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## Transportation Needs Report 2012

## Introduction

The Transportation Needs Report (TNR) is a long-term, comprehensive list of recommended improvements to serve unincorporated King County's transportation needs. It incorporates consideration of significant projects in cities, adjacent counties, and on state highways as they relate to the overall functioning of the transportation system. The transportation needs outlined in the TNR include those currently known (existing) as well as those that are forecast due to regionally-adopted targets for growth and development.

The TNR is a functional plan of the King County Comprehensive Plan. Together with the Roads Six-Year CIP and the Roads biennial operating budget, it fulfills the requirement of growth management legislation (RCW 36.70A.070) for a transportation capital facilities plan element of the King County comprehensive plan. The TNR was prepared consistent with all requirements of growth management legislation including:

1. It is based on the land use element of the comprehensive plan.
2. Its list of transportation needs and recommended improvements was developed using travel demand forecasts that are based on the regionally-adopted growth targets.
3. It includes a financial analysis that reflects the most recent land use changes, project amendments, costs, and financial revenue assumptions.

The TNR horizon year is 2031, which is consistent with regionally-adopted targets for population and employment growth.

The schedule for updating the TNR corresponds to the major updates to the Comprehensive Plan. Starting with TNR 2004, the update cycle coincides with the four-year, comprehensive plan major amendment cycles. If circumstances warrant, interim updates may be developed and transmitted with the annual comprehensive plan technical amendments.

## Purpose

The TNR serves the following purposes:
Relationship to King County Comprehensive Plan: A primary purpose of the TNR is to fulfill specific requirements of state growth management legislation for comprehensive planning. These requirements as outlined in state legislation (RCW 36.70A. 070 (6)) are:

1. Specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance locally-owned transportation facilities or services that are below an established level of service standard;
2. Forecasts of traffic for at least ten years based on the adopted growth targets and land use plan to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth;
3. Identification of state and local system needs to meet current and future demands;
4. An analysis of funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources;
5. A multiyear financing plan based on the needs identified;

The TNR needs list and financial analysis fulfill these requirements. The needs list was developed using forecasts of traffic for the 2031 horizon year based on regionally-adopted growth targets and the land use element of the King County Comprehensive Plan.

Transportation Planning and Funding: The TNR helps King County make decisions on planning and funding of transportation improvements, based on policies, strategies, and actions set forth in the comprehensive plan and the Strategic Plan for Road Services. It follows guidelines established in the state's Growth Management Act to link land use planning with transportation needs.

The TNR plays a significant role in evaluating the difference between identified transportation needs and future expected revenues for King County. This analysis assesses the County's ability to keep pace with the demands of growth and assists in developing financial strategies to deal with unmet needs.

Coordination: The TNR helps to coordinate transportation improvements connecting King County with other jurisdictions including the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), adjacent cities, and counties. Considering the location and types of capacity projects anticipated by other agencies in traffic forecasting and analysis, helps King County understand how the overall transportation system will function in the future and predict where unincorporated capacity improvements may be needed. The information in the TNR also helps facilitate coordination between different divisions of the King County Department of Transportation. In addition, by clearly showing the location and scope of intended unincorporated road system improvements as well as the priority of these improvements, the TNR provides other jurisdictions with information to use in appropriately coordinating project implementation.

Annexations: Cities considering annexing portions of unincorporated King County can refer to the TNR for identified road improvements which their city may need to address in the future.

Development Review: The TNR serves as a major source of information in the review of proposed land developments and in determining appropriate mitigation measures required as a condition of new development approval. The County's Mitigation Payment System (MPS) uses the TNR to identify growth-related projects that will be part of the impact fee system.

Road Vacation: Property owners can petition King County to have portions of the County's unused road rights-of-way sold to them if the property is not needed for current or future transportation purposes. The TNR is used to indicate the location of future projects on the road system in this road vacation process.

## Process

The development of the TNR is part of a comprehensive planning process that is guided by state growth management legislation. This process, as depicted in the flow diagram, links the guidance of the King County comprehensive plan and the Strategic Plan for Road Services with
the development of the TNR, the six-year Roads capital improvement program, and the Roads biennial operating budget. The mitigation payment system, which is authorized by growth management legislation and required by King County ordinance, is used to collect impact fees to help build road projects needed to support growth. Projects receiving MPS funding are included in the TNR. The concurrency program, which is required by growth management legislation, tests proposed development to make sure road capacity needed to support future growth will be available when needed. If a project needed to support the travel needs of a proposed development is included in the Roads six-year capital needs program and if other requirements are met, the proposed development may be granted concurrency and allowed to proceed with permit application.


## Strategic Plan for Road Services (SPRS)

The Strategic Plan for Road Services lays out the Road Services Division's mission, vision, and focused direction for an approximately five year timeframe. It aligns the division's employees, services, and programs with the overarching goals of King County; informs decisions by the King County Executive and Metropolitan King County Council on matters of policy, operations,
and budget; and provides a framework to ensure oversight and management of the division's programs and services.

The plan was developed in response to a critical funding problem coupled with a backlog of road system maintenance and preservation needs. Road Services recognizes that it may not be able to fully accomplish all of the goals and strategies suggested in the strategic plan. The plan prioritizes goals to guide division staff so their work meets the most critical needs with available funding and resources. It places high priority on regulatory compliance, immediate operational safety, and maintenance and preservation of infrastructure.

The goals for the SPRS are as follows (in order of priority):

| Priority | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Meet regulatory requirements and standards. Compliance with local, state and federal <br> regulatory mandates will be inherent in all the division's activities. |
| 2 | Meet core safety needs. Road Services will place high importance on reducing the <br> potential for harm on county roadways through activities such as repairing guardrails, <br> removing snow and ice, and maintaining signs and signals. |
| 3 | Maintain and preserve the existing roadway facilities network. The division will <br> develop a program to manage road system assets in a way that minimizes costs over <br> the life of the asset. The division also will assess and monitor road system assets, <br> develop a plan to reduce the backlog of infrastructure needs, and direct efforts to the <br> components of the road system that are most in need of attention. |
| 4 | Enhance mobility (movement of people and goods) by facilitating more efficient use <br> of the existing road system. This involves making improvements such as signal timing <br> and intelligent transportation systems in conjunction with preservation and <br> maintenance projects or by finding funding for new mobility projects. |
| 5 | Address roadway capacity when necessary to support growth targets in the urban area. <br> The division's final priority will be to pursue appropriate funding to increase capacity <br> to support urban growth, consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan. |

A key component of the SPRS implementation is the establishment of a tiered service strategy. SPRS set the priorities upon which the new, tiered approach to roads maintenance and preservation has been built: the most-used arterials would receive the highest level of maintenance and preservation, storm response and snow and ice removal, while the lowestpriority roads could be downgraded.

The new tier service strategy outlines objective criteria for the ranking of each of the nearly 1,600 miles of County roadway into one of five service levels, using criteria such as volume of use by motorists, safety requirements, detour length, and whether the road is considered soleaccess, a lifeline route or important for buses:

Tier 1 - Heavily traveled; connect large communities, major services, and critical infrastructure. Will receive the highest level of storm response, including the first roads
to receive snow removal. Users of tier 1 roads should expect good road and bridge condition and well-maintained drainage. These roads will receive the highest level of maintenance and preservation.

Tier 2 - Highly used local roads that serve local communities and large residential areas. Users of tier 2 roads can expect to see a lower level of storm and snow response. Will receive maintenance to keep these roads in good condition; generally preservation efforts will be more reactive and prioritized based on level of risk and availability of funding

Tier 3 --Highly used local roads that serve local communities and large residential areas. Will receive little to no storm and snow response, especially during significant storms. Maintenance and preservation are provided to slow deterioration but users of tier 3 roads should expect to see wear-and-tear to roadways, possible load limits, lower posted speed limits, and long-term partial closures.

Tier 4 -- Local residential dead-end roads with no other outlet. Will receive virtually no storm and snow response. Maintenance is limited to activities that preserve access. Users of tier 4 roadways may expect to see a number of one-lane roads with some downgraded to a gravel surface, depending on the level of deterioration and availability of funding.

Tier 5 -- Local residential roads that have alternative routes available for travel in case of road closures. Will receive virtually no storm and snow response. Maintenance is limited and based on factors such as life safety and risk, resulting in a growing number of deteriorating roads. Due to poor conditions, users of tier 5 roads can expect to see some closures, which may result in longer detours and difficulty accessing property. These roads may also be downgraded to a gravel surface, restricted to one lane, and have load limits and lower speed limits.

More information on the road tiers can be found on the Road Services Division website www.kingcounty.gov/roads.

Each of the projects in the Transportation Needs Report has been coded with the corresponding Tier for its road facility. The Tier information will be used to establish priorities for funding and inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program.

## Development of the TNR 2012

For this major four year update to the Comprehensive Plan and the TNR, the following changes were incorporated and itemized into the TNR 2012.

## Capital Project completions

Numerous capital projects were completed since the adoption of the Transportation Needs Report 2010, and these completed projects were deleted from the needs list.

## Annexations

Cities continue to annex portions of unincorporated King County, and when the annexed properties include TNR project locations, they are removed from the Transportation Needs Report or the project is shortened to account for the remaining portion in the unincorporated area. The latest major annexation was Kirkland's Juanita, Finn Hill and Kingsgate annexation in 2011.

## Countywide Guardrail Program

A number of guardrail improvements were completed since 2010, and these were deleted from the TNR. The Countywide Guardrail Program is soon approaching the point where new guardrail installations will be completed in all warranted arterial corridors, and the program's emphasis will shift to guardrail upgrades and repair.

## High Accident Locations (HAL) and High Accident Road Segments (HARS)

The Road Services Division completed the High Accident Locations and Road Segments Analysis (Road Safety Audits) during 2011, which identifies the locations of traffic accidents in unincorporated King County. These locations were determined from accident records that indicated a minimum of nine accidents per location over a three year period. Recommended solutions to the accident problems were developed and project costs and priorities were calculated. These were added to the TNR.

## Signal Warrant Priority Array

The latest analysis of intersections was completed in August, 2011. Intersections which met at least one traffic warrant for a traffic signal were added to the TNR. Locations which previously met warrants but no longer meet warrants were deleted. When the highest priority locations receive funding, they will be evaluated for either traffic signals or roundabouts.

## Nonmotorized Project Re-Screening

For this TNR update cycle, many nonmotorized projects have been re-evaluated. These projects were originally defined in the late 1980's and early 1990's when nonmotorized needs as well as county policies may have been different. The evaluation considered many factors, including existing conditions of the roadway, traffic speed and volumes, availability of nearby destinations to which users could walk or bicycle (schools, parks, trails, transit stops and others). Other information sources used included the Healthscape scores, bicycle level-of-service, and comfort indicators and published reports from bicycle organizations.

## Drainage-related Projects

Projects involving road culverts and other road drainage-related features have been included in the Transportation Needs Report for the first time. These are larger-scale projects which would be candidates for capital funds instead of the usual operational-funded projects. The Strategic Plan for Road Services states a program will be developed "to manage road system assets in a way that minimizes costs of the life of the asset." As King County moves towards an asset management system to meet this goal, a detailed inventory of drainage needs will be identified in conjunction with other roadway assets. These additional drainage projects will be included in future editions of the TNR.

## Travel Forecasts for 2031

Travel demand forecasts for unincorporated King County were completed for the year 2031. Travel corridors which showed future capacity problems were identified and proposed for capacity projects. Existing capacity projects were confirmed by the analysis to be needed and deleted if the analysis showed they were not needed.

## Rural Regional Corridors

Rural Regional Corridors is a term used in the King County Comprehensive Plan to refer to segments of certain arterials that pass through rural lands to primarily serve the needs of urban areas. This type of roadway plays a key regional mobility role in the county's transportation system. While additional capacity is generally prohibited by county policy on arterial roads in the rural area, a limited exception is made for Rural Regional Corridors. These corridors may receive capacity improvements if the increased capacity is designed to serve mobility and safety needs of the urban population while discouraging inappropriate development in the surrounding Rural Area or natural resource lands.

Rural Regional Corridors must be classified as Principal Arterials and carry high traffic volumes, defined as a minimum of 15,000 ADT. They also must have at least half of their PM Peak trips (the evening commute) traveling to cities or other counties. They connect one urban area to another, or to a highway of statewide significance that provides such connection, by traversing the rural area.

Based on the criteria in the Comprehensive Plan, the following King County unincorporated area roadways currently qualify as Rural Regional Corridors:

|  | Woodinville- <br> Duvall Road | Novelty Hill <br> Road | Issaquah- <br> Hobart Road | Avondale Road |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Limits | Woodinville city <br> limits to Duvall <br> city limits | Redmond city <br> limits to W. <br> Snoq. Valley Rd | Issaquah city <br> limits to SR-18 | NE 116th to <br> Woodinville- <br> Duvall Rd |
| Functional <br> Class | Principal Arterial | Principal Arterial | Principal Arterial | Principal Arterial |
| Average Daily <br> Trips (ADT) | 20,000 | 20,000 | 18,000 | 16,000 |
| \% PM Peak <br> Trips to Cities / <br> Other Counties | 60 | 59 | 56 | 51 |

## Financial Analysis and shortfall

A financial analysis was developed to balance projected needs with anticipated revenue. Revenues were projected to the horizon year for the Road Fund, Federal, State, and Mitigation Payment System revenues.

Projected needs were expressed in constant 2012 dollars and were totaled for the TNR program through the year 2031. The shortfall is calculated by subtracting the total projected needs by total projected revenues for the TNR time period.

Comparing projected revenues with projected needs reveals a financial shortfall of \$ 560,735,000 to the year 2031. Summary cost and revenue estimates are included in Appendix D of this document. Different revenue assumptions for each edition of the TNR as well as different plan horizon years make a yearly trend line of the shortfall difficult to develop, but generally show a trend of increasing growth of the financial shortfall:

Much of the financial shortfall is comprised of project costs in the designated Urban area which will eventually become annexed into cities. The following table shows the breakdown of Rural project costs and Urban Potential Annexation Area (PAA) project costs.

## Project Costs - Urban and Rural Areas

In thousands of dollars

| URBAN AREA | Project Costs |
| :--- | ---: |
| E. Federal Way PAA | $\$ 65,980$ |
| East Renton PAA | $\$ 13,473$ |
| Eastgate PAA | $\$ 8,558$ |
| Fairwood PAA | $\$ 26,131$ |
| Issaquah PAA | $\$ 37,680$ |
| NE Kent PAA | $\$ 3,882$ |
| North Highline PAA | $\$ 22,460$ |
| Not in primary PAAs | $\$ 18,351$ |
| West Hill PAA | $\$ 15,075$ |
|  |  |
| Total URBAN Costs | $\$ 211,590$ |
| Total RURAL Costs | $\$ 596,945$ |

The financial shortfall is an indication of King County's ability (or lack of ability) to serve the unincorporated area. This shortfall must be addressed by delaying improvements or by finding new sources of revenue or by some combination of the two strategies.

There are several methods available to address this shortfall. Additional revenue sources could be pursued. Implementation of needed improvements could be phased or delayed. Future development could be delayed, phased, or scaled back to assure the timely availability of needed infrastructure. These and perhaps other strategies will be employed and incorporated into future TNRs, CIPs, and budgets to balance needs with available revenues.


## NEEDS LIST for the Transportation Needs Report 2012

Needs are divided into chapters based on sub-areas of King County, in the following order:

1) Bear Creek
2) East King County
3) East Sammamish
4) Enumclaw
5) Federal Way
6) North Highline / West Hill
7) Newcastle
8) Northshore
9) Snoqualmie Valley
10) Soos Creek
11) Tahoma/Raven Heights
12) Vashon Island

## LEGEND for Needs List

Number - Unique identifier for project PAA - Potential Annexation Area (urban locations) Location - Where project is located Need - The primary purpose of the proposed project

| PRIORITIES - determined by individual programs | Other data fields - |
| :--- | :--- |
| ITS - Intelligent Transportation Systems | Tier Level - Servke Level for <br> roadway (1=Highest, 5=Lowest) |
| Safety - HAL HARS programs <br> Bridge - Bridge and structure priorities <br> Reconst. - Major roadway maintenance | Cost-000 - Future cost to King <br> Guardrail - Guardrail installation and repair <br> Oper. - Traffic-oriented operational improvements <br> Capacity - Road Widening |
| complete the proposes Division to project <br> Nonmotorized - Sidewalks and Walkways | Comments - Preliminary elements <br> of the proposed project. |
| TBD- Priority To Be Determined as future work |  |
| program item |  |



## County Subarea: Bear Creek

## CORRIDOR: Avondale Rd

| HAL-38 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Avondale Road NE \& NE 165th St | Safety |  | High | 1 | \$1,400 | Add north and southbound left turn lanes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RC-151 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Avondale Road From NE 134 St to Woodinville-Duvall Road | Preservation |  |  | 1 | \$0 | Replace damaged pavement surface |
| 100413 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Avondale Road ITS <br> Phase 2 From NE <br> 132nd St to Woodinville- <br> Duvall Road | ITS | High |  | 1 | \$1,800 | Provide Intelligent Transportation System improvements which could include synchronized signals; cameras; vehicle detection; fiber connection |
| 100209 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Bear Creek Bridge \#480A On NE 116th St Crossing Bear Creek | Bridge |  | High | 5 | \$0 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| HAL-78 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Avondale Rd \& NE 128th Way | Safety |  | Medium | 1 | \$10,000 | Build ultimate configuration per CIP \# 101088 (previously cancelled) |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | 쿠 | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\gtrless} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 믐 } \\ & \frac{1}{0} \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 김 } \\ & \text { 낑 } \\ & \text { ס } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HAL-26 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Avondale Road NE \& Woodinville-Duvall Rd | Safety |  | High |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$0 | Widen the intersection for additional turn lanes, signal improvements, illumination, curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes. See intersection project CP-16 |
| OP-RD-8 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Avondale Road Phase III From NE 133rd St To NE 155th St | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low |  | 1 | \$15,447 | Widen To Three Lanes-Construct Bridge |
| CP-16 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Woodinville-Duvall Rd \& Avondale Rd NE | Capacity Major |  |  |  |  |  | TBD |  |  | 1 | \$7,650 | Widen the intersection for additional turn lanes, signal improvements, illumination, curb, gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes. For project costs see project HAL-26 |
| OP-INT-99 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Avondale Road \& NE 165th St | Operations |  |  |  |  |  | Medium |  |  | 1 | \$735 | Provide North and South bound Left Turn Lanes. For project costs see project HAL-38 |
| CP-13 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Avondale Road NE Ph II From NE 155th St to NE 168th St | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low |  | 1 | \$5,765 | Widen roadway to 3 lanes including 2 eight foot shoulders and a walkway. |
| CORRIDOR: Bear Creek Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NM-5066 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Bear Creek Rd From Avondale Rd To Mink Rd | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | High | 3 | \$200 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| NM-5067 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Bear Creek Rd From <br> Mink Rd To NE 133 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low | 3 | \$459 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 미․ } \\ & \text { 㑒 } \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{刃 0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\gtrless} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Cost－000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 示 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग्र } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OP－INT－71 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Bear Creek Rd \＆Mink Rd | Operations |  |  |  |  |  | Medium |  |  | 3 | \＄1，744 | Improve Sight Distance－－ Realign Intersection |
| CORRIDOR：Misc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OP－RD－7 | Rural－N／O I－90 | NE 165th St From 179 Pl NE To 183 Ave NE | Capacity Minor |  |  |  | Low |  |  |  |  | 3 | \＄4，269 | Reconstruct Roadway |
| GR－115 | Rural－N／O I－90 | East Ames Lake Dr NE From W Ames Lake Dr NE to W Ames Lake Dr NE | Safety |  |  |  |  | Low |  |  |  | 5 | \＄20 | Construct Guardrail |
| NM－9984 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Mink Rd From Bear <br> Creek Rd To <br> Woodinville－Duvall Rd | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | High | 3 | \＄460 | See King County Capital Improvement Program（CIP） document or website for detailed project description including scope． |
| OP－RD－45 | Rural－N／O I－90 | 232nd Ave NE From NE 142 St To Old Woodinville－Duvall Rd | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  | Low |  |  | 3 | \＄3，713 | Reconstruct Roadway |
| NM－5001 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Paradise Lake Rd From Woodinville－Duvall Rd To County Line | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Medium | 2 | \＄573 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| CORRIDOR：NE 124 －NE 128 －NE 132 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NM－5026 | Urban－Not in primary PAAs | 172nd Ave NE From Redmond City Limits To NE 138 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low | 5 | \＄417 | Construct Neighborhood Pathway |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  | $\begin{aligned} & \cong \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \gtrless \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 訔 } \\ & \text { 荋 } \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | F |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग्रे } \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100312 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Cottage Lake Creek <br> Bridge \#240A On Bear <br> Creek Rd Crossing <br> Cottage Lake Creek | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$3,178 | Replace Bridge |
| 100114 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Bear Creek Bridge \#333A On NE 133rd St Crossing Bear Creek | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$616 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| ITS-16 | Rural - N/O I-90 | NE 124th St. ITS Ph II From SR 202 to Avondale Road NE | ITS | Medium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$2,725 | Provide Intelligent <br> Transportation System improvements which could include cameras; fiber optic communications; vehicle detection; flood detection |
| OP-RD-52 | Rural - N/O I-90 | NE 132nd St / NE 128th St From 184 Ave NE to 196 Ave NE | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low |  | 1 | \$8,165 | Widen NE 128 St for RT lane and shoulder. Widen Avondale Rd and add RT lane. Modify signals at NE 132 St and NE 128 St. Widen NE 132 St. New sigal at Bear Creek Rd. For project costs, see project HAL-78 |
| CORRIDOR: NE Union Hill Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HAL-87 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 208th Ave NE \& Union Hill Rd | Safety |  | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$1,500 | Construct Roundabout |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | ज | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{0}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\gtrless} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 믐 } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 기 } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \Gamma \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITS-20 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Union Hill Road ITS From 196 Ave NE to 238 Ave NE | ITS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$3,819 | Provide Intelligent Transportation System improvements which could include fiber optic communications; cameras; speed warning; vehicle detection |
| OP-INT-125 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 238th Ave NE \& Union Hill Rd | Operations |  |  |  |  |  | High |  |  | 2 | \$0 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| BR-952A | Rural - N/O I-90 | Evans Creek Bridge \#952A On NE Union Hill Rd Crossing Evans Creek | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$4,093 | Replace Bridge |
| OP-RD-5 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Union Hill Rd From 208 Ave NE To 238 Ave NE | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  | High |  |  | 2 | \$5,868 | Widen Travel Lanes--Pave <br> Shoulders--Provide <br> Equestrian Facility |
| RC-51 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Union Hill Rd From 229 Ave NE to 238 Ave NE | Preservation |  |  |  | Medium |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$2,117 | 20ft wall |
| ITS-11 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Union Hill Road ITS Ph II From 238th Ave NE to Ames Lake Rd. | ITS | High |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | \$166 | Provide Intelligent Transportation System improvements which could include fiber optic communications; cameras; speed warning; vehicle detection |
| SW-51 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 238th Ave NE \& NE 63 rd PL | Operations |  | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | ज | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*} \end{aligned}$ |  | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 뀽 } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RC-44 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Union Hill Rd From 196 Ave NE to 206 Pl NE | Preservation |  |  |  | Medium |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$155 | 10 ft tall wall. Complete sections not covered by CIP \# 100709. |
| RC-116 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Union Hill Rd From 238 Ave NE To 258 Ave NE | Reconstruction |  |  |  | Low |  |  |  |  | 3 | \$1,422 | Reconstruct roadway 1.5 miles |
| CORRIDOR: Novelty Hill Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OP-INT-113 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 208th Ave NE \& NE <br> Union Hill Rd | Operations |  |  |  |  |  | Low |  |  | 2 | \$735 | Provide Southbound Right Turn Lane. For project costs see project HAL-87 |
| 100992 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Novelty Hill Rd From Redmond C/L to 244 Ave NE | Capacity Major |  |  | High |  |  |  | High |  | 1 | \$61,486 | The EIS preferred alternative comprises three roads: Novelty Hill Road to 196th Avenue NE, at which point, the corridor continues southward to NE Union Hill Road. At the intersection of 196th Avenue NE and NE Union Hill Road, the project corridor extends to its western terminus of 192nd Avenue NE and NE Union Hill Road. See the CIP website for detailed project description. |
| HAL-91 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Novelty Hill Rd \& 206th Ave NE | Safety |  | High |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$0 | Construct Novelty Hill Road Phase II -- For project costs see project CP-8 |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 毋 } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\text { P/ }}{\gtrless} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 밈 } \\ & \frac{1}{0} \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 기 } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \Gamma \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | Cost－000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\overline{\bar{\omega}}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & \text { D⿳八口䒑口 } \\ & \text { O. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HARS－12 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Novelty Hill Rd from 206 Ave NE to 208 Ave NE | Safety |  | High |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \＄0 | Construct Novelty Hill <br> Road Phase II－－For project costs see project CP－8 |
| HAL－86 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Novelty Hill Rd \＆ 208 <br> Ave NE | Safety |  | High |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \＄0 | Construct Novelty Hill <br> Road Phase II－－For project costs see project CP－8 |
| CP－8 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Novelty Hill Rd Phase II From 195 Ave NE to Trilogy Parkway NE | Capacity Major |  |  | High |  |  |  | TBD |  | 1 | \＄61，486 | Road improvements to NE Novelty Hill Road starting at the east end of the roundabout at NE Novelty Hill Road／195th Avenue NE to Trilogy Parkway Northeast．Work will include the construction of a two－lane roundabout at 208th Avenue NE， realignment of NE Novelty Hill Road，widening of various section of Novelty Hill Road，construction of stormwater facilities，and development of mitigation sites．Additional project costs are found in projects HAL－86，HAL－91 and HARS－12 |
| HAL－77 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Trilogy Pkwy \＆NE Novelty Hill Rd | Safety |  | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \＄2，000 | Construct Roundabout |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  |  |  | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ज | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\oplus}{\gtrless} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 詈 } \\ & \text {. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 뀨 } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\hat{\theta}} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITS-35 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Novelty Hill Rd ITS, <br> Phase II From 208 Ave NE to West Snoqualmie Road | ITS | High |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$250 | Provide Spot ITS improvements which could include travel time devices and road weather information system and safety devices |
| SW-10 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Novelty Hill Road \& Redmond Road | Operations |  | High |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |

## CORRIDOR: Woodinville-Duvall Rd

| RC-43 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Woodinville-Duvall Rd From Old WoodinvilleDuvall Rd to W. Snoqualmie Valley Rd | Preservation |  |  | High |  | 1 | \$482 | Walls both sides 10ft tall |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HAL-35 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 194th Ave NE \& Woodinville-Duvall Rd | Safety |  | Low |  |  | 1 | \$1,031 | EB left turn lane. |
| 100415 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Woodinville-Duvall Rd ITS, Phase I \& II From 168th Ave NE to City of Duvall | ITS | High |  |  |  | 1 | \$4,001 | Provide Intelligent Transportation System improvements which could include synchronized signals; cameras; vehicle detection; fiber optic communications; dynamic message signs. |
| CP-12 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Woodinville-Duvall Rd From 171st Ave NE to Avondale Rd | Capacity Minor |  |  |  | Low | 1 | \$9,851 | Widen roadway to increase capacity. |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  |  |  | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ज | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 毋ٍ } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 訶 } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग्र } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NM-5002 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Woodinville-Duvall Rd From Avondale Rd To SR-203 | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | High | 1 | \$14,892 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| OP-RD-9 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Old Woodinville-Duvall Rd From WoodinvilleDuvall Rd To Woodinville-Duvall Rd | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  | Low |  |  | 3 | \$4,540 | Reconstruct Roadway |



| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  |  |  | Priorities |  |  | z |  | 劣 | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ज |  | 詈 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग్N } \\ & \text { ì } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { Din } \\ & \text { 를 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| OP-RD-46 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Stossell Creek Way <br> From Swan Mill Road to <br> the Snohomish County <br> Line | Operations | TBD | Environmental <br> improvements to road to <br> improve habita and reduce <br> maintenance costs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



## County Subarea: East Sammamish

CORRIDOR: Issaquah-Fall City Rd



| Number | PAA | Location | Need | $\cdots$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 峝 } \\ & \text {. } \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County Subarea: Enumclaw |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CORRIDOR: 212 Ave SE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HAL-83 | Rural - S/O I-90 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 212th Ave SE \& SE } 400 \\ & \text { St } \end{aligned}$ | Safety |  | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,000 | Construct Roundabout |
| NM-5009 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 212th Ave SE From SE 384 St To SE 358 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low | 2 | \$3,154 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| CORRIDOR: 284 Ave SE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 400210 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Newaukum Creek <br> Bridge \#3040A | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$593 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| GR-86 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 284th Ave SE From <br> Mud Mountain Dam Rd <br> To SR-410 | Safety |  |  |  |  | Low |  |  |  | 3 | \$417 | Construct Guardrail |
| 400314 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 284th Ave SE Bridge \#3049 284th Ave SE Crossing Boise Creek | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | \$765 | Construct short-span bridge |
| NM-5007 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Veazie-Cumberland Rd/Palmer Rd From SE 386 St To SE 416 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | High | 2 | \$1,237 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| NM-5013 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 284th Ave SE From SE 416 St To SR-410 | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | High | 2 | \$402 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ies |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | PAA | Location | Need | ज | $\begin{aligned} & \text { の } \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\oplus} \\ & \stackrel{1}{*} \end{aligned}$ | 号 |  |  |  | ® \％ \％ ¢ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 깆 } \\ & \text { 苟 } \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ | Cost－000 | Comments |


| BR－3052 | Rural－S／O I－90 | Boise Creek Bridge \＃3052 268th Ave SE Crossing Boise Creek | Bridge | Low |  | 5 | \＄765 | Construct short－span bridge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BR－3030 | Rural－S／O I－90 | SE 380 St Bridge \＃3030 SE 308th St Crossing slough | Bridge | Low |  | 5 | \＄765 | Construct short－span bridge |
| GR－104 | Rural－S／O I－90 | 196th Ave SE From SE 400th St To SE 456th St | Safety |  | Low | 3 | \＄15 | Construct Guardrail |
| DR－3 | Rural－S／O I－90 | SE 440 St at 27602 | Drainage |  |  | 0 | \＄0 | Drainage improvement |
| BR－3060 | Rural－S／O I－90 | 208th Ave SE Bridge \＃3060 208th Ave SE Crossing drainage ditch s／o SE 448 St | Bridge | Medium |  | 5 | \＄765 | Construct short－span bridge |
| BR－3051 | Rural－S／O I－90 | Boise Creek Bridge \＃3051 On 276th Ave SE Crossing Boise Creek | Bridge | Low |  | 5 | \＄765 | Construct short－span bridge |
| BR－3056A | Rural－S／O I－90 | SE 408th St Bridge \＃3056A On SE 408th <br> St Crossing drainage ditch | Bridge | Low |  | 5 | \＄2，000 | Construct short－span bridge |

CORRIDOR：SE 432 St

| GR－103 | Rural－S／O I－90 | SE 432nd St From 268th Ave SE To 284th Ave SE | Safety | Low |  | 5 | \＄161 | Construct Guardrail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NM－5008 | Rural－S／O I－90 | SE 432nd St From 284 Ave SE To 268 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  | High | 5 | \＄804 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | 示 |  |  | Priorities |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 응 } \\ & \text { 品 } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { 흘 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 즁 $\stackrel{N}{0}$ $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Count | y Subare | Federal Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CORR | RIDOR: | tary Rd S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300408 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | Military Rd \& S 342nd St | Safety |  | Medium |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,997 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| OP-INT-116 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | Military Rd \& S 320th St | Operations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$468 | Add eastbound right turn lane. For project costs see project HAL-2 |
| HAL-2 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way <br> PAA | Military Rd S \& S 320th St | Safety |  | Medium |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$508 | EB right turn lane <br> (Developer project). <br> Advance EB Signal Head by county |
| HAL-92 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way <br> PAA | Military Rd S \& S 352 St | Safety |  | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,000 | Add NB and SB left turn lane |
| NM-5014 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | Military Rd S From Peasley Canyon Way S To SR-161 | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low | 1 | \$8,018 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| CP-5 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way <br> PAA | Military Rd S From I-5 <br> to S 272 St | Capacity Major |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low |  | 1 | \$5,837 | Widen to Four/Five lanes-Construct Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk--Construct Bike Lane |



| OP-RD-3 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | Military Rd S From S 340 St to S 342 St | Operations |  |  | TBD |  | 1 | \$735 | Provide Two Way Left Turn <br> Lane: Left Turn Lane at S $342 \mathrm{St}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OP-INT-105 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way <br> PAA | Military Rd S \& S 374 St | Operations |  |  | Low |  | 1 | \$735 | Provide Two Way Left Turn Lane |
| SW-57 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | Military Rd \& S 360th St | Operations | Medium |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| CORRIDOR: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RC-49 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | 58th Place S./56th Place S. From West Valley Rd to West Valley Rd | Preservation |  | Medium |  |  | 4 | \$22,950 | Major Roadwork Needed, Possible Re-alignement |
| NM-4067 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | 32nd Ave S From S 360 St to S 368 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  | TBD | 5 | \$268 | Construct walkway |
| OP-INT-100 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | S 321st St \& Peasley Canyon Rd | Operations |  |  | High |  | 1 | \$735 | Reconstruct approaches to meet Road Standards; Lengthen Turn Lanes. For project costs see project HAL-3 |
| NM-9976 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | 38th Ave S From S 344 <br> St to Fishing Access Rd | Nonmotorized |  |  |  | Low | 5 | \$204 | Construct AC shoulder (West Side) |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { ※ } \\ \stackrel{\sim}{\sigma} \end{gathered}$ |  | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| NM-9971 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | 36th Pl S/ S 294 St/ 45 Pl S From S 298 St to S 288 St | Nonmotorized |  |  | Medium | 5 | \$769 | Construct sidewalk (West Side) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NM-9970 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way <br> PAA | 34th Ave S From S 288 St to S 298 St | Nonmotorized |  |  | Medium | 3 | \$503 | Construct sidewalk (West Side) |
| SW-73 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | 46 Pl S \& S 321 St | Operations | Medium |  |  | 2 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| NM-4066 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | 28th Ave S From S 349 <br> St to S360 ST | Nonmotorized |  |  | TBD | 2 | \$268 | Construct walkway |
| NM-4042 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | 38th Ave S From S 304 St to S 307 St | Nonmotorized |  |  | TBD | 5 | \$99 | Pave shoulders (East Side) |
| SW-21 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | 51st Ave S \& S 316th St. | Operations | High |  |  | 2 | \$1,377 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| CP-1 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | S 312th St Study From 28th Ave S to 51st Ave S (Federal Way Lead) | Capacity Major |  | TBD |  | 4 | \$0 | The City of Federal Way's Center Access Project has been closed, but the city still retains this road construction project in its plans. |



## CORRIDOR: Peasley Canyon

| HAL-3 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | Peasley Canyon Rd \& S 321st St | Safety |  | Low | 1 | \$514 | WB right turn lane. WB advanced signal head. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 300308 | Urban - Not in primary PAAs | Peasley Canyon Rd S \& Peasley Canyon Way S | Operations |  | High | 1 | \$0 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| ITS-8 | Urban - E. <br> Federal Way PAA | Peasley Canyon Road From Military Rd to West Valley Highway | ITS | High |  | 1 | \$2,130 | Provide Intelligent Transportation System improvements which could include coordinated signals; cameras; vehicle detection |




| Number | PAA | Location | Need | ज | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 毋 } \\ & \stackrel{\ddot{W}}{\gtrless} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 詈 } \\ & \text { ion } \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग्रे } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County Subarea: Newcastle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CORRIDOR: 156 Ave SE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OP-RD-25 | Urban - East Renton PAA | 154th Pl SE / SE 142 Pl From SE Jones Rd To 156 Ave SE | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  | Low |  |  | 1 | \$2,794 | Realign Roadway--Widen Roadway |
| ITS-19 | Urban - East <br> Renton PAA | 156th Ave SE ITS From Renton City Limts to SR 169 | ITS | Medium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$197 | Provide Intelligent <br> Transportation System improvements which could include cameras; pavement sensors; speed warning system |
| CORRIDOR: Allen Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NM-5030 | Urban - Eastgate PAA | Allen Rd (148 SE) North Side From 146 Ave SE To SE 36 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low | 3 | \$120 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| NM-9918 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Urban - Eastgate } \\ & \text { PAA } \end{aligned}$ | Allen Rd From 13800 <br> block (city limit) to 146 <br> Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | High | 3 | \$498 | Construct sidewalk (North Side) |
| CORRIDOR: May Valley Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OP-RD-26 | Rural - S/O I-90 | May Valley Road From SR-900 To SE 128 WY | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  | Medium |  |  | 1 | \$6,470 | Reconstruct/Spot Pave <br> Shoulders--Improve Sight <br> Distance |



## CORRIDOR: Misc

| NM-0109 | Urban - Eastgate PAA | 154th Ave SE From SE 39 St to SE 42 St | Nonmotorized |  | Low | 5 | \$350 | Construct sidewalke (West Side) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3P-0115 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 204th Ave SE / SE <br> 159th St From SE 156 <br> St to 205 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  | High | 5 | \$326 | Construct AC shoulder (North Side) |
| ITS-34 | Urban - East <br> Renton PAA | 164th Ave SE ITS From SE 128th St. to SE May Valley Rd. | ITS | Low |  | 2 | \$1,524 | Provide Intelligent Transportation System improvements which could include cameras; vehicle detection |

## CORRIDOR: Newport Way

| NM-4009 | Urban - Eastgate PAA | Newport Way From 13800 block(Bell. C/L) to 153 Ave SE | Nonmotorized | TBD | 2 | \$123 | Improve pathway -- North Side and South Side |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  |  |  | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 品 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & \stackrel{\text { Nan }}{0} \\ & \text { 를. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| OP-INT-84 | Urban - Eastgate PAA | Newport Way \& 164 Ave SE | Operations |  |  | Low |  | 2 | \$1,117 | Traffic Signal--Turn Channels All Legs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200413 | Urban - Eastgate PAA | Newport Way From 150 Ave SE to 152 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$0 | Construct 1,000 linear feet of sidewalk |
| NM-4010 | Urban - Eastgate PAA | Newport Way From 152 Ave SE to 161 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  |  |  | TBD | 2 | \$123 | Improve pathway (South Side) |
| 200211 | Urban - Eastgate PAA | Newport Way at 16630 | Reconstruction |  | High |  |  | 2 | \$1,035 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| OP-RD-20 | Urban - Eastgate PAA | Newport Way From 138 Ave SE To Eastgate Park Entrance | Capacity Minor |  |  | High |  | 2 | \$2,512 | Provide Left Turn Lane |
| CORRIDOR: SE 128 St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OP-INT-119 | Urban - East <br> Renton PAA | 168th Ave SE \& SE 128th St | Operations |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$451 | Add turn lanes on SE 128th St |
| HAL-85 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 175 Ave SE \& SE 128 St | Safety | Medium |  |  |  | 1 | \$500 | Convert SE 128th Street to a three-lane section. |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pri | ties |  |  | Zַ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | PAA | Location | Need | ज | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\omega} \\ & \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{\oplus} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 峝 } \\ & \text {. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग्0 } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| ITS-28 | Urban - East <br> Renton PAA | SE 128th St. ITS From 148th Ave SE to May Valley Road | ITS | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$4,382 | Provide Intelligent <br> Transportation System improvements which could include cameras; vehicle detection; synchronize signals; communications |
| HAL-61 | Urban - East <br> Renton PAA | 160th Ave SE \& SE 128th St | Safety |  | High |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,000 | Convert SE 128th Street to 3-lane section from Renton CL (158th Ave SE) to 158th Ave SE, connecting with rural 3-lane section project which extends from urban growth boundary to Lake Kathleen Road. Add dual EB left turn lane at 164th Ave SE by converting through lane, add northbound receiving lane at this intersection by widening. |
| HAL-43 | Urban - East <br> Renton PAA | 164th Ave SE \& SE 128th St | Safety |  | High |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,000 | Convert SE 128th Street to 3-lane section from Renton CL (158th Ave SE) to 158th Ave SE, connecting with rural 3-lane section project which extends from urban growth boundary to Lake Kathleen Road. Add dual EB left turn lane at 164th Ave SE by converting through lane, add northbound receiving lane at this intersection by widening. |



| Number | PAA | Location | Need | ज | $\begin{aligned} & \text { © } \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{⿳ 亠 丷 冖 巾} \\ & \gtrless \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 䍗 } \\ & \text { ion } \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost－000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग्रे } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County Subarea：North Highline／West Hill |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CORRIDOR： 1 Ave S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITS－26 | Urban－North Highline PAA | 1st Ave S．／Myers Way ITS From SW 100th St． to SW 112th St． | ITS | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | \＄952 | Provide Intelligent <br> Transportation System improvements which could include synchronized signals；transit signal priority；cameras；fiber optic communications |
| NM－0110 | Urban－North Highline PAA | 1st Ave S From S 102 St to S 108 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | High | 5 | \＄418 | Construct AC shoulder （West Side） |
| CORRIDOR： 16 Ave SW |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OP－INT－78 | Urban－North Highline PAA | 16th Ave SW \＆SW 106 St | Operations |  |  |  |  |  | Medium |  |  | 1 | \＄255 | Provide Left Turn Lane－－ <br> Pedestrian Crossing Signals |
| 300710 | Urban－North Highline PAA | 17th Ave SW From SW 100th St to SW 104th St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | \＄0 | See King County Capital Improvement Program（CIP） document or website for detailed project description including scope． |
| NM－5018 | Urban－North Highline PAA | SW 104 St From 15 <br> Ave SW To 17 Ave SW | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | High | 5 | \＄59 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| NM－5017 | Urban－North Highline PAA | SW 102 St From 8 Ave SW To 17 Ave SW | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | High | 5 | \＄140 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  |  |  | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 詈 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## CORRIDOR: 76 Ave S

| NM-9939 | Urban - West <br> Hill PAA | 76th Ave S From S 120 <br> St to S 124 St | Nonmotorized | Medium | 5 | $\$ 209$ | Construct sidewalk (East <br> Side) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NM-0004 | Urban - West <br> Hill PAA | 76th Ave S From S 115 <br> St to S 116 St | Nonmotorized | Medium | 5 | $\$ 74$ | Construct AC walkway |
|  | Urban - West <br> Hill PAA | 76th Ave S From S 124 <br> St To S 128 St | Nonmotorized | High | 5 | $\$ 108$ | Provide Nonmotorized <br> Facility |

## CORRIDOR: 78 Ave S

| NM-9938 | Urban - West Hill PAA | 78th Ave S From S 120 St to S 124 St | Nonmotorized |  | Low | 3 | \$204 | Construct sidewalk (East Side) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 300214 | Urban - West Hill PAA | 78th Ave S From S 126 St To Renton Ave S | Nonmotorized | High |  | 3 | \$1,392 | Add sidewalk to west side of roadway |

## CORRIDOR: 8 Ave S

| NM-5020 | Urban - North Highline PAA | 8th Ave SW From SW 108 St To SW Roxbury St | Nonmotorized |  | High | 5 | \$2,299 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OP-RD-12 | Urban - North Highline PAA | 8th Ave S From S Seatlle City Limit To Glendale Way S/S 112 St | Capacity Minor | Low |  | 3 | \$3,162 | Widen Roadway |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | PAA | Location | Need | テ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\text { P/ }}{\gtrless} \end{aligned}$ |  | To 웅 $\stackrel{7}{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| 300197 | Urban - North Highline PAA | South Park Bridge \#3179 RTID \& 14th/16th Ave S. | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 131,548 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| 300115 | Urban - North Highline PAA | 14th Ave SW From SW 110 St to SW 116 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TBD | 5 | \$214 | Improve walkway. Sidewalk on east side of roadway. Enclose ditches. |
| DR-6 | Urban - West Hill PAA | S Langston Street to SR900 | Drainage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | \$0 | Drainage improvement |
| NM-4012 | Urban - West Hill PAA | 80th Ave S From S 114 St to S 118 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TBD | 5 | \$31 | Improve and widen shoulder (West Side) |
| NM-4071 | Urban - North Highline PAA | 22nd Place S From Des <br> Moines Mem. Dr. S to <br> Burien City Limits | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TBD | 4 | \$214 | Improve walkway |
| NM-9920 | Urban - North Highline PAA | 28th Ave SW From SW Roxbury St to SW 102 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Medium | 5 | \$178 | Construct AC shoulder (East Side) |
| NM-9928 | Urban - North Highline PAA | 11th Ave SW From SW 102 St to SW 106 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Medium | 5 | \$253 | Construct AC shoulder (East Side) |
| NM-9937 | Urban - West Hill PAA | S 120th St From 76 Ave S to 80 Ave S | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Medium | 5 | \$204 | Construct sidewalk (South Side) |
| NM-9936 | Urban - West Hill PAA | 75th Ave S / S 122 St From Renton Ave S to 80 Ave S | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Medium | 5 | \$332 | Construct sidewalk (South Side) |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | F |  |  | Priorities |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{9}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\gtrless} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग्रे } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CORRIDOR: Rainier Ave S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300114 | Urban - West Hill PAA | Renton Ave S From 68 Ave S to 74 Ave S | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$0 | Add a sidewalk along the south side of the roadway |
| ITS-33 | Urban - West Hill PAA | Rainier Ave S ITS From Seattle City Limits to Renton City Limits | ITS | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$2,286 | Provide Intelligent <br> Transportation System improvements which could include synchronize signals; vehicle detection; cameras; transit signal priority |
| SW-55 | Urban - West Hill PAA |  <br> Lakeridge Dr S | Operations |  | Medium |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| CORRIDOR: Renton Ave S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITS-12 | Urban - West Hill PAA | Renton Ave S ITS From Rainier Ave S to Rainier Ave N | ITS | High |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$4,764 | Provide Intelligent <br> Transportation System improvements which could include synchronized signals; vehicle detection; cameras; transit signal priority |
| OP-INT-76 | Urban - West Hill PAA | Renton Ave S \& 76 Ave S | Operations |  |  |  |  |  | TBD |  |  | 2 | \$764 | Turn Channels - North \& South Legs |
| CORRIDOR: Roxbury St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300215 | Urban - North Highline PAA | Roxbury Street From 28 Ave SW to 30 Ave SW | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$0 | Add sidewalk to south side of road |



