

City of Selah
Planning Commission Minutes
Of
August 16, 2016

Selah Council Chambers
115 W. Naches Ave.
Selah, Washington 98942

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Smith at 5:31 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Members Present: Commissioners: Morehead, Miller, Smith, and Torkelson.
Members Absent: Commissioner Pendleton.
Staff Present: Harmit Bedi, City Planner, Caprise Groo, Secretary
Guest: Joseph Calhoun, Senior Planner, Yakima Valley Conference of Government.

C. Agenda Changes : None

D. Communications

1. Oral- None. No Attendees.
2. Written- None.

E. Approval of Minutes

1. July 19, 2016

Commissioner Torkelson motioned to approve the minutes.

Commissioner Miller Seconded the motion.

Chairman Smith called for a voice vote and the minutes were approved with a vote of 4-0.

F. Public Hearings

1. Old Business – None
2. New Business –Review of Draft Transportation Element of Selah Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Smith turned the floor over to Joseph Calhoun.

Mr. Joseph Calhoun, Senior Planner, Yakima Valley Conference of Government. He read the Staff Report for the Comprehensive Plan Update: Draft Transportation Element. He moved on to the table of contents, Chapter 3 Transportation Element. (Attached)

Mr. Bedi suggested that Mr. Calhoun introduce each section then answer any questions the Commission may have for that section.

Mr. Calhoun started with the table of content and progressed quickly through pages 3-2, 3-3, 3-4, and 3-5. He handed out a bigger map for page 3-6. (Attached)

Chairman Smith stated that she could not find that page.

Ms. Groo replied that the packet in front of her (Chairman Smith) was the minutes and not the current packet.

Chairman Smith was given a current packet.

Mr. Calhoun continued highlighting the sections.

Commissioner Miller asked about the sidewalk improvements on Wernex Loop.

Mr. Calhoun answered that the Wernex Loop project was paid for with a federal Transportation Alternative Program grant.

Mr. Bedi stated he had a question. He questioned the last sentence of paragraph 2 under Sidewalks. He asked that due to health conscious Americans should the study be done sooner than 2018.

Discussion ensued about Bicycle and Pedestrian Pathways Study.

Conclusion: the study should start in 2017 so funding could be allocated.

Mr. Calhoun moved on to Transportation Demand Management and the companies required to participate in the Commute Trip Reduction program.

Discussion ensued. Commissioners questioned whether the Selah School District, Larson, Matson and seasonal workers were included in the CTR program.

Mr. Calhoun stated he would look into that question. He then moved on to section 4 Road Characteristics. He discussed Levels of service and referred to page 3-12 at the top.

Mr. Bedi further discussed high traffic areas, arterial streets and Physical traffic counts.

Mr. Calhoun returned to pages 3-12 through 3-16 and the averages for the roads. He discussed how the tables are constructed and the math involved. He moved to the next sections. He highlighted section 5 and six. Mr. Calhoun moved on to the Transportation Improvement Program 2016-2021. He discussed the different funding sources.

Mr. Bedi made a correction. 2017-2021. He then explained TIP and the funding sources.

Mr. Calhoun moved on to section 7-Recommendations. He read each recommendation.

Commissioner Miller asked who did all that.

Mr. Calhoun stated that Commission, Staff, Counsel and a number of other organizations determine the Transportation needs.

Commissioner Miller stated that the Commission had touched on the issue of a Transportation Benefit District. He asked if it needed to be introduced as a formal discussion.

Mr. Calhoun replied that he thought that was a ballot issue.

Discussion ensued.

Conclusion: the Commission and Council need to have a study session about Transportation Benefit Districts later this year.

Mr. Calhoun moved to the next section-Financing. He covered Local Funding sources. He moved on to Goals and Policies. He went through the goals in bold type. Mr. Calhoun notices some format changes and noted them.

Mr. Bedi stated that the format issues would be fixed.

Mr. Calhoun moved forward with the goals. He concluded his highlights.

Chairman Smith asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Miller stated he would review the goals carefully.

Chairman Smith asked if Mr. Calhoun had anything to add.

Mr. Calhoun stated that the goals section was where changes could be made.

Chairman Smith asked if there was anything else.

Mr. Bedi expressed the amount of work staff put into the Transportation Element.

Chairman Smith asked if there was anything else to discuss.

Commissioner Miller suggested that a presentation of what is happening in the City be given to the Commission every month.

Mr. Bedi replied that if the Commission wanted updated every month then he would like to do that.

Discussion

Chairman Smith made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Bedi asked the Commission to vote on this draft.

Chairman Smith asked if the Commission had been doing that.

Ms. Groo Replied no.

Mr. Bedi asked how this moved forward if they didn't vote on it.

Ms. Groo stated that this was a draft and all the elements, once corrected, will come together and be voted on as a whole. The whole document then moves forward to Council.

Chairman Smith asked Mr. Calhoun how many more element the Commission would be reviewing.

Mr. Calhoun stated that he thought there were 3 more.

Discussion ensued about elements, drafts and the process.

G. General Business

1. Old Business – None
2. New Business- None

H. Reports/Announcements

1. Chairman- None
2. Commissioners- None
3. Staff-
 - Comp Plan Amendments Schedule Discussion
 - Zoning Ordinance Amendment Discussion
 - City Council Retreat Ideas Discussion

Mr. Bedi discussed the Comp Plan Amendments Schedule with the Commissioners. He asked what the Commission suggested the schedule should be.

Discussion ensued.


Conclusion: Comp Plan Amendment Application need to be in by Feb 28th and heard by end of April.

Mr. Bedi stated that he would construct a tentative schedule and bring it back to the Commission to discuss. He stated that he would give all the details of the process and then the Commission could discuss and decide on the process.

