lane,	, Schoolhouse Road	Road Fund
Backcoui	ntry bik	e rout	es						
signage	mile	rgnl	0.5	\$1,194	\$597	100%	\$597 Old Fort Townsend Roa	ad	Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	4.0	\$1,194	\$4,776	100%	\$4,776 Indian Island Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	4.0	\$1,194	\$4,776	100%	\$4,776 Robbins/East Marrowsto	one/East Beach Roads	Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	2.5	\$1,194	\$2,985	100%	\$2,985 Gardiner Beach Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	2.0	\$1,194	\$2,388	100%	\$2,388 West Uncas Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	6.7	\$1,194	\$8,000	100%	\$8,000 Boulton/Leland Valley F	Road	Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	3.0	\$1,194	\$3,582	100%	\$3,582 Snow Creek Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	unk	\$1,194	\$0	0%	\$0 FS#27 BonJon Pass to	Blynn	USFS
signage	mile	rgnl	5.5	\$1,194	\$6,567	100%	\$6,567 Lords Lake Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	5.6	\$1,194	\$6,686	100%	\$6,686 Penny Creek Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	4.2	\$1,194	\$5,015	100%	\$5,015 Big Quilcene River Roa	ıd	Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	1.7	\$1,194	\$2,030	100%	\$2,030 Linger Longer Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	2.4	\$1,194	\$2,866	100%	\$2,866 Bee Mill/Point Whitney	Road	Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	12.0	\$1,194	\$14,328	100%	\$14,328 Dosewallips Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	5.7	\$1,194	\$6,806	100%	\$6,806 Duckabush Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	0.8	\$1,194	\$955	100%	\$955 Black Point-Pleasant Ti-	des Rd	Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	5.2	\$1,194	\$6,209	100%	\$6,209 Dabob Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	15.3	\$1,194	\$18,268	100%	\$18,268 Coyle Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	3.1	\$1,194	\$3,701	100%	\$3,701 South Point Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	8.5	\$1,194	\$10,149	100%	\$10,149 Thorndyke Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	1.2	\$1,194	\$1,433	100%	\$1,433 Bayshore/Bayview/Mats	s Mats Beach Roads	Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	2.9	\$1,194	\$3,463	100%	\$3,463 Teal Lake Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	2.3	\$1,194	\$2,746	100%	\$2,746 Shine Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	0.5	\$1,194	\$597	100%	\$597 Seven Sisters Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	3.3	\$1,194	\$3,940	100%	\$3,940 Egg and I Road		Road Fund
signage	mile	rgnl	4.1	\$1,194	\$4,895	100%	\$4,895 Larson Lake Road		Road Fund

Total					\$73,846,329		\$30,307,941		
Facility de	velopr	nent	Miles	464.1	\$69,131,932		\$28,943,254		
Land acqu	isition	l	Acres	400.3	\$4,714,397		\$1,364,688		
	Sites		6		\$60,000		\$56,250		
cartop	each		1	\$5,000		25%		Whitney Point - WADFW property	
cartop	each		1 1	\$20,000		100%		Dabob Bay - Tarboo Bay WADNR property	
cartop	each	_	1	\$5,000		100%		Hood Canal-DOD Brown Point property	
cartop	each	_	1	\$20,000	. ,	100%		South Marrowstone-WA State Parks property	
cartop	each	_	1	\$5,000		100%		Chimacum Creek Beach Park	
cartop	each	_	1	\$5,000		100%		Fairmount	
Boat laund									
	wiies	•	4.0		Ψ20,402		φ∠0,40 2		
Trailheads	prkng Miles		4.8	included	\$0 \$26,482	100%	\$0 \$26,482		
Troilboods		rgnl	0.5	\$5,517		100%		Gibbs Lake Park	
	mile	rgnl	0.5	\$5,517		100%		Rumage Property	
areas - dirt		rgnl	0.3	\$5,517		100%		County Fairgrounds	
Riding	.,	١.		ΦE E4=	, 4,055	1000/	44.055		
Trail - dirt	mile	rgnl	3.5	\$5,517	\$19,310	100%	\$19,310	Tarboo Lake Power Line Trail	
Equestrian	facilit	ties							
					. , ,		. , ,		
Trainioaao	Miles		285	noidada	\$47,021,684	10070	\$14,761,793		
Trailheads	each	_		included	\$0	100%		included in all above	i lodd i dild
signage		rgnl	0.6	\$1,194		100%		Queets Road	Road Fund
signage signage		rgnl rgnl	4.1	\$1,194 \$1,194		100%		Quinault River Loop	Road Fund
signage		rgnl	12.0 11.0	\$1,194 \$1,194		100% 100%		Upper Hoh River Road Oil City Road	Road Fund
signage		rgnl	1.2	\$1,194		100%		Gibbs Lake Road	Road Fund Road Fund