## County Subarea: Northshore

CORRIDOR: 146-156-160 PL NE

| OP-INT-81 | Rural - N/O I-90 | NE 146th Pl \& 155 Ave NE | Operations | High |  | 3 | \$748 | Reconstruct Intersection-Improve Sight Distance-Provide Equestrian Facility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RC-48 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 146th Pl NE From SR202 to 155 Ave NE | Preservation | Medium |  | 3 | \$115 | 15 ft tall wall |
| NM-0111 | Rural - N/O I-90 | NE 145th St From 160 Pl NE to 168 Ave NE | Nonmotorized |  | Low | 5 | \$424 | Construct AC shoulder (North Side) |
| NM-5029 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 168th Ave NE From NE 143 Pl To NE 140 St | Safety |  | Low | 5 | \$174 | Construct Neighborhood Pathway |
| NM-9913 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 168th Ave NE From <br> NE 143 St to NE 145 St | Nonmotorized |  | Low | 5 | \$283 | Construct AC shoulder (West Side) |

## CORRIDOR: Misc

| NM-9903 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 152nd Pl NE / 158 Ave NE From NE 160 St to NE 165 St | Nonmotorized | Low | 3 | \$178 | Construct gravel shoulder (West Side) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NM-9901 | Urban - Not in primary PAAs | 88th Ave NE From NE 198 St to NE 205 St | Nonmotorized | Low | 5 | \$671 | Construct AC shoulder (East Side) |
| NM-5027 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Du Rocher Rd From 172 Pl NE To Woodinville-Duvall Rd | Nonmotorized | Medium | 3 | \$482 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| Needs | st for the Transpo | tation Needs Report 201 |  | Needs List - Page 35 of 67 |  |  |  |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | F | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{\sim} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\dddot{W}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 미․ } \\ & \text { 高 } \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 금 } \\ & \text { 苟 } \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| NM-0107 | Urban - Not in primary PAAs | 178th Ave NE From NE 131 St to NE 136 St | Nonmotorized |  | Low | 5 | \$67 | Construct sidewalk (West Side) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CP-11 | Urban - Not in primary PAAs | Juanita-Woodinville Way NE From 112th Ave NE to NE 145th St | Capacity Minor |  |  | 2 | \$4,837 | Widen the existing road from NE 145th St to 112th Ave NE. Provide curb, gutter, and sidewalk, street lighting, and a traffic signa at NE 145th St. |
| NM-5024 | Urban - Not in primary PAAs | 112 Pl NE From Bothell south city limits to 112 Lane NE | Nonmotorized |  | Medium | 3 | \$361 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| OP-RD-18 | Rural - N/O I-90 | NE 175 / NE 172 Pl From 164 Ave NE To 174 Ave NE | Capacity Minor | High |  | 3 | \$2,584 | Reconstruct Roadway |
| NM-9904 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 148th Ave NE From NE 154 St to NE 167 St | Nonmotorized |  | Medium | 5 | \$375 | Construct gravel shoulder (East Side) |

## County Subarea: Snoqualmic Valley

CORRIDOR: 308 Ave SE

| GR-66 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 308th Ave SE From SE 87th Pl To SE 64th St | Safety | High |  | 4 | \$31 | Construct Guardrail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NM-9941 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 308th Ave SE From SE 64 St to SE 87 Pl | Nonmotorized |  | Medium | 4 | \$1,229 | Construct gravel shoulder (East Side) |
| CORRIDOR: 428 Ave SE-Reinig Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NM-5041 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Mill Pond Rd From SR202 To Reinig Rd | Nonmotorized |  | High | 3 | \$1,609 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| RC-37 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Mill Pond Rd From SE Stearns Rd to SE Reinig Rd | Preservation | Medium |  | 3 | \$502 | Armor Shoulders <br> @ $100 /$ cyd |
| RC-16 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Reinig Rd From Mill <br> Pond Rd To 396th Dr SE | Preservation | Medium |  | 3 | \$315 | Armor Shoulders |
| NM-9942 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 428th Ave SE From SE <br> Reinig Rd to SE 108 St | Nonmotorized |  | Medium | 3 | \$1,334 | Construct AC shoulder (West Side) |
| GR-67 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Reinig Rd From Mill Pond Rd To 428th Ave SE | Safety | High |  | 3 | \$42 | Construct Guardrail |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | $\Gamma$ |  |  | Priorities |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 깆 } \\ & \text { (1) } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | Cost－000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ज |  | 咢 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & \text { D⿳亠丷厂犬土口 } \\ & \text { 를 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## CORRIDOR：Cedar Falls Rd

| NM－9958 | Rural－S／O I－90 | SE 149th St／442 Ave <br> SE From 437 Pl SE to <br> 443 Ave SE | Nonmotorized | Low | 5 | $\$ 516$ | Construct AC shoulder <br> （North Side） |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| OP－RD－38 | Rural－S／O I－90 | 436 Ave SE／Cedar Falls <br> Rd From I－90 To <br> Wilderness Rim | Capacity Minor | Medium |  |  |  |
| NM－9968 | Rural－S／O I－90 | Cedar Falls Rd SE <br> From near Rattlesnake <br> Lake | Nonmotorized | $\$ 8,203$ | Realign Roadway |  |  |

## CORRIDOR：Middle Fork Rd

| 200511 | Rural－N／O I－90 | SE Middle Fork Snoqualmie River Road From east of couplet （MP 2．7）to the campground（MP 12．4） | Preservation | Medium | 4 | \＄14，046 | Reconstruct 9.7 miles of roadway |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GR－78 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Middle Fork Rd From North Bend city limits To 496th Ave SE | Safety | Low | 4 | \＄13 | Construct Guardrail |
| CORRIDOR：Misc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DR－5 | Rural－N／O I－90 | NE 195 St \＆ 324 Ave NE | Drainage |  | 0 | \＄0 | Drainage improvement |
| DR－4 | Rural－N／O I－90 | NE 106 St \＆ 314 Ave NE | Drainage |  | 0 | \＄0 | Drainage improvement |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ies |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | PAA | Location | Need | ज | ¢ | 䓂 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & \stackrel{\text { Nan }}{0} \\ & \text { 를. } \end{aligned}$ |  | O \% \% \% |  | - | Cost-000 | Comments |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ies |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | PAA | Location | Need | ज | ¢ | 䓂 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & \stackrel{\text { Nan }}{0} \\ & \text { 를. } \end{aligned}$ |  | O \% \% \% |  | - | Cost-000 | Comments |


| OP-RD-37 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Tolt Hill Rd From Tolt Hill Bridge To 500' WEST OF SR-203 | Capacity Minor |  |  | Medium | 2 | \$1,478 | Reconstruct Roadway |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GR-98 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Fish Hatchery Rd From SR-202 To SR-202 | Safety |  | Low |  | 5 | \$301 | Construct Guardrail |
| RC-34 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 284th Ave NE From NE 100 St to NE Carnation Farm Rd | Preservation |  |  |  | 5 | \$179 | Armor Shoulders @\$100/cyd |
| GR-28 | Rural - N/O I-90 | David Powell Rd From Preston-Fall City Rd SE To End of route | Safety |  | Low |  | 4 | \$184 | Construct Guardrail |
| BR-909B | Rural - S/O I-90 | Clough Creek (Kimball <br> Creek) Bridge \#909B <br> SE 141st St Crossing <br> Clough Creek | Bridge | Low |  |  | 5 | \$172 | Construct short-span bridge |
| BR-359C | Rural - N/O I-90 | Lake Dorothy Overflow Bridge \#359C SE Lake Dorothy Rd Crossing Overflow | Bridge | Medium |  |  | 4 | \$2,000 | Construct short-span bridge |
| OP-RD-54 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Middle Fork <br> Snoqualmie River Rd From 476 Ave SE to 496 Ave SE | Safety |  |  |  | 4 | \$3,182 | Provide safety improvements within the couplet portion of the roadway, keeping the width 18 to 20 feet. There will be no vertical curve corrections or major drainage improvements. |



| GR-82 | Rural - N/O I-90 | 384th Ave SE From SE 92ND St To North Bend Way | Safety |  |  |  | 3 | \$13 | Construct Guardrail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GR-94 | Rural - N/O I-90 | NE 124th St From SR 203 To End of route | Safety |  |  |  | 4 | \$272 | Construct Guardrail |
| BR-61B | Rural - N/O I-90 | Fish Hatchery Bridge \#61B SE Fish Hatchery Rd Crossing drainage ditch | Bridge | Low |  |  | 5 | \$765 | Construct short-span bridge |
| RC-57 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Old Cascade Highway at Miller River | Preservation |  | Low |  | 3 | \$4,590 | Overflow is working as designed |
| 200215 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Tate Creek Bridge \#122N On SE 73RD St Crossing TATE Creek | Bridge | High |  |  | 4 | \$172 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| RC-55 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Money Creek Rd at Money Creek | Preservation |  | Low |  | 4 | \$689 | 20ft tall wall |
| OP-RD-4 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Ames Lake Rd From Union Hill To SR-202 | Capacity Minor |  |  | Medium | 2 | \$8,282 | Realign Roadway--Widen Travel Lanes--Pave Shoulders |
| 200313 | Rural - N/O I-90 | SE Middle Fork Snoq River Rd at HSE 49040 | Drainage |  |  |  | 4 | \$0 | Drainage improvement |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 믐 } \\ & \text { 高 } \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 금 } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { 「 } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | F |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग్N } \\ & \stackrel{2}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{3} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CORRIDOR: Mt. Si Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NM-5065 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Mt Si Rd From Mt. Si Trail To NW Corner of Section 8 | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low | 3 | \$2,622 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| GR-75 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Mt Si Rd From North Bend city limits To End of route | Safety |  |  |  |  | Low |  |  |  | 3 | \$13 | Construct Guardrail |
| NM-5064 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Mt Si Rd From North Bend city limits To Mt. Si Trail | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Medium | 3 | \$1,000 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| OP-RD-39 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Mt Si Rd From 452 Ave SE To 800' E | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  | Low |  |  | 3 | \$416 | Realign Roadway |
| CORRIDOR: NE 80 St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RC-36 | Rural - N/O I-90 | NE 80th St From West Snoqualmie Valley Rd to Ames Lake-Carnation Rd | Preservation |  |  |  | Medium |  |  |  |  | 3 | \$1,307 | Armor Shoulders @ $100 /$ cyd |
| OP-RD-40 | Rural - N/O I-90 | NE 80th St From West Snoqualmie Valley Rd To Ames Lake Rd | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  | Low |  |  | 3 | \$3,877 | Reconstruct Roadway |
| CORRIDOR: NE Cherry Valley Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR-5007 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Kelly Rd Bridge \#5007 <br> On Kelly Rd NE Crossing drainage ditch | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$765 | Construct short-span bridge |



## CORRIDOR: Preston-Fall City Rd

| OP-INT-88 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Preston-Fall City Rd \& | Operations | Low | 1 | \$650 | Realign Intersection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SE 43 St |  |  |  |  | Realign Intersection |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pri | ties |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | PAA | Location | Need | $\cdots$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 毋 } \\ & \stackrel{\ddot{\omega}}{\stackrel{1}{*}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 㓵 } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 뀽 } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 긎 } \\ & \text { 第 } \\ & \text { 雲 } \end{aligned}$ | Cost－000 | Comments |
| 200310 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Preston－Fall City RD SE Slide Repair | Reconstruction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \＄2，443 | See King County Capital Improvement Program（CIP） document or website for detailed project description including scope． |
| 200209 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Preston－Fall City／High Pt Way \＆SE 82nd St | Operations |  | High |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \＄1，205 | See King County Capital Improvement Program（CIP） document or website for detailed project description including scope． |
| NM－5060 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Preston－Fall City Rd From Regional Trail Crossing to SR－202 | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | High | 1 | \＄9，105 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| BR－186J | Rural－N／O I－90 | Fire Station Bridge \＃186J On Preston－Fall City Rd Crossing Unimproved undercrossing | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \＄2，000 | Construct short－span bridge |
| ITS－14 | Rural－N／O I－90 | Preston Fall City Rd ITS From I－90 to SR 202 | ITS | Medium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \＄5，525 | Provide Intelligent <br> Transportation System improvements which could include cameras；weather monitoring；vehicle detection |




| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\oplus}{\gtrless} \end{aligned}$ |  | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग्र } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 200213 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Woodinville-Duvall Rd \& W. Snoqualmie Valley Rd | Safety |  | Low |  |  |  | High |  |  | 1 | \$2,381 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| RC-39 | Rural - N/O I-90 | West Snoqualmie Valley Rd From NE 124th St to Ames Lake-Carnation Rd | Preservation |  |  |  | High |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$3,236 | 10ft wall@\$30/psf (Length $=4,700 \mathrm{ft}$ ) |
| 200113 | Rural - N/O I-90 | West Snoqualmie Valley Rd From NE 124th St to NE WoodinvilleDuvall Rd | Preservation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$2,319 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| CORRIDOR: Woodinville-Duvall Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR-1136B | Rural - N/O I-90 | Duvall Slough \#1136B <br> On Woodinville-Duvall <br> Rd Crossing Duvall Slough | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$0 | Upgrade bridge rail and repair concrete deck |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | ज | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 믐 } \\ & \text { 㑒 } \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग్N } \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| County Subarea: Soos Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CORRIDOR: 132-140 Ave SE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SW-91 | Urban - <br> Fairwood PAA | 140 Ave SE \& SE 184 St (Carriage Crest Elementary School) | Operations |  | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$660 | Install traffic signal |
| BR-3109B | Urban - <br> Fairwood PAA | Lake Youngs Way Bridge \#3109B SE Lake Youngs Way Crossing Soos Creek | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$765 | Construct short-span bridge |
| SW-81 | Urban - <br> Fairwood PAA | 140 Ave SE \& SE 200 St | Operations |  | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| CORRIDOR: Lake Holm Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITS-30 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Lake Holm Rd ITS <br> From 148th Ave SE to Auburn Black Diamond Rd. | ITS | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$49 | Provide Intelligent Transportation System improvements which could include a speed warning system |
| OP-RD-44 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Lake Holm Rd From Near Lake Holm (east) | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  | Medium |  |  | 2 | \$871 | Widen Roadway |
| CORRIDOR: Misc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR-3109 | Urban - NE Kent PAA | Soos Creek Bridge \#3109 On SE 224th St Crossing Soos Creek | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | \$765 | Replace Bridge |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  |  |  | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ज | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 毋u } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 号 |  |  |  | \% \% \% \% |  |  |  |  |


| RC-50 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 196th Ave SE From SE 161 St to SE 170 St | Preservation |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$930 | Retaining wall $10{ }^{\prime}$ high |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NM-9966 | Urban - <br> Fairwood PAA | Lake Youngs Pipeline Pathway From vicinity of 155 Pl SE | Nonmotorized |  |  |  | Low | 5 | \$36 | Construct AC walkway |
| BR-3109A | Urban - NE Kent PAA | Soos Creek Bridge \#3109A SE 216th St Crossing Soos Creek | Bridge | High |  |  |  | 4 | \$765 | Construct short-span bridge |
| 300810 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Alvord T Bridge \#3130 | Bridge | High |  |  |  | 5 | \$1,048 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| OP-INT-90 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 196th Ave SE \& SE 192 St | Operations |  |  | Medium |  | 2 | \$1,843 | Reconstruct Intersection-Improve Sight Distance-Turn Channels |
| NM-5015 | Urban - Not in primary PAAs | Green River Rd SE From S 258 St To SE 277 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  | Medium | 3 | \$8,796 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| NM-9965 | Urban - <br> Fairwood PAA | SE 183rd St From 142 Ave SE to 147 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  |  |  | Low | 5 | \$235 | Construct sidewalk (South Side) |
| GR-88 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 156th Ave SE From SE 240th St To CITY LIMIT | Safety |  | Low |  |  | 5 | \$13 | Construct Guardrail |
| OP-INT-102 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 148th Ave SE \& SE 308th St | Operations |  |  | Low |  | 3 | \$735 | Improve Sight Distance |


| OP-RD-27 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 164th Ave SE From SE 240 St To SE 248 St | Capacity Minor |  |  | Medium | 3 | \$134 | Pave Shoulders |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DR-9 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 164th Ave SE south of SE 224th St | Drainage |  |  |  | 3 | \$0 | Drainage improvement |
| CORRIDOR: Petrovitsky Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OP-INT-106 | Urban - <br> Fairwood PAA | Petrovitsky Rd \& SE 192nd St | Operations |  |  | Low | 1 | \$735 | Provide SE Bound Left Turn Lane |
| SW-13 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Petrovitsky Rd \& Sweeney Rd | Operations | High |  |  | 1 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| CP-15 | Urban - <br> Fairwood PAA | 140th Ave SE \& Petrovitsky Rd | Capacity Major |  |  | TBD | 1 | \$14,442 | Widen all legs of intersection to increase capacity. For project costs see project HAL-14 |
| OP-INT-85 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Petrovitsky Rd SE \& SE 184 St Crossing | Operations |  |  | Low | 1 | \$392 | Pedestrian Crossing Signals |
| HAL-59 | Urban - <br> Fairwood PAA | SE 176th St \& SE Petrovitsky Rd | Safety | Low |  |  | 1 | \$1,821 | Eastbound dual lefts and PO phasing |
| RC-3 | Urban - <br> Fairwood PAA | Petrovitsky Rd From 134 Ave SE to 143 Ave SE | Reconstruction |  | High |  | 1 | \$2,466 | Road Reconstruction |
| HAL-81 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 196th Ave SE \& SE <br> Petrovitsky Rd | Safety | Medium |  |  | 1 | \$1,000 | Construct Roundabout |


| SW-18 | Urban - <br> Fairwood PAA | Petrovitsky \& 162nd Pl SE | Operations | High |  | 1 | \$0 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HAL-14 | Urban - <br> Fairwood PAA | 140th Ave SE \& SE Petrovitsky Rd | Safety | Medium |  | 1 | \$0 | Widen all legs of intersection to increase capacity. |
| CORRIDOR: SE 208-212 St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SW-17 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 148th Ave SE \& SE 208th St | Operations | Medium |  | 2 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| NM-5038 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 208th St From 132th Ave SE To 148th Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  | Medium | 3 | \$301 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| BR-3110 | Urban - NE Kent PAA | Soos Creek Bridge \#3110 On SE 208 St Crossing Soos Creek | Bridge | Medium |  | 3 | \$900 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |

## CORRIDOR: SE 224 St

| SW-20 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 148th Ave SE \& SE 224th St | Operations | Medium |  | 2 | \$912 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NM-5071 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 232 St From 196 <br> Ave SE St To SR-18 | Nonmotorized |  | High | 3 | \$1,068 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| NM-4036 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 224th St From 172 <br> Ave SE to 180 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  | TBD | 3 | \$49 | Widen walkway |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | $$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 詈 } \\ & \text { ion } \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग्रे } \\ & \stackrel{i}{3} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CORRIDOR: SE 240 St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NM-5068 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 240th St From 148 Ave SE (south side) To 164 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Medium | 2 | \$603 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| NM-4033 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 164th Ave SE From SE 224 St to SE 240 St | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TBD | 3 | \$86 | Widen pathway and improve lighting |
| NM-5069 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 240th St From 164 Ave SE To 180 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Medium | 2 | \$603 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| NM-5032 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 240th St From 196 Ave SE To SR-18 | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Medium | 2 | \$1,809 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| NM-4041 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 240th St From 156 Ave SE to 172 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TBD | 2 | \$24 | Widen walkway |
| SW-56 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 164th Pl SE \& SE 240th St | Operations |  | Medium |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| DR-10 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Little Soos Creek at SE 240th St (west of MB \#17401) | Drainage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$0 | Drainage improvement |

## County Subarea: Tahoma/Raven Heights

CORRIDOR: 276 Ave SE

| NM-4065 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 276th Ave SE From SE 231 ST to 300' north | Nonmotorized |  | TBD | 1 | \$54 | Construct pathway (West Side) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RC-125 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 276 Ave SE From SR <br> 18 To SE 200 St | Reconstruction | Medium |  | 1 | \$1,088 | Reconstruct roadway 1.18 mile |
| 400513 | Rural - N/O I-90 | Carey Creek at 276th <br> Ave SE (Mainstem) | Drainage |  |  | 1 | \$0 | Drainage improvement |
| RC-126 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 276 Ave SE From SE <br> 200 St To SE 216 St | Reconstruction | Medium |  | 1 | \$1,258 | Reconstruct roadway 1.0 mile |
| RC-127 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 276 Ave SE From SE <br> 216 St To SE Summit <br> Landsburg Rd | Reconstruction | Medium |  | 1 | \$3,547 | Reconstruct roadway 2.59 miles |

## CORRIDOR: Auburn-Black Diamond Rd

| RC-138 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Auburn Black Diamond Rd From SE Green Valley Rd To SE Lake Holm Rd | Reconstruction | High | 1 | \$253 | Reconstruct roadway . 23 mile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RC-139 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Auburn-Black Diamond Rd From SE Lake Holm Rd To 148 Way SE | Reconstruction | Medium | 1 | \$3,338 | Reconstruct roadway 2.18 miles |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | ज |  |  | Priorities |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{2}{0} \\ & \stackrel{i}{\gtrless} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 긎 } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { © } \\ & \underline{0} \end{aligned}$ | Cost－000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 謌 } \\ & \text {. } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \text { D⿳⺈⿴囗⿰丨丨⿹勹巳刂丶 } \\ & \text { 르․ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RC－137 | Rural－S／O I－90 | Auburn Black Diamond Rd From SR 18 To SE Green Valley Rd | Reconstruction |  |  |  | High |  |  |  |  | 1 | \＄227 | Reconstruct roadway ． 18 mile |
| ITS－27 | Rural－S／O I－90 | Auburn－Black Diamond ITS From At Kent－ Black Diamond Rd and SE Lake Holm Rd | ITS | Low |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \＄145 | Provide Intelligent Transportation System improvements which could include advanced intersection warning system；slide detection |