Mr. Bedi move on to the Zoning Ordinance Amendments. He stated staff would start bringing changes to the Commission such as signage, shared parking, etc. Mr. Bedi move on to the City Council Retreat. He asked if the Commission had any ideas to share with the Council.

I. Adjournment

Commissioner Torkelson motioned to adjourn the meeting, Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. Chairman Smith adjourned the meeting at 6:32 pm with a voice vote of 4-0.


Chairman Smith

STAFF REPORT

TO: Community Development Commission, City of Selah
FROM: Joseph Calhoun, Senior Planner, Yakima Valley Conference of Governments
DATE: August 16, 2016
SUBJECT: Comprehensive Plan Update: Draft Transportation Element
ACTION REQUESTED: None; review and discussion only

Background

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires fully planning jurisdictions to review and update their comprehensive plans, development regulations, and critical areas ordinance (CAO), every eight years as established by RCW 36.70A.130(5)(c). Selah's next GMA periodic update is due June 30, 2017. After this date, without a completed update, Selah will be unable to access Washington State road and water/wastewater infrastructure grants and loans.

As part of the GMA periodic update process, staff is now reviewing and updating the current Selah Comprehensive Plan – Transportation Element.

Transportation Element Review

The Transportation Element considers the movement of people and goods in relation to existing land use and to the desired future development pattern, as outlined in the Land Use Element.

The Transportation Element includes the following, as required by RCW 36.70A.070:

- Land use assumptions used in estimating travel.
- Facilities and services needs, including:
 - An inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services.
 - Level of service standards for all locally owned arterials and transit routes to serve as a gauge to judge performance of the system.
 - Specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance locally-owned transportation facilities or services that are below an established level of service standard.
 - Forecasts of traffic for at least 10 years based on the adopted land use plan to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth.
 - Identification of state and local system needs to meet current and future demands.
- Finance, including:
 - An analysis of funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources;
 - A multiyear financing plan based on the needs identified in the comprehensive plan.

- If probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs, a discussion of how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that level of service standards will be met.
- Demand-management strategies.
- Pedestrian and bicycle component to include collaborative efforts to identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles.

Chapter 3 Transportation Element

Contents

CHAPTER 3 TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT	3-1
I. INTRODUCTION.....	3-2
GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT REQUIREMENTS	3-2
TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT CERTIFICATION	3-3
RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ELEMENTS	3-3
APPLICABLE COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES	3-4
II. MAJOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES CONSIDERATIONS.....	3-4
III. TRANSPORTATION NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS	3-5
ROADS AND STREETS	3-5
AIRPORTS	3-7
RAIL.....	3-7
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	3-7
NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION	3-9
<i>Sidewalks</i>	3-9
<i>Bicycle and Pedestrian Pathways</i>	3-9
TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT	3-9
IV. ROAD CHARACTERISTICS	3-10
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION.....	3-10
LEVEL OF SERVICE.....	3-11
IDEALIZED URBAN AND RURAL ROAD CAPACITIES	3-12
TRAFFIC VOLUME HISTORY	3-12
FREIGHT AND GOODS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM	3-17
V. TRAFFIC FORECASTS.....	3-20
DEMOGRAPHICS AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS	3-20
LAND USE PATTERNS AND POPULATION DISTRIBUTION	3-20
FORECASTED TRAFFIC VOLUMES.....	3-20
VI. EXISTING DEFICIENCIES, FUTURE NEEDS AND ALTERNATIVES	3-24
DEFICIENCIES AND ISSUES	3-24
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS	3-27
VIII. FINANCING.....	3-27
STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES	3-27
LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES	3-28
FINANCE PLAN.....	3-28
IX. GOALS AND POLICIES	3-28

Table of Figures

FIGURE 3-1. TRANSPORTATION NETWORK, CITY OF SELAH	3-6
FIGURE 3-2. ROADWAYS BY TRUCK TONNAGE CLASS, CITY OF SELAH	3-19

I. INTRODUCTION

The Transportation Element considers the movement of people and goods in relation to existing land use and to the desired future development pattern as stated within the Land Use Element. The Transportation Element considers both motorized and non-motorized forms of transportation and private and public means of transportation. The Transportation Element also coordinates the needs of the local transportation system with the transportation network of adjoining jurisdictions and the larger region.

Growth Management Act Requirements

The goal of the Growth Management Act (GMA) is to encourage efficient multi-modal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with city and county comprehensive plans. The GMA requires that communities apply the concepts of consistency and concurrency when addressing transportation issues.

Consistency means that no feature of a plan or regulation is incompatible with any other feature of a plan or regulation. Consistency allows orderly integration with other elements in a system. Consistent features and elements of the plan are compatible to the extent that they can coexist and not preclude the accomplishment of other features or elements.

Concurrency means that adequate capital facilities are available at the time that the impacts of development occur, or within six years of such development. Within the GMA, concurrency is required for transportation actions, such as development projects, that affect transportation routes that the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) has functionally classified as arterial streets or transit routes. Municipalities may optionally apply concurrency ordinances to other roadway classifications and to capital facilities.

The GMA requires that the Transportation Element address the following topics:

- Land use assumptions used in estimating travel;
- Facilities and service needs, including:
 - An inventory of air, water, and land transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments, to define existing capital facilities and travel levels as a basis for future planning;
 - Level of service (LOS) standards for all arterials and transit routes to serve as a gauge to judge performance of the system. These standards should be regionally coordinated;
 - For state-owned transportation facilities, level of service standards for highways, to gauge the performance of the system;
 - Specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance any facilities or services that are below established LOS standard;
 - Forecasts of traffic for at least 10 years based on the adopted land use plan to provide information on the location, timing and capacity needs of future growth;
 - Identification of system expansion needs and transportation system management needs to meet future demands;
- Intergovernmental coordination efforts, including an assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions;
- Demand-management strategies; and
- Pedestrian and bicycle component to include collaborative efforts to identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles.