Capital Facilities Program

The land acquisition and facility construction for Jefferson County's non-motorized transportation and recreational trail program will be implemented through the capital facility program (CFP) of the County's annual budget. Chapter 11 of this Plan includes alternative capital facilities programs for the period 2003-2008. The alternative CFPs illustrate potential funding sources, funding levels, and priority projects from the 20-Year Vision. Because Jefferson County meets the County Comprehensive Plan's LOS standard for trails, projects proposed in the CFPs are discretionary.

5.2 Land requirements

Multipurpose or linear trails

Multipurpose or linear trails are built or natural corridors, such as abandoned railroad lines, undeveloped road-rights-of-way, and active utility rights-of-way or natural areas defined by drainage features, topographical changes, wooded areas or vegetation patterns that can link employment and business districts, schools, parks, and residential areas. Generally, linear trails may be developed for multiple modes of commuter and recreational travel including hiking, biking and horseback riding. The trail system may parallel established vehicular or other transportation systems, but apart from and usually within a separate right-of-way. Linear trail corridors may also include trailhead developments or access points.

Multipurpose trail systems should be anchored by a destination or trailhead, like an employment area, shopping district, public facility, school, park, or other feature, and extend into surrounding residential areas using natural features or established roads, sidewalks or other safe travel corridors. Ideally, a minimum trail system should be at least 3-5 miles long and provide the ability to loop back to the point of origin. The trail should be sufficiently wide enough to provide for the type of trail user(s) that it is accommodating, preserve the features through which the trail is traveling, and buffer adjacent land use activities.

According to the NRPA, a suitable standard for off-road linear non-motorized transportation trails is about 0.5 miles of hiking and jogging trail and 0.5 miles of separate biking trail per 1,000 population, or the equivalent of 4.85 acres of linear trail facility per 1,000 population (assuming a 40 foot width). The ratio assumes the different types are provided within a combined off-road multipurpose corridor used primarily by local residents. The IAC does not have a standard for trail land.

	Ratios		Existing s	supply	20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Acres of trail corridor			31.5	31.5	400.3
Ratio per 1,000	4.85	Na	1.2	1.2	9.63

Jefferson County presently provides 1.2 acres of off-road multipurpose linear trail corridor per 1,000 county residents. All public or private agencies combined provide 1.2 acres of off-road multipurpose linear trail systems per 1,000 county residents.

Local residents, as well as regional tourists, use these facilities in large numbers. In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, the supply of land for off-road multipurpose linear trail systems could be increased to provide an additional 400.3 acres by to acquiring use agreements, easements, or title for a strategic county trail system of various trail corridor widths depending on location.

5.3 Facility requirements Multipurpose trails

The NRPA ratio is 0.50 miles of multipurpose trail per 1,000 residents. The ratio is for all walking activity within a multipurpose trail corridor.

The IAC participation model projections indicate the county could provide a ratio of 0.15 miles of multipurpose trails per 1,000 residents at the present time assuming local residents were the only trail users. The ratio is not specified, and includes trails of dirt, bark, gravel or asphalt surface. The projections indicate this ratio will decline to 0.14 miles as the ratio of trail enthusiast declines as a percent of the total resident population by the year 2000 and 2010.

	Ratios		Existing	supply	20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Multipurpose trail miles			4.0	4.0	95.7
Ratio per 1,000	0.50	0.15	0.15	0.15	2.1

Jefferson County presently provides 4.0 miles of multipurpose trails, a ratio of 0.15 miles of multipurpose trail facilities per 1,000 county residents. An inventory of multipurpose trails provided by all public and private agencies combined was not developed for this Plan. Such an inventory would include many miles of multipurpose trails within the Olympic National Forest and the Olympic National Park.

Local residents, as well as regional tourists, use these facilities in large numbers. In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, the supply of off-road multipurpose non-motorized transportation and trail systems could be increased to provide an additional 95.7 miles within a strategic cross-county trail system – the principal portion including the Olympic Discovery Trail system from Port Townsend to Port Angeles.