CORRIDOR：Covington－Sawyer Rd

| OP－RD－41 | Rural－S／O I－90 | Covington－Sawyer Rd From Thomas Rd To 216 Ave SE | Capacity Minor |  | Medium |  | 2 | \＄8，284 | Realign Roadway |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SW－11 | Rural－S／O I－90 | 188 Ave SE \＆ Covington－Sawyer Road | Operations | Low |  |  | 2 | \＄1，395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| 400713 | Rural－S／O I－90 | SE Covington Sawyer Rd from 179 Pl SE to 181 Ave SE | Safety | High |  |  | 2 | \＄1，000 | Add eastbound left turn lane at 181st Ave SE，improve sight distance widen shoulders and add rumble strips．Consider realigning 179th Ave SE intersection， adding two－way left turn lane from 179th Ave SE to 181st Ave SE，and improving superelevation on horizontal curve east of 181st Ave SE． |
| NM－4054 | Rural－S／O I－90 | Covington－Sawyer Rd From 188 Ave SE to 192 Pl SE | Nonmotorized |  |  | TBD | 2 | \＄161 | Construct walkway（North Side） |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | 戸 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 詈 } \\ & \text { ion } \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग्र } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 400613 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 181 Ave SE \& SE Covington Sawyer Rd | Safety |  | High |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$1,000 | Add eastbound left turn lane at 181st Ave SE, improve sight distance widen shoulders and add rumble strips. Consider realigning 179th Ave SE intersection, adding two-way left turn lane from 179th Ave SE to 181st Ave SE, and improving superelevation on horizontal curve east of 181st Ave SE. |
| 3P-9973 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Covington-Sawyer Rd From 164 Pl SE to 180 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low | 2 | \$0 | Construct AC shoulder (South Side) |
| SW-58 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 164th Pl SE \& SE <br> Covington-Sawyer Rd | Operations |  | Medium |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| RC-6 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Covington-Sawyer Rd From Covington C/L to 216 Ave SE | Reconstruction |  |  |  | High |  |  |  |  | 2 | \$1,171 | Road Rehabilitation |
| NM-9974 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Covington-Sawyer Rd <br> From east of 181 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Low | 2 | \$191 | Construct AC shoulder (North Side) |
| CORRIDOR: Green Valley Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 400311 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Green Valley Rd Bridge \#3020 SE Greeen Valley Rd Crossing drainage ditch | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | \$765 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |



| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ & \stackrel{P}{\gtrless} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 믐 } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ज |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 뀨 } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{3} \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RC-120 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Issaquah-Hobart Rd SE From Cedar Grove Rd To SE 156 St | Reconstruction |  |  |  | High |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,624 | Reconstruct roadway 1.2 miles |
| ITS-15 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Issaquah-Hobart Rd ITS From Cedar Grove Rd to SR 18 | ITS | Medium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$706 | Provide Intelligent Transportation System improvements which could include cameras; vehicle detection; data stations; message signs; weather station |
| RC-121 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Issaquah-Hobart Rd SE <br> From SE 156 St To SR $18$ | Reconstruction |  |  |  | High |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$2,779 | Reconstruct roadway 2.27 miles |
| 200612 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Issaquah-Hobart Rd SE from SE 111 St to SE 113 St | Safety |  | High |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,000 | Add a two-way left turn lane and rumble strips. |
| OP-RD-22 | Rural - S/O I-90 | May Valley Rd From SE 128 WY To Issaquah-Hobart Rd | Capacity Minor |  |  |  |  |  | Medium |  |  | 1 | \$7,732 | Widen Travel Lanes |
| OP-INT-124 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Issaquah-Hobart Rd \& May Valley Rd | Operations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$660 | Construct Roundabout. <br> Project costs included in CIP \# 400510 |
| CORR | IDOR: | t-Black Diamon | Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NM-5035 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Kent-Black Diamond Rd From SR-18 To SE Lake Holm Rd | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Medium | 1 | \$2,012 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |



| 400600 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Berrydale Overcrossing \#3086OX \& 290th | Bridge | High |  |  | 1 | \$3,456 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OP-INT-97 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Thomas Rd \& KentBlack Diamond Rd | Operations |  |  | Medium | 1 | \$756 | Realign Intersection |
| 400116 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Kent-Black Diamond Rd at SE 292nd St (Jenkin Creek) | Drainage |  |  |  | 1 | \$0 | Drainage improvement |
| BR-3082 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Covington Creek Bridge \#3082 Auburn-Black Diamond Road Crossing Covington Creek | Bridge | High |  |  | 1 | \$765 | Construct short-span bridge |
| BR-3084 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Covington Creek Bridge \#3084 | Bridge | High |  |  | 1 | \$0 | Replace Bridge |
| CORRIDOR: Kent-Kangley Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OP-INT-92 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Kent-Kangley Rd \& Kanaskat-Retreat Rd | Operations |  |  | High | 2 | \$1,622 | Realign Intersection--Turn Channels. For project costs see project HAL-75 |
| RC-133 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Kent Kangley Rd From Landsburg Rd SE To Retreat Kanaskat Rd SE | Reconstruction |  | Medium |  | 2 | \$1,896 | Reconstruct roadway 1.18 miles |
| RC-132 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Kent Kangley Rd From <br> City Limit To <br> Landsburg Rd | Reconstruction |  | Low |  | 2 | \$1,881 | Reconstruct roadway 1.14 miles |


| 400212 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Kent-Kangley Rd, west of \#26428 | Drainage |  |  | 2 | \$0 | Drainage improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HAL-72 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Kent Kangley Rd \& Landsburg Rd SE | Safety | High |  | 1 | \$0 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| HAL-75 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Kent-Kangley \& RetreatKanaskat Rd | Safety | Medium |  | 2 | \$1,000 | Realine eastbound and northbound approaches, roundabout |
| OP-INT-121 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Kent-Kangley Rd \& Landsburg Rd | Operations | High |  | 1 | \$735 | Traffic Signal or roundabout. For project costs see project HAL-72 |
| NM-5051 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Black Diamond- <br> Ravensdale Rd From SR-169 To KentKangley Rd | Nonmotorized |  | High | 2 | \$2,172 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |

## CORRIDOR: Lake Holm Rd

| SW-27 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Auburn-Black Diamond \& Green Valley Rd | Operations | Low | 1 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RC-140 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Lake Holm Rd From Auburn Black Diamond Rd To 147 Ave SE | Reconstruction | High | 2 | \$1,741 | Reconstruct roadway 1.64 miles |
| CORRIDOR: Maxwell Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR-3099 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Maxwell Rd Bridge \#3099 225th Ave SE Crossing Gem Creek | Bridge | Low | 5 | \$765 | Construct short-span bridge |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ఱ } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\gtrless} \end{aligned}$ |  | Priorities |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 융 } \\ & \stackrel{\mathrm{N}}{\underset{\sim}{\gtrless}} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 긲 } \\ & \text { 「 } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 쿠 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BR-3202 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Maxwell Rd Bridge \#3202 225th Ave SE Crossing cattle UX | Bridge |  |  | Low |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | \$765 | Construct short-span bridge |
| CORRIDOR: Misc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 400610 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Fifteen Mile Creek <br> Bridge \#1384B | Bridge |  |  | High |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | \$1,843 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| RC-128 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Landsburg Rd SE From SE Summit Landsburg Rd To SE Kent Kangley Rd | Reconstruction |  |  |  | Medium |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,547 | Reconstruct roadway 1.27 miles |
| 400309 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Summit-Landsburg Rd <br> From City Limit To <br> Landsburg Rd SE | Reconstruction |  |  |  | High |  |  |  |  | 3 | \$8,747 | See King County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document or website for detailed project description including scope. |
| DR-7 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Dry Creek at NE 40 St | Drainage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | \$0 | Drainage improvement |
| GR-54 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Lake Francis Rd From Cedar Grove Rd To SE 192nd St | Safety |  |  |  |  | High |  |  |  | 3 | \$17 | Construct Guardrail |
| NM-5034 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 168th Way (Ave) SE <br> From Kent-Black <br> Diamond Rd To Auburn- <br> Black Diamond Rd | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Medium | 3 | \$724 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |



| NM-5050 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Sweeney Rd SE From 196 Ave SE To SE 232 St | Nonmotorized |  |  | High | 3 | \$1,005 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NM-9980 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 168th Way SE \& Covington Creek | Nonmotorized |  |  | Medium | 3 | \$55 | Widen bridge and construct sidewalk (East Side) |
| BR-3097 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Dorre Don Way Bridge \#3097 Dorre Don Way Crossing drainage ditch | Bridge | Medium |  |  | 4 | \$765 | Construct short-span bridge |
| GR-95 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Courtney Rd From Kanaskat-Kangley Rd To End of route | Safety |  | Low |  | 4 | \$13 | Construct Guardrail |
| GR-93 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 200th St From 276th Ave SE To 244th Ave SE | Safety |  | Low |  | 3 | \$35 | Construct Guardrail |
| NM-0202 | Rural - S/O I-90 | 195th Ave SE From Lake Morton DR SE to SE 320 St | Nonmotorized |  |  | Medium | 3 | \$80 | Construct AC shoulder (West Side) |
| GR-113 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE Lake Walker Rd From 316 Ave SE to W Lake Walker Dr SE | Safety |  |  |  | 4 | \$15 | Construct Guardrail |
| GR-57 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 208th St From 276th Ave SE To End of Route | Safety |  | Low |  | 4 | \$383 | Construct Guardrail |
| RC-135 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Black Diamond Ravensdale From SE Kent Kangley Rd To 268 Ave SE | Reconstruction | Medium |  |  | 2 | \$640 | Reconstruct roadway . 6 mile |



## CORRIDOR: Petrovitsky Rd

| ITS-24 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Petrovitsky/Sweeney Rd SE ITS From 151st Ave SE and SR 18 | ITS | Medium |  |  |  | 1 | \$8,441 | Provide Intelligent Transportation System improvements which could include vehicle detection; cameras; fiber optic communications, weather station |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CORRIDOR: Retreat-Kanaskat Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR-63 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Cumberland-Kanaskat Rd From RetreatKanaskat Rd To SE 352nd St | Safety |  |  | High |  | 2 | \$127 | Construct Guardrail |
| RC-136 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Retreat Kanaskat Rd SE <br> From SE Kent Kangley <br> Rd To Cumberland <br> Kanaskat Rd | Reconstruction |  | High |  |  | 2 | \$3,408 | Reconstruct roadway 3.04 miles |
| OP-INT-91 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Stampede Pass Rail \& Hudson Rd RR Crossing | Operations |  |  |  | Medium | 4 | \$82 | Reconstruct Intersection-- <br> Traffic Signal |
| OP-INT-72 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Stampede Pass Rail \& Greenriver Headworks Rd | Operations |  |  |  | Low | 2 | \$82 | Reconstruct Intersection-- <br> Traffic Signal |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  |  |  | Priorities |  |  |  |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ज |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 䍗 } \\ & \text { R } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ग्र } \\ & \stackrel{2}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR-11 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 309th St From Cumberland-Kanaskat To End of route | Safety |  |  |  |  | Low |  |  |  | 2 | \$111 | Construct Guardrail |
| OP-INT-93 | Rural - S/O I-90 | Kanaskat-Kangley Rd \& Cumberland-Kanaskat Rd | Operations |  |  |  |  |  | High |  |  | 2 | \$402 | Realign Intersection |

## CORRIDOR: SE 216 St

| OP-INT-95 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 216th Way \& Dorre Don Way | Operations |  | Low |  | 2 | \$312 | Turn Channels |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RC-129 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 216 Way From SR 169 To 244 Ave SE | Reconstruction | High |  |  | 2 | \$1,564 | Reconstruct roadway 1.13 miles |
| RC-130 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 216 St From 244 Ave SE To 276 Ave SE | Reconstruction | High |  |  | 2 | \$2,144 | Reconstruct roadway 2.0 miles |
| NM-9967 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 216th Way From SR-169 to Dorre Don Way SE | Nonmotorized |  |  | Medium | 2 | \$92 | Construct sidewalk (East Side) |
| NM-5049 | Rural - S/O I-90 | SE 216th St From Approx. 232 Ave SE To 276 Ave SE | Nonmotorized |  |  | High | 2 | \$1,086 | Provide Nonmotorized Facility |

## County Subarea: Vashon

CORRIDOR: Misc

| GR-79 | Rural - Vashon | Cemetery Rd From Westside Highway SW To Vashon Highway SW | Safety | Low |  | 3 | \$13 | Construct Guardrail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RC-58 | Rural - Vashon | Cresent Dr SW From West Side Highway to SW Cove Road | Preservation | Low |  | 2 | \$574 | Rebuild Roadway with New Base |
| NM-9959 | Rural - Vashon | 107th Ave SW From <br> SW 228 St to SW 232 St | Nonmotorized |  | Medium | 5 | \$276 | Construct AC shoulder (West Side) |
| RC-59 | Rural - Vashon | Kingsbury Beach Rd From SW 234 St to 80 Ave SW | Preservation | Low |  | 5 | \$574 | Rebuild Roadway with New Base |
| 300413 | Rural - Vashon | SW Cemetery Rd / Beall Rd From 107 Ave SW to SW 184 ST | Nonmotorized |  |  | 2 | \$0 | Construct 5-6 foot wide asphalt pathway |
| DR-8 | Rural - Vashon | SW 171 Place@ 9334 (Gorsuch Creek) | Drainage |  |  | 5 | \$0 | Drainage improvement |
| NM-9975 | Rural - Vashon | Tahlequah Rd From near Tahlequah Ferry Dock | Nonmotorized |  | Low | 1 | \$184 | Construct AC shoulder (South Side) |
| NM-4079 | Rural - Vashon | Cemetery Rd From Beall Rd SW to \# 9303 | Nonmotorized |  | TBD | 2 | \$80 | Improve pathway (South Side) |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need |  |  |  | Priorities |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { ² } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ज |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & \text { 를 } \\ & \text { 으․ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RC-15 | Rural - Vashon | Vashon Highway <br> Seawall From 115th <br> Ave SW To SW 240th Pl | Preservation |  |  |  | High |  |  |  |  | 1 | \$15,606 | Perform feasibility studies, preliminary engineering, environmental documents, design and construct a solution to the major vulnerabilities of the Vashon Highway. In particular a solution to the 3200 linier feet of failing seawalls along Quartermaster Harbor will be part of this project. |
| GR-83 | Rural - Vashon | Point Robinson Rd From Dockton Rd SW To End of route | Safety |  |  |  |  | Low |  |  |  | 3 | \$421 | Construct Guardrail |
| RC-54 | Rural - Vashon | Govenor's Lane From 99 Ave SW to 96 Ave SW | Preservation |  |  |  | Low |  |  |  |  | 4 | \$2,783 | Replace seawall @ $2500 / \mathrm{ft}$ |
| GR-70 | Rural - Vashon | Beall Rd SW From SW Cemetery Rd To SW Bank Rd | Safety |  |  |  |  | High |  |  |  | 3 | \$18 | Construct Guardrail |
| NM-0106 | Rural - Vashon | Bank Rd From 97 Pl SW to Beall Rd SW | Nonmotorized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | High | 3 | \$584 | Construct AC shoulder (South Side) |
| GR-65 | Rural - Vashon | Cove Road From <br> Westside Highway SW <br> To Vashon Highway SW | Safety |  |  |  |  | High |  |  |  | 2 | \$22 | Construct Guardrail |
| GR-69 | Rural - Vashon | Wax Orchard Rd SW From SW 220th St To Vashon Highway SW | Safety |  |  |  |  | High |  |  |  | 2 | \$545 | Construct Guardrail |


| Number | PAA | Location | Need | F |  |  | Priorities |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{\text { N}}{0} \\ & \stackrel{ᅲ}{\gtrless} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Cost-000 | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| RC-10 | Rural - Vashon | Dockton Road <br> Preservation - Seawall <br> From SW Ellisport <br> Road to Portage Way <br> SW | Preservation |  | High |  |  | 5 | \$31,285 | Construct Seawall |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RC-27 | Rural - Vashon | Quartermaster Drive Seawall From 1/4 mi. east of Monument Rd SW To Dockton Rd SW | Preservation |  | Medium |  |  | 2 | \$379 | Replace seawall |
| GR-97 | Rural - Vashon | 91st Ave SW From SW 156th St To Gorsuch Rd | Safety |  |  | Low |  | 3 | \$13 | Construct Guardrail |
| GR-106 | Rural - Vashon | SW 156th St From 91st Ave SW To Vashon Highway SW | Safety |  |  | Low |  | 3 | \$13 | Construct Guardrail |
| CORRIDOR: Vashon Island Highway-N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NM-4080 | Rural - Vashon | Vashon Island Hwy From \#20120 to Metro bus stop | Nonmotorized |  |  |  | TBD | 1 | \$80 | Construct separated pathway (East Side) |
| NM-0203 | Rural - Vashon | Vashon Hwy SW / SW Bank Rd From SW 177 St to 98 PI SW | Nonmotorized |  |  |  | High | 1 | \$80 | Construct sidewalk (East and South Sides) |
| SW-2 | Rural - Vashon | Vashon Highway \& SW Bank Rd | Operations | High |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |
| SW-96 | Rural - Vashon | Vashon Highway \& SW Cemetery Rd | Operations | High |  |  |  | 1 | \$1,395 | Intersection Operational Improvement |




CORRIDOR: Westside Highway

| GR-73 | Rural - Vashon | Westside Highway SW <br> From SW 144th St To SW 196th St | Safety | Low | 2 | \$103 | Construct Guardrail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GR-76 | Rural - Vashon | Westside Highway SW From SW 220th St To SW 196th St | Safety | Low | 2 | \$32 | Construct Guardrail |
| RC-56 | Rural - Vashon | Westside Highway SW From Cresent Dr SW to Cresent Dr SW | Preservation | Low | 2 | \$458 | Rebuild Roadway with New Base |
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| OP-RD-20 | 26 |
| OP-RD-21 | 28 |
| OP-RD-22 | 57 |
| OP-RD-24 | 25 |
| OP-RD-25 | 24 |
| OP-RD-26 | 24 |
| OP-RD-27 | 50 |
| OP-RD-3 | 19 |
| OP-RD-37 | 40 |
| OP-RD-38 | 38 |
| OP-RD-39 | 42 |
| OP-RD-4 | 41 |
| OP-RD-40 | 42 |
| OP-RD-41 | 54 |
| OP-RD-44 | 48 |
| OP-RD-45 | 4 |
| OP-RD-46 | 12 |
| OP-RD-48 | 23 |
| OP-RD-5 | 6 |
| OP-RD-50 | 31 |
| OP-RD-52 | 5 |
| OP-RD-53 | 56 |
| OP-RD-54 | 40 |
| OP-RD-7 | 4 |
| OP-RD-8 | 3 |
| OP-RD-9 | 10 |
| RC-10 | 66 |
| RC-113 | 46 |
| RC-116 | 7 |
| RC-118 | 56 |
| RC-119 | 56 |
| RC-120 | 57 |
| RC-121 | 57 |
| RC-125 | 53 |
| RC-126 | 53 |
| RC-127 | 53 |
| RC-128 | 60 |
| RC-129 | 63 |
| RC-130 | 63 |

## Project Index <br> Page Number by Project Number

| Project <br> Number | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| RC-132 | 58 |
| RC-133 | 58 |
| RC-135 | 61 |
| RC-136 | 62 |
| RC-137 | 54 |
| RC-138 | 53 |
| RC-139 | 53 |
| RC-140 | 59 |
| RC-142 | 56 |
| RC-15 | 65 |
| RC-150 | 46 |
| RC-151 | 2 |
| RC-16 | 37 |
| RC-17 | 45 |
| RC-18 | 45 |
| RC-19 | 11 |
| RC-24 | 21 |
| RC-27 | 66 |
| RC-3 | 50 |
| RC-32 | 45 |
| RC-34 | 40 |
| RC-35 | 14 |
| RC-36 | 42 |
| RC-37 | 37 |
| RC-38 | 39 |
| RC-39 | 47 |
| RC-40 | 43 |
| RC-41 | 31 |
| RC-42 | 22 |
| RC-43 | 9 |
| RC-44 | 7 |
| RC-48 | 35 |
| RC-49 | 19 |
| RC-50 | 49 |
| RC-51 | 6 |
| RC-53 | 16 |
| RC-54 | 65 |
| RC-55 | 41 |
| RC-56 | 67 |


| Project <br> Number | Page <br> Number |
| :--- | ---: |
| RC-57 | 41 |
| RC-58 | 64 |
| RC-59 | 64 |
| RC-6 | 55 |
| RC-7 | 43 |
| RC-8 | 11 |
| SW-10 | 9 |
| SW-11 | 54 |
| SW-13 | 50 |
| SW-17 | 51 |
| SW-18 | 51 |
| SW-2 | 66 |
| SW-20 | 51 |
| SW-21 | 20 |
| SW-27 | 59 |
| SW-51 | 62 |
| SW-53 | 33 |
| SW-55 | 52 |
| SW-56 | 19 |
| SW-57 | 55 |
| SW-58 | 23 |
| SW-61 | 20 |
| SW-73 | 48 |
| SW-81 | 48 |
| SW-91 | 22 |
| SW-94 | 66 |
| SW-96 |  |

# Project Index <br> Page Number by Project Name 

| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1st Ave S From SW 108 St to SW 112 St | 31 |
| 1st Ave S./Myers Way ITS From SW 100th St. to SW 112th St. | 29 |
| 1st Ave S From S 102 St to S 108 St | 29 |
| 1st Ave S. \& Seattle C/L to Burien C/L | 31 |
| 6th Ave S From Glendale Way/S112 St To Myers Way (1 Ave S) | 31 |
| 8th Ave S From S Seatlle City Limit To Glendale Way S/S 112 St | 30 |
| 8th Ave SW From SW 108 St To SW Roxbury St | 30 |
| 11th Ave SW From SW 102 St to SW 106 St | 32 |
| 14th Ave SW From SW 110 St to SW 116 St | 32 |
| 16th Ave SW \& SW 106 St | 29 |
| 17th Ave SW From SW 100th St to SW 104th St | 29 |
| 22nd Place $S$ From Des Moines Mem. Dr. S to Burien City Limits | 32 |
| 28th Ave S From S 348th St To SR 161 | 21 |
| 28th Ave SW From SW Roxbury St to SW 102 St | 32 |
| 28th Ave SE \& S 360th St | 23 |
| 28th Ave S From S 349 St to S360 ST | 20 |
| 32nd Ave S From S 360 St to S 368 St | 19 |
| 34 Ave S \& S. 288 St | 22 |
| 34th Ave S From S 288 St to S 298 St | 20 |
| 36th PI S/ S 294 St/ 45 PI S From S 298 St to S 288 St | 20 |
| 38th Ave S From S 304 St to S 307 St | 20 |
| 38th Ave S From S 344 St to Fishing Access Rd | 19 |
| 40th Ave S \& S 272nd St | 22 |
| 43 PI S \& S 288 St (T J High School) | 22 |
| 46 PI S \& S 321 St | 20 |
| 48th Ave S \& S 288th St | 22 |
| 51st Ave S \& S 316th St. | 20 |


| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| 58th Place S./56th Place S. From West Valley Rd to West Valley Rd | 19 |
| 68th Ave S From Martin Luther King Way to Renton City Limits | 31 |
| 69th Ave S / S 125 St From S 128 St to 70 PI S | 31 |
| 75th Ave S / S 122 St From Renton Ave S to 80 Ave S | 32 |
| 76th Ave S From S 120 St to S 124 St | 30 |
| 76th Ave S From S 115 St to S 116 St | 30 |
| 76th Ave S From S 124 St To S 128 St | 30 |
| 78th Ave S From S 120 St to S 124 St | 30 |
| 78th Ave S From S 126 St To Renton Ave S | 30 |
| 80th Ave S From S 114 St to S 118 St | 32 |
| 87th Ave S \& S 124 St | 31 |
| 88th Ave NE From NE 198 St to NE 205 St | 35 |
| 91st Ave SW From SW 156th St To Gorsuch Rd | 66 |
| 107th Ave SW From SW 228 St to SW 232 St | 64 |
| 112 PI NE From Bothell south city limits to 112 Lane NE | 36 |
| 140th Ave SE \& SE Petrovitsky Rd | 51 |
| 140th Ave SE \& Petrovitsky Rd | 50 |
| 140 Ave SE \& SE 200 St | 48 |
| 140 Ave SE \& SE 184 St (Carriage Crest Elementary School) | 48 |
| 146th PI NE From SR-202 to 155 Ave NE | 35 |
| 148th Ave SE \& SE 308th St | 49 |
| 148th Ave SE \& SE 224th St | 51 |
| 148th Ave SE \& SE 208th St | 51 |
| 148th Ave NE From NE 154 St to NE 167 St | 36 |
| 152nd PI NE / 158 Ave NE From NE 160 St to NE 165 St | 35 |
| 154th PI SE / SE 142 PI From SE Jones Rd To 156 Ave SE | 24 |
| 154th Ave SE From SE 39 St to SE 42 St | 25 |