- Finance, including:
 - An analysis of funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources;
 - A multi-year financing plan based on the needs identified in the Comprehensive Plan, the appropriate parts of which shall serve as the basis for the six-year street, road, or transit program required by RCW 35.77.010 for cities;
 - If probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs, a discussion of how additional funding will be raised or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that LOS standards will be met.

Communities with adopted LOS standards must adopt and enforce ordinances which prohibit development approval if the development causes the LOS on a transportation facility to decline below the standards adopted in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, unless transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development are made concurrent with the development. These strategies may include increased public transportation service, ride sharing programs, demand management, and other transportation systems management strategies.

Transportation Element Certification

The City of Selah's Transportation Element must be consistent with the *Yakima Valley Metropolitan and Regional Transportation Plan 2016-2040 (M/RTP)* established by the Yakima Valley Conference of Governments (YVCOG), the lead agency for the Yakima County Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO). The Transportation Element must also implement, and be consistent with, the City's Land Use Element, as well as the Yakima Countywide Planning Policy and State growth management goals.

After review of the City of Selah Transportation Element, it was determined that it is consistent with the M/RTP and the GMA, as follows:

- The Transportation Element was submitted for consideration on {insert date} and reviewed by YVCOG Staff.
- The MPO/RTPO Technical Advisory Committee reviewed the completed Transportation Element Review Checklist on {insert date} and recommended approval to the Yakima Valley Transportation Policy Board.
- The Yakima Valley Transportation Policy Board considered the recommendation of the TAC on {insert date} and approved the City of Selah Transportation Element.
- A formal Transportation Element Consistency Certification Report was signed by YVCOG's Executive Director on {insert date} (Appendix x).

Relationship to Other Elements

The Transportation Element must be consistent with other elements of the Comprehensive Plan. It must support the desired development pattern and desired growth rates and in turn, the Transportation Element's goals and objectives must be in harmony with and supported by the Land Use Element, Capital Facilities Element, Housing Element and other portions of the Plan. The Transportation Element must support the concurrent development of transportation facilities as growth occurs.

Applicable Countywide Planning Policies

Countywide planning policies must be considered and incorporated into the Transportation Element for the plan to achieve “interjurisdictional consistency.” The following Countywide Planning Policies apply to discussion of the Transportation Element:

1. The Capital Facilities, Utilities, and Transportation Elements of each local government’s comprehensive plan will specify the general location and phasing of major infrastructure improvements and anticipated revenue sources. [RCW 36.70A.070(3)(c)(d)] (Countywide Planning Policy: B.3.4.)
2. Major public capital facilities that generate substantial travel demand should be located along or near major transportation corridors and public transportation routes. (C.3.4.)
3. The multiple uses of corridors for major utilities, trails, and transportation rights-of-way is encouraged. (C.3.6.)
4. The transportation plan element for each jurisdiction will be consistent with and support the Land Use Element of its comprehensive plan. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)] (D.3.1.)
5. Transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts resulting from new development will be implemented concurrent with new development. “Concurrent with new development” means that improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years. [RCW 36.70A.070(6)(e)]
6. Local jurisdictions will coordinate transportation planning efforts through the YVCOG, which is designated as the RTPO. This regional coordination will assure that an assessment of the impacts of each transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions conducted and conflicts prevented. (D.3.5.)
7. Each interlocal agreement will require that common and consistent development and construction standards be applied throughout the urban growth area (UGA). These may include, but not be limited to, standards for streets and roads, utilities, and other infrastructure components. (F.3.5.)

II. MAJOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES CONSIDERATIONS

- The City of Selah has identified road projects in its Six Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). What funding sources are available for these projects?
- The urban growth area (UGA) defines where the City is financially capable of providing urban services during the 20 year planning period, and the areas it may ultimately annex. If the City wants to encourage the annexation of additional areas, how will those areas meet the City’s standards for streets, lighting, sidewalks, etc.?
- What improvements to the transportation network, including public transportation, are needed to support the City’s goals in other areas, especially land use and economic development?
- Fire equipment requirements frequently determine minimum road widths and minimum radii for turnarounds. What road standards need to be met to ensure access for emergency vehicles?

- The characteristics of the City's population have changed over the past decade. Have the mobility needs in Selah also changed, and if so, how can they be met?
- Are additional sidewalks or other pathways needed for public safety, now or in the future? Is a sidewalk improvement program needed?

III. TRANSPORTATION NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS

Roads and Streets

The Selah area is served by a network of roads and streets (Figure 3-1). Access to Selah is from both SR 823 (S. 1st Street), which passes through the Selah's east side and downtown. Other roads that connect with Selah serve agricultural lands to the north and the Yakima Training Center to the east.

All of Selah's roads are paved. There are a number of unpaved road in the unincorporated portion of the UGA (Figure 3-1).

In the retail core area, some on-street parking is available. Street rights-of-way vary throughout the City from 60 feet to 80 feet wide. Pavement width ranges from 18 feet to 80 feet.

Airports

The Yakima Air Terminal is located in the City of Yakima. The 825-acre airport serves Yakima County and portions of Kittitas, Klickitat and Lewis Counties. The airport is owned by the City of Yakima and is managed and operated by airport staff. Airport maintenance and operations are funded solely through revenues generated at the airport. The Yakima Air Terminal has four runways, ranging from 1,169 feet long to 7,064 feet long; 139 aircraft; and an average of 88 aircraft operations per day. The airport is currently updating its Airport Master Plan, which will address three key issues: potential runway extensions, revisions to the Airport Safety Overlay Zone, potential development of a new turf runway, and planning for a new or improved passenger terminal area. According to the draft Airport Master Plan update, the number of enplaned passengers is expected to grow by approximately 53% between 2015 and 2030.