Streetscapes and gateways

The NRPA ratios and IAC participation models do not provide specific ratios for urban streetscapes or gateways.

	Ratios		20-Year Vision		
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Streetscape miles			0.0	0.7	2.3
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.00	0.03	0.07
Gateways			1	2	4
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.04	0.08	0.13

Jefferson County does not presently provide urban streetscape in any county village centers – but does maintain a gateway on SR-20 at the Olympic Peninsula Visitor Center. All public and private agencies combined provide a ratio of 0.03 miles of urban streetscape in Port Townsend and an additional gateway at Water Street in Port Townsend across from the Ferry Terminal.

These facilities do not provide local residents or tourists access to community and village business centers. In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, another 2.3 miles of streetscape could be provided for accent and access in Port Hadlock, Quilcene, and Brinnon. In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, the gateway supply could be increased by 4 gateways at the Port Townsend Ferry terminal,

Hood Canal Bridge, Brinnon, and Gardiner to provide entry definition into the county.

<u>Urban sidewalks</u>

The NRPA ratios and IAC participation models do not provide specific ratios for urban sidewalks – the routes provided to schools, parks, and community facilities for local residents and children.

	Ratios		Existing s	upply	20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Urban sidewalk miles			0.7	0.7	6.0
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.03	0.03	0.13

There is a system of urban sidewalks in the Port Hadlock business district along Irondale, Chimacum, Ness' Corner, and Oak Bay Roads and Matheson Street. Port Townsend has begun a program to improve local access to public facilities that has been itemized in the Port Townsend non-motorized transportation plan. Jefferson County does not presently provide urban sidewalk routes to local schools, business centers, of public facilities in Chimacum, Irondale, Quilcene, or Brinnon.

In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, 6.0 miles of urban sidewalks could be developed to provide local residents and children access to schools, parks, and other public facilities within commercial areas of Port Hadlock, Quilcene, and Brinnon. It would be particularly important to provide these facilities in Port Hadlock in conjunction with the designation of an Urban Growth Area.

Park trails

The participation model projections indicate public agencies could provide a ratio of 0.13 miles of park walking trails per every 1,000 residents during the 1990s and into 2020. The NRPA does not have a ratio for local park walking trails.

	Ratios	Ratios		supply	20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Park trail miles			9.7	65.0	6.5
Ratio per 1,000	Na	0.13	0.37	2.50	1.60

Jefferson County presently provides a ratio of 0.37 miles of local park trails per 1,000 county residents. All public and private agencies combined provide a ratio of 2.50 miles of local park trail per 1,000 county residents.

In general, the existing countywide inventory provides a sufficient amount of regional park trails with which to meet the requirements for local resident and tourist populations were all of the demand to be focused on state park facilities.

However, the inventory includes some proposed new local parks that have not been developed with park trails oriented primarily for local nearby resident use. In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, an additional 6.5 miles of park trail could be developed to provide access within county parks of primary interest and access to local residents.

Day hiking trails

The participation model projections indicate public agencies could be providing a ratio of 0.15 miles of day hiking cross-county trails per every 1,000 residents declining to 0.14 miles as the population ages into 2020. The NRPA does not have a ratio for local park walking trails.

	Ratios Existing supply			20-Year Vision	
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Day hiking trail miles			0.0	10.0	15.7
Ratio per 1,000	Na	0.15	0.00	0.39	0.58

Jefferson County does not presently provide cross-county day hiking trails apart from multipurpose trail corridors. All public and private agencies combined provide a ratio of 0.39 miles of day hiking cross-county trails per 1,000 county residents.

The existing countywide inventory does not provide day hiking trails for local resident populations – most of the existing inventory is concentrated within Port Townsend.

The county has some of the most unique historical and scenic inventories in the state including historical areas and environmental features that extend across the surrounding countryside. In addition, the volume of tourist related visits are increasing creating an additional source of cross-county day hiking trail interest.

In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, another 15.7 miles of cross-county day hiking trails could be developed or preserved. In addition, state and county agencies could plan on developing day hiking trails that access the scenic and historic features in surrounding areas of interest to local resident and tourist use alike.

Shoreline trails - walking on a beach

The NRPA ratios and IAC participation models do not provide specific ratios for beach walks along public or private tidelands.