# Project Index <br> Page Number by Project Name 

| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| 156th Ave SE ITS From Renton City Limts to SR 169 | 24 |
| 156th Ave SE From SE 240th St To CITY LIMIT | 49 |
| 160th Ave SE \& SE 128th St | 27 |
| 164th PI SE \& SE 240th St | 52 |
| 164th Ave SE \& SE 128th St | 27 |
| 164th Ave SE From SE 240 St To SE 248 St | 50 |
| 164th Ave SE From SE 224 St to SE 240 St | 52 |
| 164th Ave SE south of SE 224th St | 50 |
| 164th PI SE \& SE CovingtonSawyer Rd | 55 |
| 164th Ave SE ITS From SE 128th St. to SE May Valley Rd. | 25 |
| 168th Way (Ave) SE From KentBlack Diamond Rd To Auburn-Black Diamond Rd | 60 |
| 168th Ave SE \& SE 128th St | 26 |
| 168th Ave NE From NE 143 St to NE 145 St | 35 |
| 168th Way SE \& Covington Creek | 61 |
| 168th Ave NE From NE 143 PI To NE 140 St | 35 |
| 172nd Ave NE From Redmond City Limits To NE 138 St | 4 |
| 175 Ave SE \& SE 128 St | 26 |
| 178th Ave NE From NE 131 St to NE 136 St | 36 |
| 181 Ave SE \& SE Covington Sawyer Rd | 55 |
| 188 Ave SE \& Covington-Sawyer Road | 54 |
| 194th Ave NE \& Woodinville-Duvall Rd | 9 |
| 195th Ave SE From Lake Morton DR SE to SE 320 St | 61 |
| 196th Ave SE From SE 400th St To SE 456th St | 17 |
| 196th Ave SE From SE 161 St to SE 170 St | 49 |
| 196th Ave SE \& SE Petrovitsky Rd | 50 |
| 196th Ave SE \& SE 192 St | 49 |
| 200th Ave SE From SE 400 St to 0.17 miles north | 16 |
| 204th Ave SE / SE 159th St From SE 156 St to 205 Ave SE | 25 |


| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| 208th Ave NE \& NE Union Hill Rd | 7 |
| 208th Ave NE \& Union Hill Rd | 5 |
| 212th Ave SE From SE 384 St To SE 358 St | 15 |
| 212th Ave SE \& SE 400 St | 15 |
| 218th Ave SE \& Green Valley Rd | 16 |
| 228th Ave SE From SE 400th St To SE 452ND St | 16 |
| 232nd Ave NE From NE 142 St To Old Woodinville-Duvall Rd | 4 |
| 238th Ave NE \& Union Hill Rd | 6 |
| 238th Ave NE \& NE 63rd PL | 6 |
| 244th Ave SE From SR-18 To SE $196 \text { St }$ | 62 |
| 244th Ave SE From Enumclaw City Limit To SE 400 St | 16 |
| 276 Ave SE From SE 216 St To SE Summit Landsburg Rd | 53 |
| 276th Ave SE From SE 231 ST to 300' north | 53 |
| 276 Ave SE From SR 18 To SE 200 St | 53 |
| 276 Ave SE From SE 200 St To SE 216 St | 53 |
| 284th Ave NE From NE 100 St to NE Carnation Farm Rd | 40 |
| 284th Ave SE Bridge \#3049 284th Ave SE Crossing Boise Creek | 15 |
| 284th Ave SE From Mud Mountain Dam Rd To SR-410 | 15 |
| 284th Ave SE From SE 416 St To SR-410 | 15 |
| 308th Ave SE From SE 64 St to SE 87 PI | 37 |
| 312th Ave SE Bridge \#228F On West Snoqualmie River Rd Crossing drainage ditch | 45 |
| 308th Ave SE From SE 87th PI To SE 64th St | 37 |
| 322nd Ave NE From NE Big Rock Rd to NE 130 St | 43 |
| 384th Ave SE From SE 92ND St To North Bend Way | 41 |
| 428th Ave SE From SE Reinig Rd to SE 108 St | 37 |
| 436 Ave SE/Cedar Falls Rd From I90 To Wilderness Rim | 38 |

Page Number by Project Name

| Project <br> Name | Page <br> Number |
| :--- | :---: |
| Allen Rd From 13800 block (city <br> limit) to 146 Ave SE | 24 |
| Allen Rd (148 SE) North Side From <br> 146 Ave SE To SE 36 St | 24 |
| Alvord T Bridge \#3130 |  |$\quad 49$


| Project <br> Name | Page <br> Number |
| :--- | ---: |
| Bear Creek Rd From Avondale Rd <br> To Mink Rd |  |
| Bear Creek Rd From Mink Rd To <br> NE 133 St |  |
|  | 3 |
| Bear Creek Rd \& Mink Rd |  |$\quad 3$

Project Index
Page Number by Project Name

| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| Cove Road From Westside Highway SW To Vashon Highway SW | 65 |
| Covington Creek Bridge \#3082 Auburn-Black Diamond Road Crossing Covington Creek | 58 |
| Covington Creek Bridge \#3084 | 58 |
| Covington-Sawyer Rd From 164 PI SE to 180 Ave SE | 55 |
| Covington-Sawyer Rd From 188 Ave SE to 192 PI SE | 54 |
| Covington-Sawyer Rd From Covington C/L to 216 Ave SE | 55 |
| Covington-Sawyer Rd From east of 181 Ave SE | 55 |
| Covington-Sawyer Rd From Thomas Rd To 216 Ave SE | 54 |
| Cresent Dr SW From West Side Highway to SW Cove Road | 64 |
| Cumberland-Kanaskat Rd From Retreat-Kanaskat Rd To SE 352nd St | 62 |
| David Powell Rd From Preston-Fall City Rd SE To End of route | 40 |
| Dockton Road Preservation - <br> Seawall From SW Ellisport Road to Portage Way SW | 66 |
| Dorre Don Way Bridge \#3097 Dorre Don Way Crossing drainage ditch | 61 |
| Dry Creek at NE 40 St | 60 |
| Du Rocher Rd From 172 PI NE To Woodinville-Duvall Rd | 35 |
| Duvall Slough \#1136B On Woodinville-Duvall Rd Crossing Duvall Slough | 47 |
| East Ames Lake Dr NE From W Ames Lake Dr NE to W Ames Lake Dr NE | 4 |
| Evans Creek Bridge \#952A On NE Union Hill Rd Crossing Evans Creek | 6 |
| Fifteen Mile Creek Bridge \#1384A On Issaquah-Hobart Rd Over Fifteen Mile Creek | 56 |
| Fifteen Mile Creek Bridge \#1384B | 60 |


| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fire Station Bridge \#186J On Preston-Fall City Rd Crossing Unimproved undercrossing | 44 |
| Fish Hatchery Bridge \#61B SE Fish Hatchery Rd Crossing drainage ditch | 41 |
| Fish Hatchery Rd From SR-202 To SR-202 | 40 |
| Govenor's Lane From 99 Ave SW to 96 Ave SW | 65 |
| Green River Rd SE From S 258 St To SE 277 St | 49 |
| Green Valley Rd Bridge \#3020 SE Greeen Valley Rd Crossing drainage ditch | 55 |
| Green Valley Rd Bridge \#3022 | 56 |
| Greenwater River Bridge \#3050A SE 496th PI Crossing Packard Creek | 11 |
| High Point Regional Trail from Trail intersection w/High Point Way (W) to 300 Ave SE (E) | 39 |
| Issaquah Fall City Rd \& Klahanie Dr SE | 13 |
| Issaquah-Fall City Rd ITS From Issaquah City Limits to SR-202 | 13 |
| Issaquah-Fall City Rd Ph III | 13 |
| Issaquah-Fall City Rd/Duthie Hill Rd From Klahanie Blvd To 272 PI SE | 13 |
| Issaquah-Hobart Rd From Issaquah City Limits to May Valley Rd | 56 |
| Issaquah-Hobart Rd \& Cedar Grove Rd | 56 |
| Issaquah-Hobart Rd \& May Valley Rd | 57 |
| Issaquah-Hobart Rd ITS From Cedar Grove Rd to SR 18 | 57 |
| Issaquah-Hobart Rd SE From Cedar Grove Rd To SE 156 St | 57 |
| Issaquah-Hobart Rd SE From City Limit To SE May Valley Rd | 56 |
| Issaquah-Hobart Rd SE From SE 156 St To SR 18 | 57 |
| Issaquah-Hobart Rd SE From SE May Valley Rd To Cedar Grove Rd | 56 |

Project Index
Page Number by Project Name

| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| Issaquah-Hobart Rd SE from SE 111 St to SE 113 St | 57 |
| Juanita-Woodinville Way NE From 112th Ave NE to NE 145th St | 36 |
| Kanaskat-Kangley Rd \& Cumberland-Kanaskat Rd | 63 |
| Kelly Rd Bridge \#5007 On Kelly Rd NE Crossing drainage ditch | 42 |
| Kent Kangley Rd \& Landsburg Rd SE | 59 |
| Kent Kangley Rd From City Limit To Landsburg Rd | 58 |
| Kent Kangley Rd From Landsburg Rd SE To Retreat Kanaskat Rd SE | 58 |
| Kent-Black Diamond Rd From SR18 To SE Lake Holm Rd | 57 |
| Kent-Black Diamond Rd at SE 292nd St (Jenkin Creek) | 58 |
| Kent-Kangley \& Retreat-Kanaskat Rd | 59 |
| Kent-Kangley Rd \& KanaskatRetreat Rd | 58 |
| Kent-Kangley Rd \& Landsburg Rd | 59 |
| Kent-Kangley Rd, west of \#26428 | 59 |
| Kingsbury Beach Rd From SW 234 St to 80 Ave SW | 64 |
| Lake Alice Road at 339 Ave SE | 39 |
| Lake Dorothy Overflow Bridge \#359C SE Lake Dorothy Rd Crossing Overflow | 40 |
| Lake Francis Rd From Cedar Grove Rd To SE 192nd St | 60 |
| Lake Holm Rd From Auburn Black Diamond Rd To 147 Ave SE | 59 |
| Lake Holm Rd From Near Lake Holm (east) | 48 |
| Lake Holm Rd ITS From 148th Ave SE to Auburn Black Diamond Rd. | 48 |
| Lake Joy Bridge \#5034A | 39 |
| Lake Kathleen Rd SE \& SE 128th St | 28 |


| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| Lake Youngs Pipeline Pathway From vicinity of 155 PI SE | 49 |
| Lake Youngs Way Bridge \#3109B SE Lake Youngs Way Crossing Soos Creek | 48 |
| Landsburg Rd SE From SE Summit Landsburg Rd To SE Kent Kangley Rd | 60 |
| Little Soos Creek at SE 240th St (west of MB \#17401) | 52 |
| Maxwell Rd Bridge \#3202 225th Ave SE Crossing cattle UX | 60 |
| Maxwell Rd Bridge \#3099 225th Ave SE Crossing Gem Creek | 59 |
| May Creek Bridge \#593C | 25 |
| May Valley Rd From Coal Creek Parkway To SR-900 | 25 |
| May Valley Rd From SE 128 WY To Issaquah-Hobart Rd | 57 |
| May Valley Road From SR-900 To SE 128 WY | 24 |
| May Valley Road ITS From SR 900 to Issaquah Hobart Rd | 25 |
| Middle Fork Rd From North Bend city limits To 496th Ave SE | 38 |
| Middle Fork Snoqualmie River Rd From 476 Ave SE to 496 Ave SE | 40 |
| Military Rd \& S 320th St | 18 |
| Military Rd \& S 342nd St | 18 |
| Military Rd \& S 360th St | 19 |
| Military Rd S \& S 320th St | 18 |
| Military Rd S From S 340 St to S 342 St | 19 |
| Military Rd S \& S 352 St | 18 |
| Military Rd S \& S 374 St | 19 |
| Military Rd S From l-5 to S 272 St | 18 |
| Military Rd S From Peasley Canyon Way S To SR-161 | 18 |

Project Index
Page Number by Project Name

| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| Mill Pond Rd From SE Stearns Rd to SE Reinig Rd | 37 |
| Mill Pond Rd From SR-202 To Reinig Rd | 37 |
| Miller River Bridge replacement | 11 |
| Mink Rd From Bear Creek Rd To Woodinville-Duvall Rd | 4 |
| Money Creek Rd at Money Creek | 41 |
| Mt Si Rd From North Bend city limits To End of route | 42 |
| Mt Si Rd From 452 Ave SE To 800' E | 42 |
| Mt Si Rd From Mt. Si Trail To NW Corner of Section 8 | 42 |
| Mt Si Rd From North Bend city limits To Mt. Si Trail | 42 |
| Mud Mountain Rd at 29000 block | 16 |
| NE 100 St From West Snoqualmie Valley Rd to 284 Ave NE | 39 |
| NE 106 St \& 314 Ave NE | 38 |
| NE 124th St From SR 203 To End of route | 41 |
| NE 124th St \& West Snoqualmie Valley Rd | 46 |
| NE 124th St. ITS Ph II From SR 202 to Avondale Road NE | 5 |
| NE 132nd St / NE 128th St From 184 Ave NE to 196 Ave NE | 5 |
| NE 145th St From 160 PI NE to 168 Ave NE | 35 |
| NE 146th PI \& 155 Ave NE | 35 |
| NE 165th St From 179 PI NE To 183 Ave NE | 4 |
| NE 175 / NE 172 PI From 164 Ave NE To 174 Ave NE | 36 |
| NE 195 St \& 324 Ave NE | 38 |
| NE 50th St From 192 PI NE to Sahalee Way NE | 14 |
| NE 50th St From 214 Ave NE to SR-202 | 14 |


| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| NE 80th St From West Snoqualmie Valley Rd To Ames Lake Rd | 42 |
| NE 80th St From West Snoqualmie Valley Rd to Ames Lake-Carnation Rd | 42 |
| Neal Rd SE From SR-203 to SR203 | 43 |
| Neal Rd SE Sinkhole Repair | 43 |
| Newaukum Creek Bridge \#3040A | 15 |
| Newport Way From 138 Ave SE To Eastgate Park Entrance | 26 |
| Newport Way From 13800 block(Bell. C/L) to 153 Ave SE | 25 |
| Newport Way From 150 Ave SE to 152 Ave SE | 26 |
| Newport Way From 152 Ave SE to 161 Ave SE | 26 |
| Newport Way \& 164 Ave SE | 26 |
| Newport Way at 16630 | 26 |
| North Fork Rd SE From Wagners Bridge To Wagners Bridge | 11 |
| North Fork Road Shoulder Repair | 11 |
| Novelty Hill Rd From Redmond C/L to 244 Ave NE | 7 |
| Novelty Hill Rd \& 206th Ave NE | 7 |
| Novelty Hill Rd \& 208 Ave NE | 8 |
| Novelty Hill Rd from 206 Ave NE to 208 Ave NE | 8 |
| Novelty Hill Rd ITS, Phase II From 208 Ave NE to West Snoqualmie Road | 9 |
| Novelty Hill Rd Phase II From 195 Ave NE to Trilogy Parkway NE | 8 |
| Novelty Hill Road \& Redmond Road | 9 |
| Old Cascade Highway at Miller River | 41 |
| Old Woodinville-Duvall Rd From Woodinville-Duvall Rd To Woodinville-Duvall Rd | 10 |

Project Index
Page Number by Project Name

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Project } \\ \text { Name }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Page } \\ \text { Number }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Paradise Lake Rd From } \\ \text { Woodinville-Duvall Rd To County } \\ \text { Line }\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Patterson Creek Bridge \#180L On } \\ \text { SE 28 St Crossing Patterson Creek }\end{array}$ | 4 |
|  | 13 |
| Peasley Canyon Rd \& S 321st St |  |$] 21$


| Project Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| Rainier Ave S ITS From Seattle City Limits to Renton City Limits | 33 |
| Reinig Rd From Mill Pond Rd To 396th Dr SE | 37 |
| Reinig Rd From Mill Pond Rd To 428th Ave SE | 37 |
| Renton Ave S From 68 Ave S to 74 Ave S | 33 |
| Renton Ave S \& 76 Ave S | 33 |
| Renton Ave S ITS From Rainier Ave S to Rainier Ave N | 33 |
| Retreat Kanaskat Rd SE From SE Kent Kangley Rd To Cumberland Kanaskat Rd | 62 |
| Roxbury St From 4th Ave SW to 30th Ave SW | 34 |
| Roxbury Street From 28 Ave SW to 30 Ave SW | 33 |
| S 120th St From 76 Ave S to 80 Ave S | 32 |
| S 128 St From 64 Ave S to 76 Ave S | 31 |
| S 277 St \& 55 Ave S | 22 |
| S 304th St From 32nd Ave S To 37th Ave S | 21 |
| S 312th St Study From 28th Ave S to 51st Ave S (Federal Way Lead) | 20 |
| S 321st St \& Peasley Canyon Rd | 19 |
| S 32nd Ave S Study From S 312th St to Military Road (Federal Way Lead) | 21 |
| S 360th St From Enchanted Pkwy S to 21 PI S | 23 |
| S 360th St From SR-161 to 28th Ave S | 23 |
| S Langston Street to SR-900 | 32 |
| SE 128th St From 168 Ave SE To E OF 169 Ave SE | 28 |
| SE 128th St. ITS From 148th Ave SE to May Valley Road | 27 |
| SE 149th St / 442 Ave SE From 437 PI SE to 443 Ave SE | 38 |

# Project Index <br> Page Number by Project Name 

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Project } \\ \text { Name }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Page } \\ \text { Number }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| SE 176th St \& SE Petrovitsky Rd |  |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { SE 183rd St From 142 Ave SE to } \\ \text { 147 Ave SE }\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { SE 200th St From 276th Ave SE To } \\ \text { 244th Ave SE }\end{array}$ | 49 |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { SE 208th St From 132th Ave SE To } \\ \text { 148th Ave SE }\end{array}$ | 61 |
| SE 208th St From 276th Ave SE To |  |
| End of Route |  |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { SE 216 St From 244 Ave SE To } \\ \text { 276 Ave SE }\end{array}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { SE 216 Way From SR 169 To 244 } \\ \text { Ave SE }\end{array}$ | 61 |
| SE 216th St From Approx. 232 Ave |  |
| SE To 276 Ave SE |  |$]$


| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| SE 408th St Bridge \#3056A On SE 408th St Crossing drainage ditch | 17 |
| SE 432nd St From 268th Ave SE To 284th Ave SE | 17 |
| SE 432nd St From 284 Ave SE To 268 Ave SE | 17 |
| SE 440 St at 27602 | 17 |
| SE 456th Way From 196th Ave SE To 228th Ave SE | 16 |
| SE Covington Sawyer Rd from 179 PI SE to 181 Ave SE | 54 |
| SE Green Valley Rd From 243 Ave SE To SR-169 | 56 |
| SE Lake Walker Rd From 316 Ave SE to W Lake Walker Dr SE | 61 |
| SE Middle Fork Snoq River Rd at HSE 49040 | 41 |
| SE Middle Fork Snoqualmie River Road From east of couplet (MP 2.7) to the campground (MP 12.4) | 38 |
| Snoqualmie Valley Rd Bridge \#5009B | 46 |
| Soos Creek Bridge \#3109 On SE 224th St Crossing Soos Creek | 48 |
| Soos Creek Bridge \#3109A SE 216th St Crossing Soos Creek | 49 |
| Soos Creek Bridge \#3110 On SE 208 St Crossing Soos Creek | 51 |
| South Park Bridge \#3179 RTID \& 14th/16th Ave S. | 32 |
| Stampede Pass Rail \& Greenriver Headworks Rd | 62 |
| Stampede Pass Rail \& Hudson Rd RR Crossing | 62 |
| Stossell Creek Way From Swan Mill Road to the Snohomish County Line | 12 |
| Summit-Landsburg Rd From City Limit To Landsburg Rd SE | 60 |
| SW 102 St From 8 Ave SW To 17 <br> Ave SW | 29 |
| SW 104 St From 15 Ave SW To 17 <br> Ave SW | 29 |
| SW 112th St From 1 Ave S to 4 Ave SW | 34 |

Page Number by Project Name

| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| SW 112th St From 16 Ave SW to 26 Ave SW | 34 |
| SW 112th St From Ambaum Blvd SW to 10 Ave SW | 34 |
| SW 156th St From 91st Ave SW To Vashon Highway SW | 66 |
| SW 171 Place@ 9334 (Gorsuch Creek) | 64 |
| SW Cemetery Rd / Beall Rd From 107 Ave SW to SW 184 ST | 64 |
| Sweeney Rd SE From 196 Ave SE To SE 232 St | 61 |
| Tahlequah Rd From near Tahlequah Ferry Dock | 64 |
| Tate Creek Bridge \#122N On SE 73RD St Crossing TATE Creek | 41 |
| Thomas Rd \& Kent-Black Diamond Rd | 58 |
| Tolt Hill Rd From Tolt Hill Bridge to SR-203 | 45 |
| Tolt Hill Rd From Tolt Hill Bridge To 500' WEST OF SR-203 | 40 |
| Trilogy Pkwy \& NE Novelty Hill Rd | 8 |
| Union Hill Rd From 196 Ave NE to 206 PI NE | 7 |
| Union Hill Rd From 229 Ave NE to 238 Ave NE | 6 |
| Union Hill Rd From 238 Ave NE To 258 Ave NE | 7 |
| Union Hill Rd From 208 Ave NE To 238 Ave NE | 6 |
| Union Hill Road ITS From 196 Ave NE to 238 Ave NE | 6 |
| Union Hill Road ITS Ph II From 238th Ave NE to Ames Lake Rd. | 6 |
| Upper Preston Rd From SE 97th St to SE 97th St | 39 |
| Vashon Highway \& SW Bank Rd | 66 |
| Vashon Highway \& SW Cemetery Rd | 66 |
| Vashon Highway Seawall From 115th Ave SW To SW 240th PI | 65 |
| Vashon Hwy SW / SW Bank Rd From SW 177 St to 98 PI SW | 66 |


| Project <br> Name | Page Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| Vashon Island Hwy From \#20120 to Metro bus stop | 66 |
| Veazie-Cumberland Rd/Palmer Rd From SE 386 St To SE 416 St | 15 |
| Wax Orchard Rd SW From SW 220th St To Vashon Highway SW | 65 |
| West Snoqualmie River Rd From NE Tolt Hill Rd To SE 24th St | 45 |
| West Snoqualmie River Rd From SE 24th St To Tolt Hill Rd | 45 |
| West Snoqualmie River Rd Bridge \#916A West Snoqualmie River Rd Crossing slough | 45 |
| West Snoqualmie River Road/Tolt Hill Road ITS From WSRR from SE 24th St to Tolt Hill and Tolt from SR203 to SWRR | 45 |
| West Snoqualmie Valley Rd From NE 124th St to NE WoodinvilleDuvall Rd | 47 |
| West Snoqualmie Valley Rd From NE 124 St To NE Novelty Hill Rd | 46 |
| West Snoqualmie Valley Rd From NE 124th St to Ames LakeCarnation Rd | 47 |
| West Snoqualmie Valley Rd From NE 80 St To Ames Lake Carnation Rd | 46 |
| West Snoqualmie Valley Rd From Snohomish County Line to Woodinville-Duvall Rd | 46 |
| West Snoqualmie Valley Rd NE ITS From NE Woodinville Duvall Road to Ames Lake Rd | 46 |
| Westside Highway SW From Cresent Dr SW to Cresent Dr SW | 67 |
| Westside Highway SW From SW 144th St To SW 196th St | 67 |
| Westside Highway SW From SW 220th St To SW 196th St | 67 |
| Woodinville-Duvall Rd From 171st Ave NE to Avondale Rd | 9 |
| Woodinville-Duvall Rd From Avondale Rd To SR-203 | 10 |
| Woodinville-Duvall Rd From Old Woodinville-Duvall Rd to W. Snoqualmie Valley Rd | 9 |
| Woodinville-Duvall Rd \& Avondale Rd NE | 3 |