Rail

The Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad provides the majority of freight service within the Yakima Valley. The BNSF mainline runs roughly parallel to SR 823, on the east side of the City. Currently, no inter-regional passenger rail service is provided in Yakima County.

Public Transportation

Yakima Transit provides the only public fixed-route transportation service in Yakima County. Yakima Transit provides 10 fixed routes serving the City of Yakima as well as vanpool services. Route 10 also serves the City of Selah, Monday through Saturday. Route 10 includes a north-south route through Selah, a trip along Speyers-Fremont Loop, and service to the Firing Center Road Park and Ride for military personnel working at the Yakima Training Center. Yakima Transit has a contract with Selah to provide the service, which is paid for by the City through a sales tax approved in 2007. In addition, the Yakima-Ellensburg Commuter which provides service between Yakima and Ellensburg, stops in Selah at the Firing Center Road Park and Ride. The Commuter runs Monday through Friday. Yakima Transit vanpools can provide service to residents of the Selah area who work in the Yakima area. Fees vary depending on the frequency of trips, number of riders, and distance of travel. Vanpool fees are shared among all riders, and Yakima Transit provides the van, insurance, maintenance, and fuel.

As in most of the smaller communities in Yakima County, public transportation options in Selah are limited. The major transportation needs in Yakima County are for employment, nutrition, education, health care, and human services. Individuals most in need of public transportation include older adults, youth, and those with limited incomes. Without public transportation options, older adults may be forced to leave their homes or communities for assisted living options or communities with ready access to transit. Selah youth can access Central Washington University via the Yakima-Ellensburg Commuter, but may have difficulty accessing other educational opportunities in the Valley, such as Yakima Valley Community College and Perry Technical Institute in Yakima, and Heritage University in Toppenish. Nearby Yakima is an employment center for Selah residents, and those with lower incomes may have difficulty maintaining employment without reliable transportation options. The continued availability of Route 10 is vital for those with lower income to continue to access jobs in Yakima.

People for People (PFP) is a local non-profit organization that has provided transportation services throughout Yakima County since 1982, including the Selah area. PFP is also the Medicaid Trip Broker for the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS). With funding from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), the organization provides the following services:

- Paratransit services to individuals with disabilities outside the City of Yakima. People for People requests 24-hour notification. Riders must complete a short telephone survey, but are not required to provide doctor verification.
- The Yakima-Prosser Community Connector provides fare-free weekday fixed-route service between Yakima and Prosser, stopping at Wapato, Toppenish, Zillah, Granger, Sunnyside, and Grandview. The closest Yakima-Prosser Connector stop to Selah is in Yakima at the Yakima Transit Center, 105 S. 4th Street, approximately five miles south of Selah.
- Job Access-Reverse Commute transportation for recipients of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and their children. This service provides transportation to job training activities for eligible participants.
- Senior transportation to those 60 years and older and living outside Yakima city limits. The service provides transportation to nutrition or meal sites, necessary shopping, and medical appointments.

Regional bus service is provided by Greyhound Bus Lines, which has a station in Yakima at 1803 Fruitvale Boulevard. Greyhound provides services to Seattle three times per day via I-82, service to the Tri-Cities and Pendleton, Oregon and points south via I-82 twice a day; and service to Portland via Goldendale on I-82 and SR-97 once a day.

The *Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan* was created by PFP on behalf of the YVCOG. The plan was developed in response to the federal Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Act, which required that communities develop a coordinated public transit and human services transportation plan to be eligible for certain Federal Transit Administration funding. The plan calls for the following:

- Preserve and expand transportation services for individuals with disabilities, older adults, youth veterans, and individuals with low incomes.
- Promote safe and accessible transportation services for individuals with special needs by educating and advocating for special needs transportation.
- Coordinate transportation and human services for increased efficiencies and utilization of resources.

The *Yakima Valley Metropolitan and Regional Transportation Plan 2016-2040* (M/RTP) was updated by YVCOG in 2016, in compliance with MAP-21. The M/RTP includes strategies for expanding transit to meet future travel demands throughout the Yakima Valley region. The M/RTP recognizes a need to expand demand-response service in the South Central area where Selah is located, and to coordinate with existing and expanded rural transit service to regional services and facilities. Strategies to reduce peak period travel demands also are included. The transit and transportation demand management strategies include:

- Expand and improve existing fixed-route transit service and fleets.
- Add demand-response service for developing areas that cannot support fixed-route service.
- Expand People for People Community Connector service to directly serve medical and educational facilities.
- Coordinate existing fixed-route transit service with existing and expanded rural transit services to community colleges, hospitals, and other regional facilities and attractions.
- Maintain existing paratransit services to provide transportation access for special needs populations.

- Purchase more vehicles for vanpool programs.
- Construct high-priority missing links in the regional non-motorized system.
-

Non-motorized Transportation

Non-motorized transportation refers to pedestrian and bicycle modes of travel. Walking and bicycling are integral parts of the transportation system. Every trip begins and ends as a pedestrian trip. People use bicycles to commute to work and school, for utilitarian trips such as visiting friends and shopping, and to make connections to transit or other intermodal facilities. A benchmark of making a community a desirable place to live is its pedestrian access and bicycle facilities.

Sidewalks

A linked system of sidewalks is the most obvious and economical pedestrian pathway network for the City of Selah. Selah has a fairly strong sidewalk system, with portions of the downtown area, 1st Street, Selah's major arterials, school zones, and some residential areas having sidewalks. The current sidewalk system could be built upon to create a more linked network between services and schools, and Selah's older neighborhoods.