	Ratios		Existing su	pply	20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Park trail miles			1.1	5.2	22.8
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.04	0.20	0.62

Jefferson County presently provides a ratio of 0.04 miles of shoreline or beach walking trails per 1,000 county residents. All public and private agencies combined provide a ratio of 0.20 miles of shoreline trail per 1,000 county residents.

The existing countywide inventory probably provides beach walking trails of interest for local resident populations were all of the demand to be focused on local park facilities and used only by local residents.

However, the county has one of the most extensive expanses of public tidelands in the state - a condition reflected by the large number of state parks located on shoreline sites. These tideland stretches provide scenic and environmental features that can not be easily accessed by the public in most other state

locations - a fact reflected in the growing volumes of in and out-of-state tourists who visit these park beaches every year.

In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, State and local agencies could provide access to another 22.8 miles of strategically located public tideland beach walking trails for local county and city residents.

Backcountry and backpacking trails

The NRPA ratios and IAC participation models do not provide specific ratios for backcountry or backpacking trails.

	Ratios		Existing s	upply	20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Park trail miles			0.0		
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.00		

Jefferson County does not presently provide backcountry or backpacking trails – nor does it own or have access to lands with this type of trail potential. It is not Jefferson County's mission to provide these facilities.

The U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service provide an extensive inventory of backcountry and backpacking trails within the Olympic National Forest and National Park. Planning for additional facilities of this type is beyond the scope of this Plan.

On-road urban bikeways

The NRPA ratios and IAC participation models do not provide specific ratios for on-road urban bikeways – or the local route children take to schools, parks, and public facilities.

	Ratios Existing supply			pply	20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Urban bikeway miles			0.0	0.0	7.0
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.00	0.00	0.16

Jefferson County does not presently provide specially marked bicycle lanes on local roadways to indicate routes to schools, parks, and other public facilities in the developing village centers in Port Hadlock, Quilcene, and Brinnon. School children unofficially use roadways of various conditions between residential neighborhoods and schools. Preparation of safe walk route maps for elementary schools is the responsibility of school districts.

In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, 7.0-miles of on-road routes used by school children could be improved and designated within the developing village centers and urban neighborhoods.

On-road bicycle commuting/touring routes

Participation model projections indicate public agencies should be providing a ratio of 0.03 miles of designated and shoulder improved roadways per every 1,000 residents - assuming local roads provide routes to work for commuters and interesting viewpoints and other characteristics preferred by bike touring enthusiasts. The ratio should remain the same at the present time and as the

population ages into 2010. The NRPA does not have a standard for bicycle commuting and touring.

<u>Note</u> - bicycle touring is a specialized form of bicycling activity and is not the same as bicycling on a trail or bicycling on a road for commuter or other more functional purposes. Bicycle touring is usually accomplished by an organized group of cyclists on scenic roads or along scenic shoreline routes on designated road shoulders or sometimes in traffic on designated roadways.

	Ratios Existing supply			20-Year Vision	
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Bicycling route miles			28.3	61.4	142.7
Ratio per 1,000	Na	0.03	1.09	2.37	4.55

Jefferson County presently provides 1.09 miles of bicycle commuting and touring routes with road shoulders and specially marked bicycle lanes on major commuter or recreational routes per 1,000 county residents. All public and private agencies in the county currently provide 2.37 miles of on-road bicycle commuting and touring routes per 1,000 residents.

The existing countywide inventory provides a significant amount of on-road bicycle commuting and touring routes of interest to local resident and tourist populations. However, commuting and touring destinations including employment centers, schools and parks, and scenic features and areas, are widely distributed throughout the county rather than being concentrated within a few locations. The rural character of the county requires a more extended bicycle trip to commute or tour to destinations than would be typical in more urban, developed areas. Bicycle commuters and touring interest groups use roadways of various conditions and ratios along the most trafficked arterial and scenic roadways.

In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, the present supply of improved and designated biking roadways along commuting and scenic routes could be expanded by another 142.7 miles to include connected roadways providing access between employment, business, and recreational facilities of interest to local residents and tourists.

On-road backcountry routes

The NRPA ratios and IAC participation models do not provide specific ratios for on-road backcountry bicycle routes – or the in-lane bicycle trips on scenic rural roads.

<u>Note</u> – backcountry bicycle touring is usually accomplished by family groups or by an organized group of cyclists usually in traffic on designated scenic rural roadways of low traffic volumes.