Page Number by Project Name

| Project <br> Name | Page <br> Number |
| :--- | :---: |
| Woodinville-Duvall Rd \& W. <br> Snoqualmie Valley Rd |  |


| $\|c\|$ <br>  <br>  <br> Project <br> Name | Page <br> Number |
| :--- | ---: |
| Woodinville-Duvall Rd ITS, Phase I <br> \& II From 168th Ave NE to City of <br> Duvall |  |

## Appendix A

 Growth Targets|  | 2006-2031 | 2006-2031 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JURISDICTION | HH Target | Empl Target |
| Algona | 190 | 210 |
| Auburn | 9,620 | 19,350 |
| Beaux Arts | 3 | 3 |
| Bellevue | 17,000 | 53,000 |
| Black Diamond | 1,900 | 1,050 |
| Bothell | 3,000 | 4,800 |
| Burien | 3,900 | 4,600 |
| Carnation | 330 | 370 |
| Clyde Hill | 10 | 0 |
| Covington | 1,470 | 1,320 |
| Des Moines | 3,000 | 5,000 |
| Duvall | 1,140 | 840 |
| Enumclaw | 1,425 | 735 |
| Federal Way | 8,100 | 12,300 |
| Hunts Point | 1 | 0 |
| Issaquah | 5,750 | 20,000 |
| Kenmore | 3,500 | 3,000 |
| Kent | 7,800 | 13,200 |
| Kirkland | 7,200 | 20,200 |
| Lake Forest Park | 475 | 210 |
| Maple Valley | 1,800 | 2,000 |
| Medina | 19 | 0 |
| Mercer Island | 2,000 | 1,000 |
| Milton | 50 | 160 |
| Newcastle | 1,200 | 735 |
| Normandy Park | 120 | 65 |
| North Bend | 665 | 1,050 |
| Pacific | 285 | 370 |
| Redmond | 10,200 | 23,000 |
| Renton | 14,835 | 29,000 |
| Sammamish | 4,000 | 1,800 |
| SeaTac | 5,800 | 25,300 |
| Seattle | 86,000 | 146,700 |
| Shoreline | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| Skykomish | 10 | 0 |
| Snoqualmie | 1,615 | 1,050 |
| Tukwila | 4,800 | 15,500 |
| Woodinville | 3,000 | 5,000 |
| Yarrow Point | 14 | 0 |
| CITIES TOTAL | 217,227 | 417,918 |
| KING-Seashore | 1,360 | 2,530 |
| PAA's | 12,930 | 3,950 |
| BCUPD's | 910 | 3,580 |
| Unclaimed Urban unincorp | 650 | 90 |
| UNINC KING CO | 15,850 | 10,150 |
| KING CO TOTAL | 233,077 | 428,068 |

## Appendix B

> City and State Projects

## KC Traffic Model

## Future Year Road Network

 Project List| On | From | To | Network Edit | Lead Sponsor | Main County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| "I" Street NE Corridor | 52nd St | Harvey Rd | Add new 5-lane arterial | Auburn | King County |
| A Street | W Main St | 14th St S | Add new 3-lane arterial | Auburn | King County |
| F St. SE | 4th Ave SE | Auburn Way S | Widen to 3 lanes | Auburn | King County |
| M St NE | E Main St | 8th St NE | Widen to 5 lanes | Auburn | King County |
| M St SE | E Main St | Auburn Way S | Widen to 5 lanes | Auburn | King County |
| S 277th St | Auburn Way N | Green River | Widen to 5 lanes | Auburn | King County |
| 106th/108th Ave NE | Main Street | NE 12th St | 3 GP \& 1 HOV NB on 108th, 3 GP SB on 106th | Belleuve | King County |
| 110th Avenue NE | NE 4th St | NE 8th St | Widen to 5 lanes | Bellevue | King County |
| 150th Ave SE | SE 36th St | SE Newport Wy | Widen to 7 lanes | Bellevue | King County |
| Bellevue Way | South Bellevue P\&R | I-90 | Add HOV lanes in each direction | Bellevue | King County |
| NE 10th St | 112th Ave NE | 116th Ave NE | Add new 3-lane arterial | Bellevue | King County |
| NE 2nd St | Bellevue Way | 112th Ave NE | Widen to 5 lanes | Bellevue | King County |
| NE 8th St | 108th Ave NE | 106th Ave NE | Add WB GP lane | Bellevue | King County |
| Northup Way | 120th Ave NE | 124th Ave NE | Widen to 5 lanes | Bellevue | King County |
| Annexation Road | Auburn-Black Diamond Rd | future South Connector | Add two-lane arterial | Black Diamond | King County |
| Lake Sawyer Extension | Auburn-Black Diamond Rd | Annexation Road | Add two-lane arterial | Black Diamond | King County |
| Lawson <br> Connector/Southeast <br> Loop Connector | SR-169 @ Roberts | SR-169 @ Railroad Ave | Add two-lane arterial | Black Diamond | King County |
| North Connector | SR-169 | Morgan St | Add two-lane arterial | Black Diamond | King County |
| Pipeline Rd | Auburn-Black Diamond Rd | SR-169 | Add two-lane arterial | Black Diamond | King County |
| South Connector | Annexation Road | SR-169 | Add two-lane arterial | Black Diamond | King County |
| SR-169 | Lawson St | Baker St | Widen to three lanes | Black Diamond | King County |
| NE 195th Street | North Creek Pkwy | I-405 | Add WB lane | Bothell | King County |
| Ambaum Blvd SW / S. 156th St. | S 153rd St | Des Moines Dr. | Road diet to 3 lanes | Burien | King County |
| 168th Ave SE extension | SR-516 | Convington Way SE | Add new 3-lane roadway | Covington | King County |
| 172nd Ave SE | SE 240th St | SR-516 | Add new 2-lane collector (no connection w. SR-18) | Covington | King County |
| 180th Ave SE Ext. | SE 267 Pl | SR-516 |  | Covington | King County |
| Covington Way | SR-18 | Wax Rd. | Widen to 4 lanes | Covington | King County |
| SE 256th St | 160th Av SE | 168th PI SE | Widen to 5 lanes | Covington | King County |
| SR-516 | Wax Rd | 192nd Ave SE | Widen to 5 lanes | Covington | King County |
| Wax Rd | SR-516 | Covington Way | Widen to 4 lanes | Covington | King County |
| Kent-Des Moines Rd (SR-516) | Marine View Dr | Pacific Hwy S | Add TWLT lane | Des Moines | King County |
| SR 410 | 244th Ave SE | Farman St | Widen to 3 lanes | Enumclaw | King County |
| 16th Ave S | SR 99 | SR 18 | Add HOV lanes | Federal Way | King County |
| 1st Ave S | S 348th St | S 356th St | Widen to 5 lanes | Federal Way | King County |
| 32nd Ave S | Military Road | S 320th St | Extend and widen to 3 lanes | Federal Way | King County |
| Military Rd S | S 288th St | S 304th St | Widen to 3 lanes | Federal Way | King County |
| S 272nd St | Military Rd | 26th Ave S | Add TWLT lane | Federal Way | King County |
| S 288th St | 18th Ave S | Military Rd S | Widen to 5 lanes | Federal Way | King County |
| S 288th St | Military Road | I-5 | Widen to 5 lanes | Federal Way | King County |
| S 312th St | 23rd Ave S | 28th Ave S | Widen to 5 lanes | Federal Way | King County |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { S 312th St / I-5 } \\ & \text { Interchage } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 28th Ave S | 51st Ave S | Add 5-lane road with interchange at l-5 | Federal Way | King County |
| S 320th St | 1st Ave S | 8th Ave S | Add HOV lanes in each directio | Federal Way | King County |
| S 320th St | 8th Ave S | SR 99 | Add HOV lanes in each direction | Federal Way | King County |

KC Traffic Model
Future Year Road Network Project List

| On | From | To | Network Edit | Lead Sponsor | Main County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S 320th St | 1st Ave S | 21st Ave SW | Add HOV lanes in each direction. | Federal Way | King County |
| S 320th St | 25th Ave S | 32nd Ave S | Add HOV lanes | Federal Way | King County |
| S 336th | 26th PI SW | Hoyt Rd SW | Widen to 5 lanes | Federal Way | King County |
| S 336th / S 348th St | 1st Ave S | 21st Ave SW | Add HOV lanes in each direction | Federal Way | King County |
| S 348th St | 9th Ave S | SR 99 | Add HOV lanes in each direction | Federal Way | King County |
| S 348th St | 1st Ave S | 9th Ave S | Add HOV lanes in each direction | Federal Way | King County |
| SR 161 | SR 18 | Milton Road | Add HOV lanes in each direction | Federal Way | King County |
| SR 99 | S 284th St | SR 509 (Dash Pt Rd) | Add HOV lanes in each direction | Federal Way | King County |
| SR 99 | SR 509 (Dash Pt Rd) | S 312th St | Add HOV lanes in each direction | Federal Way | King County |
| SR 99 | S 340th St | S 356th St | Add HOV lanes in each direction | Federal Way | King County |
| SR-509 | 47th Ave SW | Pierce Co Line | Add TWLTL | Federal Way | King County |
| SR-509 | 1st Ave S | 21st Ave SW | Add TWLTL | Federal Way | King County |
| SR-509 | 30th Ave S | 47th Ave SW | Add TWLTL | Federal Way | King County |
| SR-99 | S 284th St | S. 272nd St. | Add 1 HOV lane in each direction | Federal Way | King County |
| 17th Ave NW | NW Sammamish Rd | 1-90 | Add 1 SWB lane | Issaquah | King County |
| E Lake Sammamish Pkwy | SE 56th St | 1-90 | Widen to 5 lanes | Issaquah | King County |
| E Lake Sammamish Pkwy | 1-90 | Issaquah-Fall City Rd | Add NB GP lane | Issaquah | King County |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { I-90 crossing (221st } \\ & \text { PI. SE) } \end{aligned}$ | SE 56th St | NE Gilman Blvd | Add new 3-lane arterial | Issaquah | King County |
| Maple St | SR 900 | Newport Way | Add new 5-lane road | Issaquah | King County |
| Newport Way | W. Sunset Wy | NW Maple St | Widen to 3 lanes | Issaquah | King County |
| NW Juniper St. | Newport Way | Rainier Blvd. | Widen to 3 lanes | Issaquah | King County |
| SE Newport Way | SR-900 | SE 54th St | Widen to 3 lanes | Issaquah | King County |
| SR-900 | Newport Way | S. of Talus Dr. | Widen to 5 lanes | Issaquah | King County |
| SR-900 | Newport Way | 1-90 | Widen to 5 lanes | Issaquah | King County |
| SR-900 | NW Maple | NW Gilman Blvd | Add 1 NB lane | Issaquah | King County |
| 68th Ave NE | Simonds Rd | SR 522 | Add NB HOV lane | Kenmore | King County |
| 68th Ave NE | Sammamish River Bridge | NE 175th St | Widen to 5 lanes | Kenmore | King County |
| Juanita Drive NE | NE 170th St | NE 145th St | Widen to 3 lanes | Kenmore | King County |
| NE 181st St @ 68th Ave NE |  |  | Realign east leg to create a four-way intersection. | Kenmore | King County |
| 132nd Ave SE | SE 272nd ST | SE 256th ST | Widen to 5 lanes | Kent | King County |
| 132nd Ave SE | SE 240th St | SE 256th St | Widen to 3 lanes | Kent | King County |
| 84th Ave S | SR-167 | S 212th St | Widen to 6 lanes | Kent | King County |
| S 208th St | 84th Ave SE | 96th Way SE | Wide to 5 lanes | Kent | King County |
| S 228th St | Military Rd | 64th Ave S | Add new 5-lane arterial, and widen Military Road to 5 lanes south to SR516. | Kent | King County |
| S 272nd St | 26th Ave S | SR-99 | Add HOV lanes in each direction | Kent | King County |
| SR-181 Widing | Meekder St | Aprox S 208th St | Widen to 7 lanes | Kent | King County |
| W Meeker St | Washington Ave | 64th Ave S | Widen to 5 lanes | Kent | King County |
| W Meeker St | Green R Bridge | SR 516 | Widen to 5 lanes | Kent | King County |
| W Valley Hwy | SR-516 | Green River Bridge | Widen to 4 lanes | Kent | King County |
| W Valley Hwy | Hawley Rd | S 272 St | Widen to 5 lanes | Kent | King County |
| Issaquah-Fall City <br> Road | SE 48th St | Klahanie Blvd | Widen to 5 lanes | King County | King County |

KC Traffic Model
Future Year Road Network Project List

| On | From | To | Network Edit | Lead Sponsor | Main County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Issaquah-Hobart Road | SE 125th PI | 100' s/o SE 127th St | Widen to 3 lanes | King County | King County |
| Novely Hill Road | Redmond ECL | Redmond Ridge UPDs |  | King County | King County |
| Snoqualmie Ridge Drive | I-90 | SE 96th St | Widen to 4 lanes | King County | King County |
| 120th Ave NE | NE 128th St | NE 132nd St | Widen to 5 lanes | Kirkland | King County |
| 124th Ave NE | NE 85th St | NE 116th St | Widen to 3 lanes | Kirkland | King County |
| 124th Ave NE | NE 116th St | NE 124th St | Widen to 5 lanes | Kirkland | King County |
| NE 120th St extension | Slater Ave NE | 124th Ave NE |  | Kirkland | King County |
| NE 124th St | 116th Ave NE | 132nd PL NE | Add 1 HOV lane in each direction | Kirkland | King County |
| NE 128th St extension (NE 128th St Interchange) | 116th Ave NE | Totem Lk Blvd | Add new 3-lane arterial w HOV connectn to I-405 | Kirkland | King County |
| SR-169 | SE 271st St | SR-516 | Widen to 5 lanes | Maple Valeey | King County |
| SE 272nd St Bypass | 232nd Ave SE | SR-169 |  | Maple Valley | King County |
| SR 169 | SR 516 | SE 264th | Widen to 5 lanes | Maple Valley | King County |
| SR-169 | Witte Rd | S 253rd St | Widen to 5 lanes | Maple Valley | King County |
| SR-169 | SE 264th St | SE 253rd St | Widen to 5 lanes | Maple Valley | King County |
| Coal Creek Pkwy (Phase I \& II) | SE 72nd St | SE 95th St (Renton City Limits) | Widen to 5 lanes | Newcastle | King County |
| W Valley Hwy | Pacific north city line | Jovita Blvd | Add TWLT lane | Pacific | King County |
| 160th PI NE | NE 90th St | SR-202 | extend arterial | Redmond | King County |
| 185th Ave NE/188th Ave NE | Union Hill Road | SR-202 | Add two new n -s arterials, and e-w local roads (see NHR sensitivity test). | Redmond | King County |
| Bear Creek Pkwy Extension | Leary Way | 159th PI NE | Add new 2-lane principal arterial | Redmond | King County |
| Bel-Red Rd | NE 30th St | NE 40th St | Widen to 5 lanes | Redmond | King County |
| Cleveland St | SR-908 | SR-202 | Convert to 1 lane each direction | Redmond | King County |
| East Lake Sammamish Pkwy | Redmond Way | 187th AVE NE | Widen to 3 lanes | Redmond | King County |
| NE 116th St | 167th PI NE | 179th PI NE | Widen to 3 lanes | Redmond | King County |
| NE 85th Street | 154th Ave NE | 164th Ave NE | Reduce to 3 lanes | Redmond | King County |
| Old Redmond Road | 132nd Ave NE | 136th Ave NE | Add 2-way LTL | Redmond | King County |
| Redmond Way | 159th PI | 170th Ave NE | Convert to 1 lane each direction | Redmond | King County |
| Woodinville-Redmond Rd | 160th Ave NE | NE 124th ST | Widen to 3 lanes | Redmond | King County |
| Duvall Ave NE | NE 4th St | SE 95th Wy (Renton City Limit) | Widen to 5 lanes | Renton | King County |
| Lind Ave SW | SW 16th St | SW 43rd St | Widen to 5 lanes | Renton | King County |
| Oakesdale Ave SW | Monster Rd | SR 900 | Widen to 5 lanes | Renton | King County |
| Park Dr-Sunset Blvd | Garden Ave | I-405 | Provide EB HOV lane | Renton | King County |
| SR 169 | 140th Way SE | I-405 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Widen to } 6 \text { lanes (4 GP + } \\ & 2 \mathrm{HOV} \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Renton | King County |
| SR-900 | Mill Ave | Park Ave | Widen to 5 lanes | Renton | King County |
| SW 27th St @ SR-167 <br> / Strander Blvd Extention | SR 167 | SR 181 | Add HOV lanes to SW 27th fm Oaksdale to SR167, Add new HOV IC, Add 5-lane connection to Strander | Renton | King County |
| 244th Ave NE | SE 8th St | NE 8th St | Add new 3-lane arterial | Sammamish | King County |
| East Lake <br> Sammamish Pkwy | Inglewood Hill Rd | NE 26th | Widen to 3 lanes | Sammamish | King County |

KC Traffic Model
Future Year Road Network Project List

| On | From | To | Network Edit | Lead Sponsor | Main County |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Issaquah-Pine Lake <br> Rd | Klahani Blvd | SE 32nd St | Widen to 3 lanes | Sammamish | King County |
| 28th/24th Ave S | S 200th St | S 216th St | Add new 5-lane road | SeaTac | King County |
| S 154th St | SR-518 | 24th Ave S | Widen to 4 lanes | SeaTac | King County |
| Greenwood Avenue N | N 105th St | Widen to 5 lanes | Seattle | King County |  |
| Mercer Street | Fairview | Dexter | Redesignate as 2-way $6-$ <br> lane arterial, connect with <br> Aurora | Seattle | King County |
| SR-99 | Battery Street Tunnel | N 105th St (except Aurora <br> Bridge | Add BAT lanes | Seattle | King County |
| SR 99 (Aurora Ave N) | N 145th St. | N 165th St. | N | Add 1 HOV lane in each <br> direction | Shoreline |

KC Traffic Model
Future Year Road Network Project List

| On | From | To | Network Edit | Lead Sponsor | Main County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-405 | SR-181 | SR-167 | Add 1 GP auxilary lane in each direction | WSDOT | King County |
| 1-405 @ Lind |  |  | Add half diamond interchange (facing north or south?) | WSDOT | King County |
| I-405 @ NE 132nd St |  |  | Add new half diamond IC pointing north | WSDOT | King County |
| I-405 @ NE 8th Street (Renton) |  |  | Provide HOV direct access ramp connecting to NE 8th Street | WSDOT | King County |
| I-405 @ SR-515 |  |  | Add half diamond interchange (facing north or south?) | WSDOT | King County |
| I-5 | Pierce County Line | South 288th St Vicinity | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | King County |
| I-5 @ Airport/Industrial Way |  |  | Add HOV direct access from NB HOV lanes to Industrial Way | WSDOT | King County |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { l-5 @ SR-18 @ SR- } \\ & 161 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Triangle connection | WSDOT | King County |
| 1-90 | Rainier Ave | 1-405 | Add 1 HOV lane in each direction | WSDOT | King County |
| 1-90 | Eastgate | Front Street | Add 1 HOV lane and 1 auxillary lane in each direction | WSDOT | King County |
| Southcenter Pkwy | Tukwila Pkwy | Strander Blvd | Add TWLT lane | WSDOT | King County |
| SR 167 | I-405 | S 180th St | Add 1 SB auxilary GP lane | WSDOT | King County |
| SR 167 | I-405 | S 180th St | Add 1 NB GP lane | WSDOT | King County |
| SR 167 | SR 410 (Sumner) | S. 180th St (Renton) | Add 1 GP lane in each direction? | WSDOT | King County |
| SR 18 | Issaquah-Hobart Rd | I-90 | Widen to 4 lanes | WSDOT | King County |
| SR 202 | E Lake Sammamish Pkwy | Sahalee Way | Widen to 5 lanes w/o 187th, 4 lanes to east | WSDOT | King County |
| SR 509 | SW 210th | Sea Tac International Airport | Extend 6-lane freeway (4 GP + 2 HOV ). Add 1 GP lane to l-5 in each direction from SeaTac to S 320th St. Include IC to S 200th, 24th/28th Ave, \& South Access Freeway. | WSDOT | King County |
| SR 520 | W Lake Sammamish Pkwy | SR-202 | Widen to 8 lanes, 6 GP and 4 HOV | WSDOT | King County |
| SR 520 | I-405 | I-5 | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | King County |
| SR 522 @ NE 195th St |  |  | Complete full diamond IC | WSDOT | King County |
| SR 900 | SE 78th St | Newport Way | Widen to 5 lanes | WSDOT | King County |
| SR 99 | N 105th St | N 145th St (Seattle - NCL) | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | King County |
| SR-518 | Airport Freeway | I-5 | Add EB GP lane | WSDOT | King County |
| SR-520 | SR-202 | Union Hill Road | Widen to 4 lanes | WSDOT | King County |
| SR-520 @ UW Bothell Campus |  |  | Move centroid a little to the east, and add centroid connection to SR-520. | WSDOT | King County |
| SR-304 | SR-3 | Farragut Ave | Add WB HOV lane | Bremerton | Kitsap County |
| SR-304 | Farragut Ave | Bremerton Ferry Dock | Widen to 5 lanes | Bremerton | Kitsap County |