Sidewalk improvements are ongoing. In 2015, Selah constructed a new sidewalk along Wernex Loop between the Selah Middle School and Selah High School, to create a safer route for students walking to and from school. The project was paid for with a federal Transportation Alternatives Program grant. Several other road projects included in Selah's Transportation Improvement Program (Table 3.9, page 3-26)) have a sidewalk construction or reconstruction component. In addition, Selah is planning a pedestrian and bicycle path study that is anticipated to start in 2018.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Pathways

The Yakima Greenway is a 10-mile long paved parkway that connects Selah, Yakima, and Union Gap; a final planned segment will also connect the rest of the Greenway to Naches. The 2.1-mile Selah extension of the Yakima Greenway extends north from Harlan Park at the confluence of the Naches and Yakima Rivers, into Selah. It terminates at Southern Avenue with a dedicated bike lane up to Third Street, and then a bike route on Third Street through the City.

Transportation Demand Management

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) consists of strategies that seek to maximize the efficiency of the transportation system by reducing demand on the system. The results of successful TDM can include:

- Travelers switching from driving alone to high-occupancy vehicles modes such as transit, vanpools or carpools.
- Travelers switching from driving to non-motorized modes such as bicycling or walking.
- Travelers changing the time they make trips from more congested to less congested times of day.
- Travelers eliminating trips altogether either through means such as compressed workweeks, consolidation of errands, or telecommuting.

Within the State of Washington, alternative transportation solutions are further necessitated by the objectives of the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) law. Passed in 1991 as a section of the Washington Clean Air Act (RCW 70.94), the CTR law seeks to reduce workplace commute trips in the nine most

populous counties in the State, which includes Yakima County. This law requires that in the designated high population counties, each city within the county adopt a CTR plan requiring private and public employers with 100 or more employees implement TDM programs. Programs provide various incentives or disincentives to encourage use of alternative transportation modes, other than the SOV. The purpose of CTR is to help maintain air quality in metropolitan areas by reducing congestion and air pollution.

Three employers within the City of Selah fall within the criteria of the CTR law:

- City of Selah
- Washington Department of Social and Health Services
- Tree Top, Inc.

IV. ROAD CHARACTERISTICS

The City of Selah maintains approximately 39.4 miles of streets within the City limits.

Functional Classification

All of the roads in the Selah UGA have an assigned functional classification. Functional classification is the grouping of highways, roads and streets by the character of service they provide for transportation planning purposes. Comprehensive transportation planning, an integral part of total economic and social development, uses functional classification to determine how travel can be channelized within the road network in a logical and efficient manner. Functional classification defines the part that any particular route should play in serving the flow of trips through a road network.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has delegated to state transportation agencies the primary responsibility for developing and updating the statewide highway functional classification in rural and urban areas to determine functional usage of the existing roads and streets. State transportation agencies must cooperate with responsible local officials in developing and updating the functional classification.

Roads are classified as either rural or urban depending on the population of the municipality and its population density. In those places which are designated by the U.S. Bureau of the Census as urban, urban areas must be established to meet the requirements of Title 23, Section 103, USC. State and local officials fix boundaries in cooperation with each other, subject to approval of the FHWA Division Administrator. An urban area may be one of two types: urbanized area or urban cluster. Urban clusters or small urban areas have populations of 5,000 to 49,999 and are not within an urbanized area. Urbanized areas include a city or multiple cities that have a population of 50,000 or more (central city) and surrounding incorporated and unincorporated areas that meet certain criteria for population size and density.

The Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) estimates Selah's 2016 population at 7,530 persons. Selah is located in the Yakima-Selah-Union Gap Urbanized Area and is considered an urban area for the purpose of transportation planning. This urbanized area is separate from the Selah Urban Growth Area (UGA) established under the Growth Management Act and which is designated as the area in which growth will occur during a 20-year planning period. The urbanized area designation is used for purposes of transportation planning and extends well beyond Selah's UGA boundary.

The City's functional street classification is defined below, based on standards developed by WSDOT. Figure 3-1, page 3-6 depicts the functional classification of roads within the City of Selah.

- *Principal Arterial:* A highway connecting major community centers and facilities, often constructed with partial limitations on access through intersections and common driveways. Principal arterials generally carry the highest traffic volumes and provide the best mobility in the road network. Since most principal arterials are intra-county, they serve both urban and rural areas. Regional and inter-county bus routes are generally located on principal arterials as well as transfer centers and park-and-ride lots.
- *Minor Arterial:* A highway connecting centers and facilities within the community and providing some access to abutting properties. The minor arterials stress mobility and circulation needs over providing specific access to properties. Minor arterials allow densely populated areas easy access to principal arterials, adjacent land uses (i.e. shopping, schools, etc.), and have lower traffic rates than principal arterials.
- *Collector Street:* A highway connecting two or more neighborhoods as well as carrying traffic within neighborhoods. Collectors also channel traffic onto the minor and principal arterials. Typically, they carry moderate traffic volumes, have relatively shorter trips than arterials, and carry very little through traffic. Urban collectors and rural major collectors are the lowest classes of road classification eligible for federal funding.
- *Local Access Street:* This category comprises all roads and streets not otherwise classified. Their main function is providing direct access to abutting properties, sometimes at the expense of traffic movement. Traffic generally moves slowly on these streets and delays are caused by turning vehicles.

Level of Service

The ease of traffic movement along a road is a function of the road's vehicular capacity, the number of vehicles using the road, the number of stops along the road, and the time spent waiting at each stop. To characterize the ease of traffic movement, transportation engineers have developed the concept of level of service (LOS), which measures the effectiveness of service on transportation infrastructure. Levels of service standards, as described in Table 3.3, are taken from the Transportation Research Board *Highway Capacity Manual*.