	Ratios		Existing supply		20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Backcountry road miles			0.0	0.0	136.5
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.00	0.00	3.05

Jefferson County does not presently designate backcountry or rural roadways for in-lane or in-traffic bicycle touring routes.

However, the county has an extensive rural or backcountry road inventory through some of the most scenic and environmental attributes in the region and state. These rural roads provide scenic and environmental features that can not be easily and safely accessed by the public in most other state locations - a fact reflected in the growing volumes of in and out-of-state tourists who ride these rural roadways every year.

In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, 136.5 additional miles of these rural roadways could be designated and preserved as rural backcountry bike riding routes for local county and tourist interests alike.

Off-road bicycle riding areas

The NRPA ratios and IAC participation models do not provide specific ratios for off-road bicycle riding areas – or the local BMX courses most frequented by younger age riders in urban areas.

		Ratios	Ratios		upply	20-Year Vision
		NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Off-roa	ad course miles			0.2	0.2	0.6
Ratio	per 1,000	Na	Na	0.01	0.01	0.02

Jefferson County presently provides a specially constructed off-road bicycle or BMX riding area for younger age riders with obstacles, jumps, racing, and other improvements at HJ Carroll Park. BMX riding areas are increasing in popularity in the county, even as available gravel pits, vacant lands, and other suitable sites are being absorbed by urban land developments.

In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, approximately 0.6 miles of courses could be developed in the inventory at scattered sites throughout the county to provide local riding and competition courses for county youth.

Off-road bicycle trails

Participation model projections indicate public agencies should be providing a ratio of 0.30 miles of off-road riding trails per 1,000 residents declining to 0.29 as the population ages into 2020. The NRPA standard is 0.50 miles of off-road trail per 1,000 residents.

	Ratios		Existing	supply	20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Off-road bike trail miles			0.0	10.0	21.7
Ratio per 1,000	0.50	0.30	0.00	0.39	0.71

Jefferson County does not presently provide off-road mountain bicycle trails other than the Larry Scott Memorial Trail – a multipurpose facility. Other public and private agencies in the county currently provide 0.39 miles of off-road bike trail per 1,000 residents.

The existing countywide inventory does not provide off-road biking trails for all local resident populations within the county since the existing facilities are concentrated entirely within the Port Townsend area.

The county has some of the most unique historical and scenic inventories in the state including historical areas and environmental features that extend across the

surrounding countryside. In addition, the volume of tourist related visits are increasing creating an additional demand for off-road biking trails.

In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, another 21.7 miles of off-road cross-county biking trails could be developed or preserved. In addition, state and county agencies could plan on developing off-road biking trails that access the scenic and historic features in surrounding areas of interest to local resident and tourist use alike.

Horseback riding areas

The NRPA ratios and IAC participation models do not provide specific ratios for horseback riding areas – or the local stables, corrals, and arenas most frequented by younger age riders and competitions.

	Ratios		Existing s	Recmnd	
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Add/std
Horse riding area miles			0.2	0.2	1.3
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.01	0.01	0.03

Jefferson County presently provides a ratio of 0.01 miles of horseback riding areas per 1,000 county residents. All public and private agencies combined provide a ratio of 0.01 miles per 1,000 county residents when private trails are included. Local residents as well as an increasing number of regional or tourist riding groups interested in competition riding events use these facilities.

In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, an additional 1.3 miles of public riding facilities could be added to the system to provide instruction and competition space for local younger age riders and tourists interests alike.

Horseback riding trails

Participation model projections indicate public agencies should be providing a ratio of 0.12 miles of horseback riding trails per every 1,000 residents declining to 0.11 miles as the population ages into 2020. The NRPA does not have a standard for horseback riding trails.

	Ratios	Existing supply			20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Horse trail miles			4.0	4.0	3.5
Ratio per 1,000	Na	0.12	0.15	0.15	0.12

Jefferson County presently provides a ratio of 0.15 miles of horseback riding trails per 1,000 county residents – consisting exclusively of the riding opportunity provided on the Larry Scott Memorial Trail.

The existing countywide inventory does not reflect the extensive system of undesignated trails that have been developed by equestrian user groups on forestland or across private properties throughout the county.