KC Traffic Model
Future Year Road Network Project List

| On | From | To | Network Edit | Lead Sponsor | Main County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 104 | Lindvog Rd | Kingston Ferry and Couplet | Add 1 GP lane in each direction | WSDOT | Kitsap County |
| SR 166 | SR 16 | Blackjack Creek bridge | Widen to 4 lanes | WSDOT | Kitsap County |
| SR 3 | SR 16 spur at Gorst | Gorst USG RR Bridge 3/105 Vicinity | Widen to 5 lanes | WSDOT | Kitsap County |
| SR 3 | Gorst USG RR Bridge 3/105 Vicinity | SR 3/SR 304 Interchange | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | Kitsap County |
| SR 3 | Mason/Kitsap County Line | SR 16 spur at Gorst | Widen to 4 lanes | WSDOT | Kitsap County |
| SR 305 | Poulsbo South Corporate Limit Vicinity | Bond Road | Add HOV lanes in each direction (HOV will revert to GP during OP) | WSDOT | Kitsap County |
| Gravelly-Thorne Connector | Gravelly Lake Drive Uxing | Thorne Lane | Add SB 1 lane arterial | Lakewood | Pierce County |
| Milton Way | 28th Ave | 20th St E | Add TWLT lane | Milton | Pierce County |
| 176th St E | SR-7 | SR-161 | Widen to 5 lanes | Pierce County | Pierce County |
| 176th St E | SR-161 | Calistoga Ave | Add new road? | Pierce County | Pierce County |
| 8th St E | E Valley Hwy E | W Valley Hwy | Widen to 5 lanes | Pierce County | Pierce County |
| Canyon Rd E | SR 167 | Pioneer Way | Add new 4-lane arterial | Pierce County | Pierce County |
| Canyon Rd E | 106th St E | 192nd St E | Widen to 7 lanes | Pierce County | Pierce County |
| Canyon Rd E | 72nd St E | 106th St E | Widen to 5 lanes | Pierce County | Pierce County |
| Canyon RdE | Mountain Hwy (SR 7) | 192nd Street E | Add new arterial - 5 lanes n/o 224th St E, and 2 lanes to the south | Pierce County | Pierce County |
| Millitary Rd | Waller RdE (B St) | Spanaway Loop Rd | Widen to 4 lanes | Pierce County | Pierce County |
| Old Military Rd | Shaw Rd | SR-162 | Widen to 4 lanes | Pierce County | Pierce County |
| Shaw Rd | E Pioneer | 39th Ave SE | Widen to 4 lanes | Puyallup | Pierce County |
| Shaw Rd | SR-410 | Orting-Kapowsin Hwy | Provide 4-lane arterial | Puyallup | Pierce County |
| SR 410 | SR 167 | Bonney Lake | Add 1 WB and 2 EB GP lanes | Sumner | Pierce County |
| Valley Avenue | SR-410 | Elm Street | Widen to 3 lanes | Sumner | Pierce County |
| Norpoint Way | 49th Av NE | Nassau Ave | Widen to 3 lanes | Tacoma | Pierce County |
| I-5 | Port of Tacoma Vicinity | SR-16 | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| I-5 | Pierce County Line | Port of Tacoma Vicinity | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| I-5 | SR 16 | 72nd St Vicinity | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| I-5 | S 72nd St | SR-512 | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 16 | I-5 | South 19th St | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 16 | South 19th St | SR 163-Pearl St Vicinity | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 16 | SR 163 - Pearl St Vicinity | Tacoma Narrows Bridge | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 16 | Tacoma Narrows Bridge | Rosedale Rd Vicinity | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 16 (Tacoma Narrows Bridge) | Approx. Skyline Dr | Approx. 36th St NW | Widen to 6 lanes, 4 GP lanes and 2 HOV | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 161 | 36th St E | Jovita Blvd. | Widen to 5 lanes | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 161 | 234th St E | 204th St E | Widen to 5 lanes | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 161 | 204th St East | 176th Street East | Widen to 5 lanes | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 167 | SR-410 | Auburn | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 167 | SR 161 | SR-410 | Add HOV lanes in each direction | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 167 | I-5 | Port of Tacoma | Add new 4-lane freeway | WSDOT | Pierce County |

KC Traffic Model
Future Year Road Network

## Project List

| On | From | To | Network Edit | Lead Sponsor | Main County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 167 | I-5 | Puyallup | Add new 4-lane freeway | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 410 | 214th Ave E Vicinity | 234th Ave E Vicinity | Widen to 4 lanes | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR 99 | Porter Way | King County Line | Add TWLT lane | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| SR-704 (Cross-Base Hwy) | Fredrickson | I-5 @ Thorne Lake | Add 4-lane principal arterial | WSDOT | Pierce County |
| Orting Hwy | SR-410 | Orting CL | Widen to 4 lanes |  | Pierce County |
| 39th Ave SE | SE 228th St | SE 240th St | Add new 3 lane arterial | Bothell | Snohomish County |
| 39th Ave SE extension | SE 228th St | SE 240th St | Add new 3-lane arterial | Bothell | Snohomish County |
| SR 524 | SR-527 | 9th Ave SE (Bothell CL) | Widen to 5 lanes | Bothell | Snohomish county |
| Evergreen Way | 112th SW | Airport Rd | Widen to 7 lanes | Everett | Snohomish County |
| 196th St SW | 48th Ave W | 37th Ave W | Widen to 7 lanes | Lynnwood | Snohomish County |
| 200th St SW | SR-99 | 48th Ave W | Widen to 5 lanes | Lynnwood | Snohomish County |
| 36th Ave W | Maple Rd | 164th St SW | Widen to 4 lanes | Lynnwood | Snohomish County |
| 44th Ave W | S 200th St | S 196th St | Add 1 NB lane | Lynnwood | Snohomish County |
| Maple Road Extension | 36th Ave W | Alderwood Mall Pkwy | Extend 3-lane arterial | Lynnwood | Snohomish County |
| 88th St NE | State Ave | 67th Ave NE | Widen to 5 lanes | Marysville | Snohomish County |
| State Ave | 100th St NE | 116th St NE | Widen to 5 lanes | Marysville | Snohomish County |
| Airport Way | SR 9 | Lowell-Snoqualmie River Rd | Widen to 3 lanes | Snohomish County | Snohomish County |
| Beverly Park-Ferndale Rd | SR-525 | Airport Rd | Widen to 5 lanes | Snohomish County | Snohomish County |
| I-405 | NE 195th St | SR-527 | Add 1 NB GP lane | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| I-5 | SR 526 | SR 2 | Add HOV lanes in each direction, and 1 GP lane in each direction from 41st to SR-2 | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| I-5 | 220th St SW | 44th Ave W | Add NB GP lane | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| SR 2 | SR 522 I/C | Monroe ECL | Construct two lane bypass of Monroe on new alignment. | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| SR 522 | SR-9 | Snohomish River | Widen to 4 lanes | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| SR 524 | I-5 | SR 527 | Widen to 5 lanes | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| SR 531 | I-5 | SR 9 | Wident to 5 lanes | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| SR 9 | SR 522 | 176th St SE | Widen to 5 lanes | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| SR 9 | SR 2 | SR 92 | Widen to 5 lanes | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| SR 9 | 176th St SE | Marsh Rd | Widen to 4 lanes | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| SR 9 | Marsh Rd | SR 2 | Widen to 4 lanes | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| SR 99 | SR 525 | Airport Rd | Widen to 5 lanes | WSDOT | Snohomish County |
| SR-522 | Snohomish River | SR-2 | Widen to 4 lanes | WSDOT | Snohomish County |

## Appendix C

## Priority Processes

> Capacity HAL / HARS Bridges Short-Span Bridges
> Guardrail Traffic Signals
> Pedestrian
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Vulnerable Road Segments Small-Scale Operational Road and Intersection

## King County Road Services Division PROJECT PRIORITY PROCESSES

## CAPACITY NEEDS

Forecast travel information was used to identify future capacity needs and potential improvements. A travel forecasting model was developed by King County DOT staff using EMME/2 travel demand forecasting modeling software.

The model was calibrated to base year 2006 conditions using existing land use data, roadway information, and empirical traffic count data. Detailed documentation of this model is available from the King County Department of Transportation, Roads Services Division.

A forecast year of 2031 was chosen consistent with the land use element of the comprehensive plan as required by state growth management legislation (RCW36.70A.070(6)). The model was run with regionally-adopted, GMPC target land use data for population and employment distributed to the model's zonal system. Growth targets and land use assumptions are included in Appendix A of this document. The model road network was developed to represent existing conditions plus a limited number of capacity projects that were considered committed for development and therefore likely to be in place by 2031. The Washington State Department of Transportation's 20-year list of transportation improvements to the state highway system was included in the network as were city projects listed in the 20-year time horizon of the regional plan, Transportation 2040. City and state projects are listed in Appendix B.

By forecasting future year travel demand on a roadway network comprised of only existing and committed projects, it is possible to highlight areas that lack the capacity needed to accommodate the travel demand associated with the target year. Capacity needs information was identified by analyzing model results using forecast traffic volumes, forecast ratios of traffic volumes to roadway capacity.

The resulting identified needs represent the roadway capacity needs. All needs identified through this process are included in the Needs List section of this document. Needs are also shown on maps included in Section 3.

Since capacity needs exceed available revenues, a priority scoring methodology was developed to help balance needs with available revenue. This methodology incorporated existing, empirical data; including forecast data for 2031. The following data elements were collected, calculated, and scored:

- Average weekday traffic
- Existing traffic volume to roadway capacity ratios
- 2031 forecast volume to capacity ratios
- Arterial Classification of the project need

A description of this scoring system is included in the following tables.

## Priority Scoring for Capacity Projects

EXISTING Average Daily Traffic (ADT) for project
5 groupings based on magnitude of ADT - from Count Station locations

| ADT Value | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| $>20,000$ | 5 |
| $15,000-20000$ | 4 |
| $10,000-15,000$ | 3 |
| $5,000-10,000$ | 2 |
| $<5,000$ | 1 |

EXISTING Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C) problem in 2006 - from the model
5 groupings based on severity of V/C

| V/C Value | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| $>1.2$ | 5 |
| $1.0-1.2$ | 4 |
| $8 .-1.0$ | 3 |
| $.6-.8$ | 2 |
| $<.6$ | 1 |

Year 2031 ADT with final recommended improvements

| ADT Value | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| $>40,000$ | 5 |
| 30,000 to 40,000 | 4 |
| 20,000 to 30,000 | 3 |
| 10,000 to 20,000 | 2 |
| $<10,000$ | 1 |

## SYSTEM-Level ratings

Arterial Classification

| Value | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| Principal | 3 |
| Minor | 2 |
| Collector | 1 |
| Local | 0 |

## FINAL SCORES AND GROUPING

Score 27 to $24=$ High Priority Group
Score 23 to $20=$ Medium Priority Group
Score 19 and below = Low Priority Group

## NON-CAPACITY NEEDS

Non-capacity needs are prioritized by groups of like needs. Existing prioritization processes have been developed either in-house or by consultants for various categories including bridge, guardrail, high accident location, traffic signals, and others.

Existing prioritization processes used to develop the TNR are summarized below.

## HIGH ACCIDENT LOCATION (HAL) AND HIGH ACCIDENT ROAD SEGMENT (HARS) NEEDS

In 2007 the King County Department of Transportation list of prioritized High Accident Locations (HALs) and High Accident Road Segments (HARSs) was updated. The first step in this process was to develop a list of candidate HALs and HARSs for review and analysis. A list was compiled based on collision data from the three-year period from 2003-2005. The list was made up of locations that had nine or more recorded collisions during the three-year period.

Once the locations were identified, data such as collision types, traffic volumes, and roadway characteristics were collected for each location. This information was used to develop improvements intended to reduce the occurrence of collisions ("countermeasures"). There are a broad range of countermeasures, with approaches ranging from changing roadway geometrics to altering traffic signal timing. Countermeasures were selected based on predominant collision patterns, field observations, County practices, and the experience of the review team.

Countermeasures were developed for most but not all of the locations. There were several reasons for not developing countermeasures for a given location. These include:

- Locations where recent improvements were judged likely to have a significant effect on the predominant accident patterns were omitted, as were locations slated for near-term improvements judged likely to have a significant effect on the predominant accident patterns.
- Any locations that had been recently annexed by other jurisdictions were excluded.
- Sites with no clear collision pattern and no noted deficiencies were excluded.

Once the countermeasures were developed, a benefit-cost analysis was prepared for each location. The benefit/cost ratio accounts for economics and therefore is frequently used to prioritize safety improvements. The benefit/cost ratio is equal to the benefit of the expected reduction in collision costs divided by the project cost. A benefit/cost ratio greater than 1 indicates the expected benefits of a proposed countermeasure are greater than the costs.

The expected reduction in collisions due to a given countermeasure was estimated using nationally published "reduction factors" with modifications based on King County's past experience. The reduction factor was used in combination with typical collision costs to determine the expected societal benefit (in dollars) of completing the improvement. The benefit was then "normalized" by converting to a present value based on the expected service life of the
improvement. Finally, the normalized benefit was divided by a planning-level cost estimate to obtain the benefit-cost ratio for the project.

The results of the benefit/cost analysis and detailed documentation of the process used are contained in the report, High Accident Locations and Road Segments Analysis, King County, Washington; King County DOT, Traffic Engineering Section; December 2007.

## BRIDGE NEEDS

Assessment of bridge needs begins with inspection of all county roadway bridges. The inspection program implements the National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS) and calculates a sufficiency rating (SR) for each bridge. The SR is based on such factors as structural adequacy and safety, serviceability and functional obsolescence, and how essential the bridge is for public use. The rating ranges from zero (worst) to 100 (best). The SR score is used to establish eligibility for federal bridge replacement and rehabilitation funds. Bridges with a sufficiency rating less than or equal to 50 that are either functionally obsolete or structurally deficient, are eligible for replacement funds. Any bridge with a sufficiency rating less than or equal to 80 that is functionally obsolete or structurally deficient is eligible for rehabilitation funds. In Washington federal bridge funds are allocated to local agencies through WSDOT using a competitive process. WSDOT is focusing on funding local agency bridges that are classified as structurally deficient with a sufficiency rating of 40 or less for replacement, and structurally deficient with a sufficiency rating of 80 or less for rehabilitation projects.

Though the sufficiency rating establishes eligibility for federal funding, it is inadequate to prioritize bridges for replacement or rehabilitation. It does not give enough weight to important criteria such as load limitations, hydraulics, geometric deficiency, and expected useful life. The King County Bridge Priority Process establishes the need for individual bridge replacement by score and rank using criteria approved by the King County Council (Ord. 11693). In fall 2011, King County Road Services moved forward with implementing Tier Service Level Criteria for all unincorporated King County Roads. Tier Service Levels are now applied in addition to the Priority Process to help establish priority ranking. The results of the bridge priority process are published annually and reported in the Annual Bridge Report.

Priority process rankings are used in the development of the annual six-year Roads CIP. Recommendations for adding bridge projects to the CIP are guided by the following goals: add the highest priority bridges requiring replacement or rehabilitation, establish a preventative maintenance program including routine painting of steel bridges, and provide for major maintenance and repairs that cannot be accomplished by county maintenance staff.

## SHORT-SPAN BRIDGE NEEDS

The Short-Span Bridge Program was started in 2006 to address the needs of short bridges nearing the end of their useful life. These bridges are less than twenty feet in length, and ineligible for federal or state bridge funds. The Road Services Division has identified over 50
bridges for this new program. The bridges have been inventoried and assigned a priority. It is expected that the bridge replacement program will last for a number of years, as several of the top ranked bridges will be implemented each year in a two year, design -- build schedule. The priority array used for the Short-Span Bridge Program is the same priority array used for the other bridge needs.

## ROADSIDE BARRIER (GUARDRAIL) NEEDS

The methodology for identifying and ranking potential sites for safety mitigation using roadside barriers, specifically guardrails and bridge rails, was revised in 2002-2003. The new methodology is quantitative and was used to develop priority arrays for each of three categories of barriers: new barriers, retrofits to existing barriers, and bridge rail upgrades.

The methodology has two principal considerations-risk potential and severity. The risk potential factor is a function of parameters that quantify the exposure and probability associated with vehicles running off the road. Severity is a function of parameters that quantify and rate personal injury potential. These factors were derived from current statistics and existing roadside features. Factors are based on accidents, average daily traffic (ADT), road functional classification, corridor geometry, bridge geometry, speed limit, need as defined by embankment slopes, and roadside obstacles. The algorithms for retrofit barriers and bridge rail upgrades also incorporate parameters for existing barrier and rail deficiencies.

The primary source for establishing potential new barrier locations was the existing barrier priority array initially established in 1988. All locations remaining on the list were included in the array. In addition, a comprehensive roadside hazard inventory was completed for the King County arterial roadway system and analyzed to identify locations that might require barriers. Twenty-one sites were identified for further investigation. Additional non-arterial sites suggested by citizens and county employees were also included.

All sites with existing roadside barriers that are not compliant with standards were included as candidates for barrier retrofit. About have the existing barriers are non compliant and were therefore included as candidates. Risk exposure and degree of deficiency were the primary considerations in the prioritization process. Severity was less of a concern than for new barriers because it was assumed that all barrier locations were warranted.

All bridges and culvert crossings maintained by King County were included as candidates for bridge rail upgrades. Many of the candidate bridges were built prior to 1964 and do not have bridge railings designed to current safety standards. The bridge rail array identifies locations with safety deficiencies and prioritizes their upgrade. Three specific bridge deficiency and difficulty factors were established: structural deficiency, difficulty of upgrade, and end transition deficiency. In addition, a risk potential factor (average daily traffic) and a severity factor (posted speed limit) were included.

Priority arrays were developed for each of the three categories of barrier using the appropriate factors and algorithms. Each priority array was fully tested following development. Statistically
valid sample sizes were developed for each array, and engineers field reviewed and ranked the sites. In each case, rankings correlated $90 \%$ or better with the results of the priority arrays.

Detailed documentation of priority array development and methodology is available in the document, King County Roadside Barrier Program Priority Array Development; September 2003; Jacobs Civil Inc., TransCore ITS, Inc., Garry Struthers Associates, Inc.; for King County Department of Transportation Traffic Engineering Section.

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL PRIORITY PROCESS

The process to prioritize signals conforms to the laws set forth by the federal government, adopted with amendments by state government, and presented in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) published by the Federal Highway Administration and the U.S. Department of Transportation. The prioritization process evaluates signal warrants (tests) set forth in the MUTCD and assigns rating values to each warrant. The rating values assign weights to the individual warrants. The sum of the individual warrant rating values provides a basis for comparison to other potential signal locations.

Prioritization and selection of intersections for signalization starts with data collection. Traffic Engineering staff members collect data on vehicle and pedestrian volumes, prevailing speeds, and collision history at each intersection over the most recent three-year period. Each intersection is then evaluated using MUTCD warrants based on the number of approach lanes and the collected data.

The MUTCD states that the signal warrants define the minimum conditions under which installing a traffic control signal might be justified. However, selection and use of traffic control signals should be based on careful analysis of traffic operations, pedestrian and bicyclist needs and other factors, coupled with engineering judgment. Traffic signals should not be installed unless one or more of the nine signal warrants are met. Three of these warrants are based on traffic volumes at several periods during the day: the peak hour, the fourth highest hour, and the eighth highest hour. Another warrant examines the traffic collision history, focusing attention on accidents correctable by signalization (left-turn and right-angle types). Two warrants examine pedestrian activity to determine if pedestrian volumes warrant signalization. Two warrants examine whether signalization would improve traffic flow in a coordinated signal system or roadway network. The final warrant examines the proximity to a grade (rail) crossing.

Five primary warrants are used to prioritize (rate and rank) all intersections. The remaining warrants are also considered in the evaluation process by are less apt to apply to the suburban and rural nature of unincorporated King County.

The five primary warrants are:

1. Warrant 1 - Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume

Condition A: Minimum Vehicular Volume
Condition B: Interruption of Continuous Traffic
2. Warrant 2 - Four-Hour Vehicular Volume
3. Warrant 3 - Peak-Hour Vehicular Volume
4. Warrant 6 - Coordinated Signal System
5. Warrant 7 - Crash Experience

To these five MUTCD warrants, King County adds a factor for proximity to school site. This additional factor does not replace the pedestrian-related warrants. For locations near schools, shopping and other pedestrian attractors, the volume of pedestrian activity is examined as well as pedestrian warrants. The proximity to school factor addresses the potential for pedestrian activity outside the average-day activities.

Rating values, representing the degree to which signal warrants are met, are calculated for each of the five primary warrants. Values are summed by intersection, and the list of intersections is sorted to separate those that meet a least one signal warrant from those that do not. Intersections that meet one or more warrants are sorted by rating value from the largest to the smallest and are then numbered according to their order in the list. The resulting list of rank-ordered intersections is commonly called the priority array. It provides a starting point for determining locations to signalize.

Intersections on the top of the priority array undergo extensive evaluation of alternatives to signalization listed in M.U.T. C. D. Section 4B.04. The list of alternatives includes, but is not limited to, the construction of additional lanes, revising the intersection geometrics to channelize movements and realign intersections, installing street lighting, improving sight distance, roundabouts, measures to reduce approach speeds, changing lane use assignments, restricting movements, adding stop controls or intersection flashers. Particular attention is given to the predominant type of collision recurring at the intersection. The evaluation also includes existing and forecast traffic operational analyses to determine the effectiveness of each alternative and development of estimates for cost comparisons. A committee of engineers and maintenance staff reviews the information developed from these analyses and selects the improvement providing the safest, most cost effective, long-term solution.

Detailed documentation of the signal prioritization process is contained in the report, Signal, Intersection Control Beacons and Pedestrian Crosswalk Priority Process, King County Road Services Division, Department of Transportation, January 31, 2005 [updated per December 2009 M.U.T.C.D. revisions].

## NONMOTORIZED NEEDS

As part of the Healthscape program effort, the County worked with a consultant in 2007 to develop a "Transportation Programming Tool" (TPT) which evaluates the effectiveness of nonmotorized projects and their potential for increasing nonmotorized accessibility. The purpose of the TPT is to prioritize nonmotorized transportation improvements based on air quality, health, and transportation outcomes.

Using the new Transportation Planning Tool, all nonmotorized projects, with the exception of the School Pathway projects, were evaluated and scored and assigned high, medium and low priorities. The priority list was further stratified into urban and rural projects.

A more detailed description of the Transportation Programming Tool can be found at the following location.
http://www.kingcounty.gov/sites/transportation/healthscape/tools.aspx

## Healthscape TPT Factors:

## Transportation

Non-motorized projects have the potential to increase transit and non-motorized mode share and decrease vehicle mode share; and decrease per capita rates of vehicle use (hours $/ \mathrm{miles} / \mathrm{trips} /$ mode share), and increase per capita rates of walking, bicycling, and transit (hours/miles/trips/mode share) (Ewing \& Cervero, 2001).

## Safety.

Non-motorized projects can slow vehicle traffic (traffic calming), provide vehicle-free pathways, reduce vehicle conflicts with pedestrians (intersection redesign) and increase the number of users, all of which have been shown to reduce risk and/or the perception thereof.

## Environmental

Non-motorized projects shift travel from polluting modes (vehicular) to those that have less or no health-damaging air pollutant emissions (NOx, CO2, VOCs, and hydrocarbons) and dramatically lower carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas releases. Moreover, the vehicle trips replaced are largely short trips, which are more frequently higher-polluting 'cold starts' (WSDOT, 2005 and LUTAQH, 2005).

## Economic

Our economy benefits from more efficient, productive use of energy. Non-motorized travel is highly energy efficient, and increases as walkability increases (Frank et al. 2006). The increased physical activity is efficiently accomplished as part of daily routine trips to both work and nonwork destinations. Moreover, the reduction in health care costs, as a result of facility improvements inducing physical activity, can be quantified (TRB, 2006).

## Equity

Depending on where a project is located (close to a school, for example) it can improve access for sensitive populations or those who are less reliant on vehicle travel (for example, low income, youth and elderly).

## Health

As noted above, non-motorized transportation projects generate more walking and bicycling travel. Such physical activity, whether for the purpose recreation or transportation, is associated with higher rates of physical activity, and lower rates of obesity and other chronic diseases (LUTAQH, 2005; McGinnis, 2002).

## Healthscape TPT Measures:

## Increased Route Directness (Connectivity).

Nonmotorized projects can create more direct routes between destinations for cyclists and pedestrians.

## Connections to Transit

Although it is related to connectivity, access to transit is important to measure outside of the other connectivity measures. Transportation benefits are not exclusive to bicycling and walking transit ridership is dependent on good access by nonmotorized modes. In the LUTAQH study, a measure of transit inaccessibility (distance from home to nearest bus stop) was found to be positively related to VMT, and each $1 / 4$ mile increase in distance to transit reduced the odds of someone reporting a transit trip to work by $16 \%$. Another Puget Sound region study for WSDOT (2005) found each mile to a bus stop was associated with a $5 \%$ increase in VMT, and just over $4 \%$ increase in VHT.