LOS can be calculated in several ways. A simple measure, and the one used in this analysis, relates traffic volume to road capacity. Road capacity refers to the maximum amount of traffic that can be accommodated by a given road facility. Road capacity is based on an analysis of road conditions, including the number and width of lanes, pavement and shoulder types, and the presence of controls at an intersection. The LOS is calculated by dividing the observed peak traffic volume by the idealized road capacity. The resulting number is assigned one of six different levels of service from "A" to "F," summarized in Table 3.3 below.

The City of Selah has selected a standard of LOS D for principal arterials, and LOS C for all other minor arterials, collectors, and local access roads. In urban areas, the LOS of roadway intersections controls the LOS of the roadway system. This standard is consistent with the LOS methodologies and thresholds established by YVCOG, the Yakima Valley RTPO, which is tasked with ensuring LOS methodologies are coordinated with surrounding jurisdictions to ensure a consistent regional evaluation of transportation facilities and corridors.

SMC Section xx, Transportation Concurrency Review, provides criteria for review of mitigation measures in the event a proposed development project is determined to not meet the LOS standards.

Table 3.3. Level of Service Categories

Level of Service	Description	Volume/Capacity Ratio
A	Free flow. Low volumes and no delays.	Less than 0.60
B	Stable flow. Speeds restricted by travel conditions, minor delays. Presence of other users in the traffic stream.	0.60 to 0.69
C	Stable flow. Speeds and maneuverability reduced somewhat by higher volumes.	0.70 to 0.79
D	Stable flow. Speeds considerably affected by change in operating conditions. High density traffic restricts maneuverability.	0.80 to 0.89
E	Unstable flow. Low speeds, considerable delay, volume at or near capacity. Freedom to maneuver is extremely difficult.	0.90 to 1.00
F	Forced flow. Very low speeds, volumes exceed capacity, long delays and queues with stop-and-go traffic.	Over 1.00

Communities with adopted LOS standards must adopt and enforce ordinances which prohibit development approval if the development causes the LOS on a transportation facility to decline below the standards adopted in the Transportation Element of the comprehensive plan, unless transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development are made concurrent with the development. To accommodate the impacts of the development, local governments may change the phasing or timing of the new development, provide transportation facilities or services to serve the new development, reduce the LOS standard, or revise the Land Use Element.

Idealized Urban and Rural Road Capacities

For each of the functional classifications of roads noted above, a corresponding idealized capacity is shown below. These idealized capacities are based on road capacities designated by the *Highway Capacity Manual* developed by the Transportation Research Board. The actual capacity of any specific road is affected by the road's speed limit, the number of intersecting roads, the number of stops or other delays, and other factors. These definitions of capacity by functional class are consistent with those developed by the YVCOG.

<i>Functional Class</i>	<i>Capacity of Two Lane Road (Vehicles/Hour)</i>
Principal Arterial (Urban/Rural)	2,200
Minor Arterial (Urban/Rural)	2,000
Collector Arterial (Urban)	1,800
Major Collector (Rural)	2,000
Minor Collector (Rural)	2,000
Access/Local (Urban)	1,600
Access/Local (Rural)	1,600

Traffic Volume History

Traffic volumes in the Selah area tend to be much lower than the capacities noted above.

Available historical records on traffic flows in the Selah area are limited to a periodic counting of vehicular traffic on the major collectors and some of the local streets. In June 2016, YVCOG conducted a traffic count in the City that updated traffic volumes for 17 road segments.

Table 3.1 shows the peak hour traffic volume and LOS for selected street segments within the City of Selah. The measure of traffic volumes is “Average Annualized Daily Traffic” (AADT), which is the average daily traffic that can be expected throughout the year on each road segment. The AADTs were calculated using the “Average Weekday Traffic” (AWDT) gained from traffic counts. The AWDT is normalized for the month the count occurred using a “Monthly Normalization Factor” (MNF) provided by WSDOT to determine AADT, regardless of when the count occurs. The calculation is: $AWDT * MNF = AADT$.

Table 3.1 shows the peak hour traffic volume and LOS for selected street segments within the city of Selah, while Table 3.2 shows the same for the unincorporated UGA. Peak hour volumes indicate a LOS designation of “A” for all streets except S. 1st Street, with a LOS designation of “C.”

Table 3.1. Peak Hour Volume and Level of Service, City of Selah

Functional Class	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Number of Lanes	AADT Base Year (2017) ¹	Peak Hour Volume ²	Idealized Roadway Capacity	Peak Volume as a Ratio of Roadway Capacity	Level of Service
Principal Arterial	S. First Street	W. Selah Ave	South City Limits	5	17,647	1,765	2,200	0.80	C
	S. First Street	E. Naches Ave	W. Selah Ave	5	10,312	1,031	2,200	0.47	A
Minor Arterial	W. Naches Ave	4th Street	First Street	2	4,557	456	2,000	0.23	A
	E. Naches Ave	First Street	N. Wenas Rd	4	3,901	390	2,000	0.20	A
	N. Wenas Rd	E. Goodlander Rd	Harrison Rd.	2	10,150	1,015	2,000	0.51	A
	Jim Clements Way	E. Naches Ave	2nd Ave	2	11,165	1,117	2,000	0.56	A
	Crusher Canyon Rd	Fourth Street	W. City Limits	2	2,365	237	2,000	0.12	A
	W. Fremont Ave	16th St	N. First Ave	2	4807	481	2,000	0.24	A
	E. Fremont Ave	N. First St	N. Wenas Rd	2	7,483	748	2,000	0.37	A
	Speyers Rd	Fremont Ave	N. Ninth St	2	3,712	371	2,000	0.19	A
		N. Ninth St	W. City Limits	2	2,356	236	2,000	0.12	A
	N. First St	E. Naches Ave	E. Fremont Ave	5	7,483	748	2,000	0.37	A
		E. Fremont Ave	Goodlander	5	4,356	436	2,000	0.22	A
	Collector	E. Goodlander Rd	N. First St	N. Wenas Rd	2	3,883	388	1,800	0.22