Some or most of these undesignated trails could be lost to future subdivision developments or to new, less willing property owners. In order to achieve the 20-Year Vision, State, county, and city agencies could plan to acquire and/or preserve another 3.5 miles of permanent riding trails, separate from multipurpose trail corridors, to increase the overall total provided for local residents.

Backcountry horseback riding trails

The NRPA ratios and IAC participation models do not provide specific ratios for horseback riding areas – or the local stables, corrals, and arenas most frequented by younger age riders and competitions.

	Ratios		20-Year Vision		
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Backcountry miles			0.0		0.0
Ratio per 1,000	Na	0.12	0.00		

Jefferson County does not presently provide backcountry horseback riding trails – nor does it own or have access to lands with this type of trail potential. It is not Jefferson County's mission to provide these facilities.

The U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service provide an extensive inventory of backcountry horseback riding trails within the Olympic National Forest and National Park. Planning for additional facilities of this type is beyond the scope of this Plan.

Freshwater trails - ponds and lakes

There are no participation model ratios for hand-carry boat launch or access sites to freshwater ponds or water bodies. The NRPA does not have a standard for freshwater hand-carry launch facilities

	Ratios		20-Year Vision		
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Launch sites			3	9	0
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.12	0.35	0.20

Jefferson County presently provides a ratio of 0.12 hand-carry launch sites on freshwater ponds and lakes per 1,000 county residents. All public and private agencies combined provide a ratio of 0.35 launch sites on freshwater ponds and lakes per 1,000 county residents.

These facilities are used on a regional basis by populations who reside outside Jefferson County – sometimes during special events by tourists, sometimes on a regular basis due to a lack of similar access opportunities and facilities in the surrounding area.

The current inventory provides access to the only freshwater bodies that are suitable for hand-carry boating activities.

Freshwater trails – rivers

There are no participation model ratios for hand-carry boat launch or access sites to navigable freshwater rivers and streams. The NRPA does not have a standard for freshwater hand-carry launch facilities

	Ratios		20-Year Vision		
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Launch sites			1	11	0
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.04	0.42	0.25

Jefferson County presently provides a ratio of 0.04 hand-carry launch sites on navigable freshwater rivers and streams per 1,000 county residents. All public and private agencies combined provide a ratio of 0.42 launch sites on freshwater rivers per 1,000 county residents.

These facilities are used on a regional basis by populations who reside outside Jefferson County – sometimes during special events by tourists, sometimes on a regular basis due to a lack of similar access opportunities and facilities in the surrounding area.

The current inventory provides access to the only navigable freshwater rivers that are suitable for hand-carry boating activities.

Freshwater trails - whitewater river runs

There are no participation model ratios for whitewater river runs. The NRPA does not have a standard for whitewater river runs

	Ratios		Existing s	supply	20-Year Vision	
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions	
Whitewater river miles			0	52.8	0	
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.00	2.03	1.18	

Jefferson County does not presently provide whitewater river runs – nor does it own or have access to navigable rivers with this type of trail potential. All public and private agencies combined provide a ratio of 2.03 miles of white water river runs per 1,000 county residents – located within the Olympic National Forest and National Park.

These facilities are used on a regional basis by populations who reside outside Jefferson County – sometimes during special events by tourists, sometimes on a regular basis due to a lack of similar access opportunities and facilities in the surrounding area.

The current inventory provides access to the only navigable whitewater river runs that are suitable for hand-carry boating activities.

Saltwater trails - hand launch

There are no participation model ratios for hand-carry boat launch or access sites to saltwater bodies. The NRPA does not have a standard for saltwater launch sites

	Ratios Existing supply 2				20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Saltwater launch sites			9	39	5
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.35	1.5	0.98

Jefferson County presently provides a ratio of 0.35 hand-carry launch sites on saltwater bodies per 1,000 county residents. All public and private agencies combined provide a ratio of 1.5 launch sites on saltwater bodies per 1,000 county residents.

These facilities are used on a regional basis by populations who reside outside Jefferson County – sometimes during special events by tourists, sometimes on a

regular basis due to a lack of similar access opportunities and facilities in the surrounding area.

The current inventory provides access to numerous saltwater launching sites that are suitable for hand-carry boating activities. However, during the planning process the public expressed an interest in additional saltwater hand-carry launch sites in areas with significant recreational value, particularly Discovery Bay, Hood Canal, and Dabob Bay.