## Reduced Conflicts With Vehicular Modes

The various non-motorized level of service tools use measures like vehicle speeds, traffic volumes, number of lanes or roadway width, and separation from traffic, and crossing distance to score the safety/comfort conditions, many of which are statistically associated either with lower rates of collision or perception of reduced risk.

## Size and Characteristics of Impacted Population

The size of the surrounding population - the 'travelshed' of the improvement - acts as a multiplier to the other benefits. Certain locations, such as those that have a high density or many destinations, may be more 'ripe' for nonmotorized transportation improvements. This is, essentially, the concept of latent demand for nonmotorized improvements.
Demographics of the impacted population may also change the equity benefits.

## Healthscape TPT project evaluation criteria

The following are the individual data items which comprise the TPT scores. In most cases, the data item receives a value between 1 and 4 based on the raw score.

- Does the project address an accident location?
- Does the project address a known or perceived hazard?
- What is the traffic volume on the closest adjacent street?
- What is the traffic speed on the closest adjacent street?
- How many bus stops within a $1 / 4$ mile?
- What is the transit LOS (level of service, as measured by bus stop boardings) within $1 / 4$ mile of the project?
- Does the project create a new connection to retail areas?
- Does the project create a new connection to transit?
- Does the project fill a gap in the street, pedestrian or bicycle network?
- Proximity to:
o Elementary School
o Middle or High School
o Park
o Hospital
o Civic facility
- Does project meet ADA requirements?
- Percentage disabled households surrounding the project
- Percentage low-income households surrounding the project
- Percentage elderly households surrounding the project
- Percentage of residents under 18 surrounding the project
- Average residential density surrounding the project
- Retail Floor Area Ratio surrounding the project
- Land use mix surrounding the project
- Density of road intersections surrounding the project


## INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM (ITS) NEEDS

The corridor projects provide an overall ITS improvement program for key regional corridors. The key corridors were identified from the 2004 Transportation Needs Report (TNR) and from stakeholder feedback regarding transportation needs in unincorporated King County. ITS improvements proposed for the identified corridors include cameras, vehicle detection, traffic signal equipment and timing upgrades, pavement conditions sensors, and other devices where needs warrant, as well as communications infrastructure to support these devices. For the most part, these corridors are linked to each other or to other King County ITS projects, allowing for communications continuity and the establishment of a regional ITS corridor network. The corridors include both urban arterials and smaller-capacity rural roads.

A total of 34 corridor projects were identified. As with any planned improvement program, all of the projects cannot begin at once, and a prioritization process is needed to determine which projects best meet the needs of the County based upon their ability to meet key criteria. Criteria for analyzing the project priorities were established based upon examples from the 2004 Transportation Needs Report (TNR), as well as other criteria specific to ITS projects and the needs of the County. Each criterion was analyzed on a scale of $1-5$ points; no single criterion was weighted more heavily than another. Priorities were established by totaling the points received by each project. A general priority level (Low, Medium, High) was then assigned by comparing the scores each project received.

It is recognized that actual project deployments are likely to be affected by such factors as funding availability and dependence on other projects, as well as require additional investigation into overall project feasibility. Therefore, the intent of the exercise was to provide a relative analysis of King County's ITS priorities, and not to establish a set order for deployment.

## ITS Corridor Projects

The corridor projects include a broad cross-section of both urban and rural corridors, dispersed across the county. This section describes the process and criteria that was used to assign a relative (high, medium, low) priority to each project. These criteria were established with the purpose of providing a quantitative assessment of each project's alignment with King County
needs and priorities. To the extent possible, the prioritization method was based upon criteria used in the 2004 TNR. The criteria include:

Average Daily Traffic (ADT): This criterion used the same traffic volume scale as capacity projects to assign priority to corridor projects along roads with the highest average daily traffic counts.

| ADT Value | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| $>20,000$ | 5 |
| $15,000-20,000$ | 4 |
| $10,000-15,000$ | 3 |
| $5,000-10,000$ | 2 |
| $<5,000$ | 1 |

Volume to Capacity Ratios: This criterion gave priority to roads whose volumes were approaching or exceeding capacity, based upon the following scale used in the TNR:

| V/C Value | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| $>1.2$ | 5 |
| $1.0-1.2$ | 4 |
| $.8-1.0$ | 3 |
| $.6--.8$ | 2 |
| $<.6$ | 1 |

Accident Rates: Corridors with high accident rates were considered higher priority, using the following scale:

| Accident Rate | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| $>4.1$ | 5 |
| Below 4.0 | 4 |
| Below 3.0 | 3 |
| Below 2.0 | 2 |
| Below 1.0 | 1 |

Transit Ridership: Corridors with greater volume of transit ridership were considered higher priority, using the following scale:

| Average Weekday Ridership | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| $>400$ | 5 |
| $300-400$ | 4 |
| $200-300$ | 3 |
| $100-200$ | 2 |
| $1--100$ | 1 |

Potential for Annexation: Proposed and approved land annexations for 2004 and 2005 were reviewed as well as proposed future annexations. Corridors with little probability of annexation were considered higher priority using the following scale:

| Proposed Annexation Year | Score |
| :--- | :--- |


| Rural | 5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $>2010$ | 4 |
| $2009-2010$ | 3 |
| $2007-2008$ | 2 |
| $2005--2006$ | 1 |

Availability of Communications: Corridors with access to communications infrastructure were considered higher priority, using the following scale:

| Communications | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| King County fiber existing on corridor | 5 |
| King County or WSDOT fiber nearby | 4 |
| INET Hub Nearby | 3 |
| Other | 2 |
| None / Unknown | 1 |

Links to Other Existing/Planned Projects: Higher priority was given to corridor projects that could coordinate or build off of other county ITS corridor projects, as follows:

| Projects | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| Links to Funded / Existing King County <br> Corridor Project | 5 |
| Links to Other Strategic Plan Project | 3 |

Hazard Areas: King County has identified a number of hazards along county roadways, including High Accident Road Segments (HARS), High Accident Locations (HAL), and areas prone to flooding, ice, and landslides. Corridors with two or more of these hazard locations were given a score of 5; corridors with one identified hazard were given a score of 3 .

| Hazard Areas | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| Two or more hazards in corridor | 5 |
| One identified hazard in corridor | 3 |
|  |  |

Final Priority Ranking

| Total Corridor Priority | Total Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| High | Score $>23$ |
| Medium | Score $22-17$ |
| Low | Score $<16$ |

## VULNERABLE ROAD SEGMENTS (VRS) STUDY

The Vulnerable Roadway Segments (VRS) study was instituted in 2005 to identify and address specific roadway funding needs throughout the County. A vulnerable road segment was defined as a road segment that requires abnormally expensive and/or frequent repairs. This includes roads with failing retaining walls, seawalls, roads with chronic settlement problems, or roadways close to rivers with repetitive erosion problems.

The first step of the study was to identify the vulnerable road segments throughout the County. The identification process consisted of a two-pronged effort; researching existing lists of problem roads as well as finding new segments. The data collected from researching existing lists and working with the Road Services Division Maintenance Section provided enough information to start compiling a comprehensive list of the roadway segments found.

## Priority Array Description

The factors shown in the pie chart below were used in developing the priority rank formula for vulnerable roadway segments. The value assigned to each of the factors was either calculated or collected from various data sources. The percentage of influence each category has in producing the priority rank is shown in the pie chart below.

The factors were chosen by the project team and refined through an iterative process. After each iteration, the values and percentages of the factors, as well as the segment rankings were studied for reasonableness. The overall goal was achieved when the full numerical range of each factor was well distributed among the segments and the weighting percentage of each factor seemed to result in a logical ranking of segments.

Priority Ranking Factors


The Maintenance Cost / Year is the average estimated amount of money spent each year repairing the road segment to correct the identified problem in the short term. Projects with higher annual maintenance costs are given more priority.

$$
\text { Factor }=\frac{M \times f}{20,000} \times 25
$$

where $M=$ estimated maintenance cost/year (in thousands of dollars)
$f=$ the frequency of the maintenance each year
20,000 = the maximum maintenance cost/year
$25=$ the maximum number of points possible for this factor
The Construction Cost / Vehicle factor divides the cost of the permanent construction fix (i.e., not a maintenance repair) by the average daily number of vehicles that travel the road. Projects with a lower cost benefiting a higher number of vehicles are given a higher priority.

$$
\text { Factor }=20-\frac{C / A D T}{1500} \times 20(\text { Factor }=0 \text { if formula results in negative value })
$$

where $C=$ cost of permanent construction fix
ADT = average daily traffic count on segment
$1500=$ highest C/ADT ratio, except for a few outliers (1500 chosen to keep this factor well distributed among segments)
$20=$ maximum number of points possible for this factor
The Impact of Failure factor accounts for the importance in correcting a vulnerable roadway segment. The project team made many field visits evaluating the majority of the vulnerable roadway segments, classifying the roadway problem, and performing a preliminary engineering assessment to score the roadway vulnerabilities. Each of the road segments was scored 1 to 5 addressing the predicted consequences if no action were taken to correct the problem. The scoring is as follows:

Score $=1$ If problem is left uncorrected, total failure would likely occur, resulting in closure of the entire road.
Score $=2$ If problem is left uncorrected, partial (or possibly total) failure of the road could occur, closing half (or all) of the road.
Score $=3$ If problem is left uncorrected, partial failure of road could occur, closing a shoulder and/or possibly a lane of the road.
Score $=4$ If problem is left uncorrected, minor loss of road function could occur in near future.
Score $=5$ If problem is left uncorrected, maintenance would be necessary with no foreseeable loss of road function.

| If Score $=1$, Factor $=20$ | Values of factors determined by an |
| :--- | :--- |
| If Score $=2$, Factor $=11$ | exponential function (as opposed to a |
| If Score $=3$, Factor $=6$ | linear function), to weigh full or partial |
| If Score $=4$, Factor $=3$ | road closures much more heavily than a |
| If Score $=5$, Factor $=0$ | minor loss of road function. |

The Driver Inconvenience factor of each road segment measures the overall level of driver inconvenience if a vulnerable road segment is closed. The detour length and the traffic volume on the segment is considered in this factor. Segments involving longer detours with higher traffic volumes are given more priority.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Factor }=\frac{l \times A D T}{95,000} \times 15 \\
& \text { where } l=\text { length of detour caused by closed road segment } \\
& \text { ADT = average daily traffic on segment } \\
& 95,000=\text { maximum l/ADT ratio (except for one outlier) } \\
& 15=\text { maximum number of points possible for this factor }
\end{aligned}
$$

If a segment is part of a planned project in the CIP or TNR, the Inclusion in Future Project factor gives priority to such segments to account for the opportunity to complete two needs with one project.

Factor $=10$ if segment included in other project
Factor $=0$ if segment not included in other project
The Guardrail Need factor is a yes or no toggle identifying the need for guardrail on the vulnerable segment. Road segments slated for future guardrail projects are given more priority to account for the opportunity to fulfill two needs with one project.
Factor $=10$ if guardrail is needed on segment
Factor $=0$ if guardrail is not needed on segment
All of the priority ranking factors are then weighted to the percentages shown in the pie chart above and summed to produce a score between 0 and 100, ranking the different road segments and identifying the best project candidates. The road segments with the lower scores are the best candidates for road projects.

## Sample calculation

The following sample calculation for vulnerable segment of NE Woodinville Duvall Road (steep slopes above and below roadway) will help illustrate how the final rating scores were calculated:

Maintenance Cost / Year (25 points max.)

$$
\text { Factor }=\frac{M \times f}{20,000} \times 25=(\$ 10,000 \times 0.5 \text { times/year }) / 20,000 \times 25=\mathbf{6}
$$

Score is only 6 out of 25 due to relatively inexpensive repairs at infrequent frequency - once every two years.

Construction Cost / Vehicle (20 points max.)

$$
\text { Factor }=20-\frac{C / A D T}{1500} \times 20=20-(\$ 420,000 / 11,100 \text { vehicles } / \text { day }) / 1500 \times 20=19
$$

Score is a high 19 out of 20 due to relatively inexpensive permanent fix for large volume of vehicles.

Impact of Failure (20 points max.)

$$
\text { If Score = 3, Factor = } \mathbf{6}
$$

Score is only 6 out of 20 due to lower impact of problem, which would close a shoulder of the segment, or one lane at worst. Traffic would not need to be detoured.

## Driver Inconvenience (15 points max.)

$$
\text { Factor }=\frac{l \times A D T}{95,000} \times 15=(8.5 \text { mile detour } \times 11,100 \text { vehicles } / \text { day }) / 95,000 \times 15=\mathbf{1 5}
$$

Score is a full 15 out of 15 due to lengthy detour affecting a large volume of vehicles.
Inclusion in Future Project (10 points max.)

Factor $=\mathbf{1 0}$ (segment included in operational project identified in TNR)
Score is a full 10 points because it has also been identified as a need in another study.
Guardrail Need (10 points max.)
Factor $=\mathbf{0}$ (guardrail is not needed on segment)
Factor is zero since there is no need for guardrail on this segment, meaning two projects cannot be completed due to action on this segment.

## Total Score

$6+19+6+15+10+0=56$
Total Rating (lower score is better candidate for action)
$100-56=44$ (actually 43 due to rounding in spreadsheet)

## SMALL SCOPE OPERATIONAL PROJECTS

## Program Description

Historically, small scope operational projects have been a lower consideration in the Road Services Division's CIP project development process, as these project are typically developed on an as-needed basis. In September 2005, the Division recognized the need to establish a program for these types of projects -- those that do not rate high enough to be funded from other prioritized program project lists. The goal for this program is to identify and support high benefit cost ratio projects that could address small scope traffic flow and safety issues. The focus of this effort is to develop a comprehensive list of pedestrian facilities, non-signal intersection improvements and roadway location projects with recommended improvements to serve unincorporated King County's transportation and pedestrian needs.

## Program Development Process

As a new program and process, a statement of the programs goals and objectives was developed. A project recommendation and evaluation process was introduced that satisfied these goals and objectives. The project selection process used an objective methodology for ranking potential sites for safety and traffic improvements. Finally, a budget element was applied to make sure the most deserving projects are achieved first.

## Goals and Objectives

The goal of this Small Scope Operational Program is to identify locations within unincorporated King County that could be enhanced by operational improvements, yet have not been implemented due to funding constraints. There are needs that have been identified for pedestrian facilities, non-signal intersection improvements and roadway locations that either do not fit the criteria of existing improvement programs or do not score high enough to be funded.. The objective of this program is to develop a prioritized list of small scale projects showing description of proposed work scope, limits and costs. Another common element of these projects is their short design and construction schedules, which makes this program highly responsive to emerging needs.

## Project Selection Process

The staff from the Road Services Division's Traffic Engineering Section developed a logical, project-selection process for identifying, selecting and prioritizing projects. There are four tiers to this process:

- Identification of a candidate project
- Preliminary screening and scoping of candidate locations
- Determination of priority process score
- Evaluations of candidate locations


## Identification of Candidate Projects

A list of potential improvements is compiled from recommendations by a number of sources including KCDOT engineering staff, businesses, community groups, and members of the general public.

## Preliminary Screening and Scoping of Candidate Locations

A field review was conducted for candidate projects for scope verification, cost estimating, and identification of unique constraints and challenges. Field trips were made to most sites to collect relevant, up-to-date field information, site-specific data, create site diagrams and sketches and take photographs. In addition, King County traffic volume and accident data was included as part of the location-specific analysis.

The evaluation for each project was based on a preliminary screening of the project information obtained during data collection. Preliminary screening/feasibility analysis was undertaken prior to project development to assure a candidate project is feasible and satisfies program goals and criteria before it is evaluated. As each project was screened, it was assigned a relative (high, medium, low) priority to develop a preliminary ranking and determination of whether to advance formal prioritization process.

## Determination of Priority Process Score

The priority process was developed with the purpose of providing a quantitative assessment of each project's merits for comparison with similar projects. Prioritization and selection of projects begins with project screening/feasibility analysis and ends with the prioritized project list. Data on vehicle and pedestrian volumes, vehicle speeds, existing and planned facility capacities and accident history at each location over the most recent three or five year period was also collected as part of the analysis process.

Each project is unique due to the specific issues addressed. Certain concerns are indicative of site deficiencies that can be addressed by specific countermeasures. Countermeasures are the improvements that address problems at a given location to improve the safety or traffic operations. Countermeasures at each location were developed for the three separate categories (pedestrian facilities, non-signal intersection improvements and roadway locations) based on the
predominant problems, field observations, King County practices and standards, and the experience of the review team.

Pedestrian-oriented projects used the existing pedestrian priority array (see Pedestrian Priority Process earlier in this appendix). . The algorithm for non-signal intersection improvements and roadway location projects was developed specifically by the Traffic Engineering staff to score projects in these categories. The potential improvements for these projects were rated on the following criteria:

## NON-SIGNAL INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Volume to Capacity Ratio

| Volume to Capacity Ratio | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| Greater than 1.0 | 15 |
| .5 to .99 | 10 |
| .25 to .49 | 5 |
| Less than .25 | 0 |

Volume to Capacity Ratio relative to number of hours it exceeds various thresholds

| Volume to Capacity Ratio | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| V/C $>.8$ for $8+$ hours | 10 |
| V/C $>.8$ for $5-7$ hours | 7 |
| V/C $>.6$ for $8+$ hours | 5 |
| V/C $>.6$ for 7 hours or less | 0 |

## SAFETY CRITERIA

Accidents per million Entering vehicles -average of 5 most recent years (ACC/MEV)

| Accidents / MEV | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| Greater than 1.0 | 30 |
| .5 to .99 | 25 |
| .25 to .49 | 15 |
| .10 to .24 | 10 |
| Less than .10 | 0 |

## SAFETY CRITERIA

Intersection Geometrics with respect to King County Road Standards-1993 for angle of intersection, horizontal curvature of approach, vertical curvature of approach, and stopping sight distance

| Road Design Standards Met | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4 Criteria Not Met | 30 |
| 3 Criteria Not Met | 20 |
| 2 Criteria Not Met | 15 |
| 1 Criteria Not Met | 10 |
| Meets KCRS Criteria | 0 |

## SAFETY CRITERIA

Speeding
$85{ }^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Speed in excess of the posted speed limit

| Speed greater than posted speed | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| Greater than 10 MPH | 15 |
| 7 MPH to 10 MPH | 10 |
| 5 MPH to 7 MPH | 5 |
| Less than 5 MPH | 0 |

## ROADWAY LOCATIONS PROJECT CRITERIA

Level-0f-Service (congestion)

| Level-of-Service | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| A | 0 |
| B | 0 |
| C | 5 |
| D | 15 |
| E | 20 |
| F | 25 |

## SAFETY CRITERIA

Accidents per million vehicles (average of 5 most recent years)

| Accidents per Million Vehicle miles <br> traveled $\mathbf{- 5}$ years | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| Greater than 3.0 | 30 |
| 3.0 to 2.5 | 20 |
| 2.5 to 1.5 | 10 |
| Less than 1.5 | 0 |
|  |  |

## SAFETY CRITERIA

Roadway geometrics with respect to King County Road Standards 1993

| Road Design Standards Met | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| Meets none | 30 |
| Meets 1 | 25 |
| Meets 2 | 15 |
| Meets all | 0 |

## Speeding

| Speed greater than posted speed | Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| Greater than 10 MPH | 15 |
| 7 MPH to 10 MPH | 10 |
| 5 MPH to 7 MPH | 5 |
| Less than 5 MPH | 0 |

## Evaluations of Candidate Locations

Scores for each location ranged from 0 to 100 , with the following levels:

| 0 to 30 | Low |
| :--- | :--- |
| 31 to 50 | Medium |
| 51 to 100 | High |

Potential projects were reviewed with planning-level cost estimates and then subjected to a basic financial analysis. Low scoring projects or those with prohibitive costs are given less consideration. The highest scoring projects are prioritized and considered as best candidates for the Road Services Division's Small Scope Operational Projects program.

## Project Selection

The small scope operational projects include a broad cross-section of both urban and rural locations, and priority arrays were developed for each of the three categories. The final project selection will be based on the priority scores weighted based on an assessment of each project's potential effectiveness. Consideration and higher priority was also given to such factors as whether the project could coordinate with or enhance other King County transportation needs and priorities.

## Appendix D

Financial Analysis

## Transportation Needs Report 2012

## March 2012

Financial Forecast in Constant 2012 Dollars
All columns other than Road Fund in thousands of dollars

| Year | Road Fund | Fed BRAC | Fed <br> TP/ITS/ <br> CMAQ | Fed <br> HEF/HES | State TIB | State <br> RAP | MPS | Other | Property <br> Sales |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2013 | $\$ 27,296,417$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 500$ | $\$ 350$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2014 | $\$ 26,811,443$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 500$ | $\$ 350$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2015 | $\$ 23,172,683$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 500$ | $\$ 350$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2016 | $\$ 21,802,628$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 500$ | $\$ 350$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2017 | $\$ 20,696,868$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 500$ | $\$ 350$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2018 | $\$ 21,019,059$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 400$ | $\$ 350$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2019 | $\$ 20,764,539$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 350$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2020 | $\$ 20,081,174$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 350$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2021 | $\$ 19,399,747$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 350$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2022 | $\$ 18,721,728$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2023 | $\$ 19,022,830$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,250$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2024 | $\$ 19,461,123$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,250$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2025 | $\$ 19,831,352$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,250$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2026 | $\$ 20,136,373$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,250$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2027 | $\$ 20,380,098$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,250$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2028 | $\$ 20,566,249$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,250$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2029 | $\$ 20,698,355$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,250$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2030 | $\$ 20,779,763$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,250$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 2031 | $\$ 20,813,642$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 2,250$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 750$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 500$ |
|  | $\$ 401,456,072$ | $\$ 14,250$ | $\$ 40,250$ | $\$ 5,200$ | $\$ 10,000$ | $\$ 14,250$ | $\$ 6,800$ | $\$ 3,150$ | $\$ 9,500$ |

Total estimated revenue to the year $2031=\$ 504,856,000$

| Need | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 2012---2031 } \\ \text { Project Costs } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Bridge | \$74,350 |
| Capacity Major | \$76,198 |
| Capacity Minor | \$149,551 |
| Drainage | \$11,402 |
| ITS | \$53,062 |
| Nonmotorized | \$106,558 |
| Operations | \$68,792 |
| Preservation | \$119,461 |
| Reconstruction | \$58,759 |
| Safety | \$90,402 |
|  |  |
| Total Needs | \$808,535 |
|  |  |
| Other CIP Needs | 2010-2031 <br> CIP NEEDS |
| Overlay | \$141,516 |
| ADA | \$1,760 |
| Debt Service | \$113,780 |
| Total | \$257,056 |
|  |  |
| ( - ) Other Needs | \$257,056 |
| FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR CIP | \$247,800 |
| SHORTFALL | \$560,735 |


| Need | 2012---2031 <br> Allocation |
| :--- | ---: |
| Bridge | $\$ 74,300$ |
| Capacity Major | 0 |
| Capacity Minor | $\$ 10,500$ |
| Drainage | $\$ 5,000$ |
| ITS | $\$ 5,500$ |
| Nonmotorized | $\$ 5,900$ |
| Operations | $\$ 6,600$ |
| Preservation | $\$ 12,500$ |
| Reconstruction | $\$ 39,900$ |
| Safety | $\$ 86,300$ |
|  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 4 6 , 5 0 0}$ |
| TOTAL |  |