Functional Class	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Number of Lanes	AADT Base Year (2017) ¹	Peak Hour Volume ²	Idealized Roadway Capacity	Peak Volume as a Ratio of Roadway Capacity	Level of Service
	E. Naches Ave	N. Wenas Rd	E. City Limits	2	3,390	339	1,800	0.19	A
	N. Third St	Fremont Ave	W. Naches Ave	2	1,176	118	1,800	0.07	A
	S. Third St	Selah Ave	Southern Ave	2	2,030	203	1,800	0.11	A
		W. Naches Ave	Selah Ave	2	1,598	160	1,800	0.09	A
	Southern Ave	S. First St	Fassett Rd	2	2,025	203	1,800	0.11	A
	N. Eleventh St	Speyers Rd	Fremont Ave	2	422	42	1,800	0.02	A

¹ YVCOG 2016 – calculated to 2017 using 1.5% growth rate

² Estimated at 10% of AADT

Table 3.2. Peak Hour Volume and Level of Service, Selah Unincorporated UGA

Functional Class	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	Number of Lanes	AADT Base Year (2017)	Peak Hour Volume	Idealized Roadway Capacity	Peak Volume as a Ratio of Roadway Capacity	Level of Service
Minor Arterial	N. Wenas Rd	E. Goodlander Rd	Harrison Rd	2	10,457 ¹	1,046	2,000	0.52	A
	Harrison Rd	N. Wenas Rd	SR-821	2	4,915 ¹	492	2,000	0.25	A
	Crusher Canyon Rd	W. City Limits	Mapleway Rd	2	1,824 ²	182.4	2,400	0.08	A
	Speyers Rd	W. City Limits	Hinton Lane	2	1,920 ³	192	2,400	0.08	A
	N 1st St	Goodlander Rd	McGonagle Rd	2	4,104 ³	410.4	2,400	0.17	A
Collector	Pleasant Hill Rd	Tenth St	Brigit Rd	2	1,516 ²	151.6	1,600	0.09	A

¹ WSDOT 2015 – calculated to 2017 using 1.5% growth rate.

² Yakima County 2011 – calculated to 2017 using 1.5% growth rate.

³ Yakima County 2012 – calculated to 2017 using 1.5% growth rate.

Freight and Goods Transportation System

WSDOT has designated a statewide Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS), most recently updated in 2015.

WSDOT used criteria based on the level of annual freight tonnage carried by a particular segment of road to identify road segments that play a significant role in the movement of freight and other goods throughout the state (Table 3.4). The FGTS is the first step in identifying and developing a year-round, all-weather system of routes serving truck travel and the economic needs of communities statewide.

Through the FGTS, WSDOT estimates truck traffic on highways and roads used most heavily by trucks. Truck traffic count data is converted into average weights by truck type. The five truck route classes based on annual tonnage are listed below. Category T-5 accounts for roads subject to heavy use on a seasonal basis.

Table 3.4. Truck Route Classes Based on Annual Tonnage

Truck Route Class	Annual Tonnage
T-1	10,000,000 +
T-2	4,000,000 - 10,000,000
T-3	300,000 - 4,000,000
T-4	100,000 - 300,000
T-5	At least 20,000 in 60 days and less than 100,000 tons per year

Table 3.5 lists the City of Selah FGTS streets and roads, and Table 3.6 lists Selah UGA FGTS streets and roads in the unincorporated UGA. Figure 3-2, page 3-19 illustrates the FGTS streets and roads for the City of Selah and UGA.

Table 3.5. Freight and Goods Transportation System Classified Roads, City of Selah


Route Name	Start Location	End Location	FGTS Class
SR 823	South City limits	North City limits	T-2
Crusher Canyon Road/ W. Naches Avenue	West City limits	SR 823	T-3
S. 1 st Street	E. Naches Avenue	Valleyview Avenue	T-3
N. 1 st Street	North City limits	W. Fremont Avenue	T-4
W. Fremont Avenue	S. 1 st Street	N. 16 th Street	T-4
Speyers Road	W. Fremont Avenue	West City limits	T-4

Table 3.6. Freight and Goods Transportation System Classified Roads, Unincorporated UGA

Route Name	Start Location	End Location	FGTS Class
SR 823 – South UGA	South UGA boundary	South City limits	T-2
SR 823 – North UGA	North city limits	Kinne Lane	T-2
Kinne Lane	SR 823	North UGA boundary	T-3
Selah Loop Road	E. Goodlander Road	North UGA boundary	T-3
Speyers Road	West City limits	West UGA boundary	T-3
Crusher Canyon Road	West City limits	West UGA boundary	T-3

The City of Selah has several FGTS roads passing through and around its downtown area, and through residential neighborhoods in City. Due to the stress placed on these roads from additional tonnage, Selah will need to monitor these roads and plan for maintenance, and consider mitigation measures addressing potential noise and safety issues along FGTS roads that pass through residential neighborhoods.

Figure 3-2. Roadways by Truck Tonnage Class, City of Selah



V. TRAFFIC FORECASTS

Demographics and Population Projections

As noted in the Land Use Element, the City of Selah population projection for 2037 is 9,607.

The 2010 Census indicated that 32.6% of Selah's population was age 19 or younger. An additional 8.7% age 65 or older. As of the 2010 Census, 49.5% of Selah's households had an income of \$49,999 or less, while 14.3% of all families were considered to be below the poverty level. In Selah, the number of young people and lower-income families is of particular significance for transit.

Land Use Patterns and Population Distribution

The City of Selah's UGA future land use designations were revised in 2016 (see Land Use Element). Over the near term, the area immediately in the southwest UGA served by Southern Avenue and Crusher Canyon Road is anticipated to be annexed and develop into residential, commercial, mixed, and civic uses. The city is seeking to diversify land uses with more emphasis on retail, commercial, industrial, and mixed uses that include residential.