These areas are also important shellfish production areas that could be impacted by water quality degradation or unauthorized shellfish harvest. Planning for the development of additional hand carry sites should be done in consultation with adjoining property owners and shellfish producers.

Saltwater trails - waterside

There are no participation model ratios for hand-carry boat access sites to saltwater shoreline from the waterside – or to publicly owned or accessible tidelands, beaches, and other remote shorelines. The NRPA does not have a standard for saltwater access from the waterside.

	Ratios		Existing si	upply	20-Year Vision	
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions	
Waterside access sites			0	15	0	
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.00	0.58	0.33	

Jefferson County does not presently provide public shoreline in locations that can only be accessed by hand-carry craft from the waterside. All public and private agencies combined provide a ratio of 0.58 waterside access sites to publicly accessible tidelands, beaches, and other remote shorelines per 1,000 county residents.

These facilities are used on a regional basis by populations who reside outside Jefferson County – sometimes during special events by tourists, sometimes on a regular basis due to a lack of similar access opportunities and facilities in the surrounding area.

The current inventory provides access to the only saltwater accessible shorelines that are suitable for hand-carry boating activities.

<u>Saltwater trails – overnight campsites</u>

There are no participation model ratios for overnight water trail campsites. The NRPA does not have a standard for water trail overnight campsites

	Ratios Existing supply				20-Year Vision
	NRPA	IAC	JeffCo	All total	Additions
Overnight campsites			0	5	0
Ratio per 1,000	Na	Na	0.00	0.19	0.11

Jefferson County does not presently provide overnight water trail campsites – nor does it own or have access to shorelines with this type of trail potential. All public and private agencies combined provide a ratio of 0.19 campsites per 1,000 county residents – located within saltwater state parks.

These facilities are used on a regional basis by populations who reside outside Jefferson County – sometimes during special events by tourists, sometimes on a regular basis due to a lack of similar access opportunities and facilities in the surrounding area.

The current inventory provides access to the only overnight camping sites that are suitable and strategically located for saltwater trail activities and routes.

5.4 Future growth implications

The Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) forecasts that the population of Jefferson County will increase from 25,953 persons in 2000 to 44,822 persons by the year 2020 – an increase of 18,869 persons or 72%.

This forecasted population increase would create significant demand for additional non-motorized transportation and recreational trail lands and facilities. In order to maintain its ELOS for these facilities, Jefferson County would need to acquire 22.9 acres of land for multipurpose trails and develop 35 miles of non-motorized transportation and recreational trail facilities.

The cost of the additional land and facilities needed to maintain the County's ELOS through 2020 is estimated to be \$6,250,000 - not accounting for maintenance, operation, or repair costs.

The cost of maintaining the county's existing level-of-service (ELOS) standard would be equal to about \$294 per every new person added to the County's population or about \$647 for every new housing unit based on the County average of 2.2 persons per household. This cost can also be expressed in relation to the number of vehicles. It would be equal to about \$250 per vehicle or \$629 for every new housing unit based on the County average of 2.5 vehicles per household.

Financial implications

Jefferson County can neither maintain its ELOS nor implement significant components of the 20-Year Vision for non-motorized transportation and recreational trails with the resources currently available to it and Port Townsend, if each jurisdiction pursues an independent delivery approach or uses traditional methods of funding. Neither agency will be financially able to develop, manage, and maintain a comprehensive, independent non-motorized transportation and recreational trail system using traditional financing methods in light of the needs projected.

These needs require an area-wide financing approach by Jefferson County, Port Townsend, and WSDOT. An area-wide approach may use a combination of shared road and vehicle fees and taxes, joint grant applications, impact fees, and a voter approved metropolitan park district levy to maintain and improve facilities in the face of continued Jefferson County population increases.

Existing level-of-service (ELOS) requirements Non-motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails

Population in county 2002: 25,953 Vehicles in county 2002 30,436

Population in county 2020 44,822

Population in cou	1111y 2020	44,822			1				
			2222	ا ، ، ا	2020		Facility		2020
Land		Linita		Standard	-	Deficit	cost	cost	funding
Land		Units	inventory	per 1000 1.21		Deficit		per capita	defici
linear trails		acres	31.5	1.21	54.4	22.9	\$16,000	\$19.42	\$366,43°
Facilities	10 ft conholt w/ovo	mila		0.00	0.0	0.0	Φ20E CC0	ΦΩ ΩΩ	Φ.
	10 ft - asphalt w/svs	mile	4.0	0.00		0.0			\$(
trails	10 ft - rock w/svs	mile	4.0	0.15		2.9			\$538,013
	8 ft - asphalt w/svs	mile		0.00		0.0			\$0
	8 ft - rock trail w/svs	mile mile		0.00	0.0	0.0			\$(\$(
2 streetscape	brick paver	mile		0.00 0.00	0.0 0.0	0.0			\$(
	concrete	mile	4			0.0		_	
Qurban	gateways		0.7	0.04		0.7	\$50,000		\$36,352
3 urban	6 ft concrete	mile mile	0.7	0.03 0.00		0.5			\$127,233
sidewalks	6 ft - asphalt	mile				0.0			\$(\$(
4 park trails	10 ft - asphalt w/o svs 10 ft - rock w/o svs	mile		0.00		0.0		_	
				0.00 0.00		0.0			\$0 \$0
	8 ft - asphalt w/o svs 8 ft - rock w/o svs	mile mile				0.0		\$0.00 \$0.00	\$(
		mile	0.7	0.00 0.37		0.0		· ·	
E day bildas	4 ft - dirt w/o svs	mile	9.7		16.8	7.1	\$27,300		\$192,529
5 day hiking	6 ft - asphalt w/svs			0.00		0.0			\$0
trails	6 ft - rock w/svs	mile		0.00		0.0			\$0
	5 ft - rock w/svs	mile		0.00		0.0	\$74,750		\$0
0 -1	4 ft - dirt w/svs	mile	- 4 4	0.00		0.0	\$41,681	\$0.00	\$(
6 shoreline	beach trail	mile	1.1	0.04		0.8	\$14,593		\$11,67
	dirt trail s/campsites	mile		0.00		0.0	\$47,399		\$(
	8 ft - shoulder w/o svs	mile	400	0.00		0.0	\$356,999		\$0
9 on-road bike	6 ft - shoulder w/o svs	mile	16.9	0.65		12.3	\$252,587	\$164.48	
40	4 ft - shoulder w/o svs	mile	11.4	0.44		8.3	\$200,000		\$1,657,663
10 on-road bike	in-lane county road	mile		0.00		0.0	\$19,667	\$0.00	\$0
11 off wood biles	in-lane backcountry	mile		0.00		0.0	\$1,194		\$(
i i oii-road bike	14 ft - asphalt w/svs 14 ft - rock w/svs	mile mile		0.00		0.0			\$0
	6 ft - dirt w/svs	mile		0.00 0.00		0.0		\$0.00 \$0.00	\$(\$(
	5 ft - dirt w/svs	mile		0.00		0.0 0.0	\$38,434	· ·	\$(
	4 ft - dirt w/svs	mile		0.00				\$0.00	\$(
	BMX course	mile	0.2	0.00	0.0	0.0 0.1	\$31,394 \$48,487	\$0.00 \$0.37	ەر \$7,050
10 horoo troil									
12 horse trail	riding areas 6 ft dirt w/svs	mile mile	0.2 4.0	0.01 0.15	0.3 6.9	0.1	\$26,060 \$26,060		\$3,789 \$75,78
		mile	4.0	0.13		2.9 0.0	\$5,517		
10 water trail	backcountry fresh pond launch		2						\$0
13 water trail	•	each	3	0.12		2.2	\$13,894		\$30,30
	fresh river launch river runs	each	I	0.04		0.7	\$13,894		\$10,102
	salt hand launch	miles	0	0.00		0.0	#12.004	\$0.00	\$(
		each	9	0.35		6.5	\$13,894		\$90,91
	salt access water side	each		0.00		0.0		\$0.00	\$(
Outstal for for 111	salt overnight campsite	each	40.0	0.00		0.0		\$0.00	\$004.004
Subtotal for facili	ту ітраст	Miles	48.2		83	35		\$274.70	\$5,884,96

Total impact for land and facilities - per capita	\$294.12	\$6,251,391	
per vehicle	\$250.80		
Total impact for land and facilities - Persons per household:	2.20	\$647.07	
Vehicles per household:	2.52	\$632.02	
Total value of existing NMT and recreational trail lands			\$504,000
Total value of existing NMT and recreational trail facilities		_	\$7,129,354
Total value of existing NMT and recreational trail lands and facilities			\$7,633,354