Forecasted Traffic Volumes

Traffic forecasts for Selah area roadways are being developed as part of the Countywide YVCOG Travel Demand Model set. The model set is using 2015 as the base year, includes a 2020 forecast for Metropolitan and Regional Transportation Improvement evaluation, and includes a 2040 forecast to align with the Regional Transportation Plan and the local comprehensive plan updates. The Countywide YVCOG Travel Demand Model set covers the metropolitan and regional planning areas and is administered by YVCOG. When development of the model set is completed, travel forecasts will predict growth in traffic volume on the basis of anticipated regional changes in land use and employment patterns.

To develop the land use assumptions, YVCOG worked in an iterative process with each jurisdiction to best represent the household inventory by type, employee information by business type and location, student and employee information for schools, and amount of available agricultural land. Selah and each jurisdiction was asked to provide actual land use information for the year 2015 and forecasts for each of the described land use inputs for 2020 and 2040 according to their comprehensive planning assumptions. In this way, not only could YVCOG provide forecasted traffic volumes for Selah, transportation system changes could be evaluated for potential impacts before they are ever constructed or implemented.

For the current analysis, YVCOG assumed that a growth in the AADT of 1.5% per year was reasonable and within expected bounds for the metropolitan area. This method was used to calculate traffic forecasts for Selah area roads. Table 3.6 shows traffic forecasts for road segments within City limits, at five-year intervals from 2017 to 2037. The base year of each estimate is the most recently available traffic count for each road segment. Table 3.7 shows the same forecasts for road segments in the unincorporated UGA.

At the forecasted AADTs for 2037, most roads maintain a LOS designation of A. However, S. 1st Street between W. Selah Avenue and the south City limits is forecasted to reach LOS F by the year 2032, with a volume to capacity ratio exceeding 1.0. Additionally, S. 1st Street from E. Naches Avenue and W. Selah Avenue, and N. Wenas Road between E. Goodlander Road and Harrison Road are forecasted to reach LOS B by 2037, while Jim Clements Way between E. Naches Avenue and 2nd Avenue is forecasted to reach LOS C by 2037.

As discussed previously, the forecasts are based on an assumption of 1.5% growth in AADT per year. These forecasts are only estimates, but provide an idea of where congestion may be an issue in the future. Given the current LOS B for S. 1st Street between W. Selah Avenue and the south City limits and the LOS projected by 2032, Selah should consider further studies to further refine forecasts and to identify the best ways to either increase capacity on S. 1st Street, and/or to reduce demand on that corridor through demand management strategies.

Table 3.7. Traffic Forecasts for Road Segments, City of Selah

Functional Class	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	AADT Base Year (2017)	AADT 2022	AADT 2027	AADT 2032	AADT 2037
Principal Arterial	S. First Street	W. Selah Ave	South City Limits	17,647	19,011	20,480	22,063	23,768
	S. First Street	E. Naches Ave	W. Selah Ave	10,312	11,109	11,968	12,893	13,889
Minor Arterial	W. Naches Ave	4th Street	First Street	4,557	4,910	5,289	5,698	6,138
	E. Naches Ave	First Street	N. Wenas Rd	3,901	4,202	4,527	4,877	5,254
	N. Wenas Rd	E. Goodlander Rd	Harrison Rd.	10,150	10,934	11,779	12,690	13,671
	Jim Clements Way	E. Naches Ave	2nd Ave	11,165	12,028	12,957	13,959	15,038
	Crusher Canyon Rd	Fourth Street	W. City Limits	2,365	2,548	2,745	2,957	3,185
	W. Fremont Ave	16th St	N. First Ave	4,807	5,179	5,579	6,010	6,474
	E. Fremont Ave	N. First St	N. Wenas Rd	7,483	8,061	8,684	9,355	10,078
	Speyers Rd	Fremont Ave	N. Ninth St	3,712	3,999	4,308	4,641	4,999
		N. Ninth St	W. City Limits	2,356	2,538	2,734	2,945	3,173
	N. First St	E. Naches Ave	E. Fremont Ave	7,483	8,061	8,684	9,355	10,078
		E. Fremont Ave	Goodlander	4,356	4,693	5,056	5,446	5,867
	Collector	E. Goodlander Rd	N. First St	N. Wenas Rd	3,883	4,184	4,507	4,855

Functional Class	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	AADT Base Year (2017)	AADT 2022	AADT 2027	AADT 2032	AADT 2037
	E. Naches Ave	N. Wenas Rd	E. City Limits	3,390	3,652	3,934	4,238	4,566
	N. Third St	Fremont Ave	W. Naches Ave	1,176	1,267	1,365	1,471	1,584
	S. Third St	Selah Ave	Southern Ave	2,030	2,187	2,356	2,538	2,734
		W. Naches Ave	Selah Ave	1,598	1,721	1,854	1,997	2,152
	Southern Ave	S. First St	Fassett Rd	2,025	2,181	2,350	2,532	2,727
	N. Eleventh St	Speyers Rd	Fremont Ave	422	455	490	528	569

Table 3.8. Traffic Forecasts for Road Segments, Selah Unincorporated UGA

Functional Class	Road Name	Start Location	End Location	AADT Base Year (2017)	AADT 2022	AADT 2027	AADT 2032	AADT 2037
Minor Arterial	N. Wenas Rd	E. Goodlander Rd	Harrison Rd	10,457 ¹	11,265	12,136	13,074	14,084
	Harrison Rd	N. Wenas Rd	SR-821	4,915 ¹	5,295	5,704	6,145	6,620
	Crusher Canyon Rd	W. City Limits	Mapleway Rd	1,824 ²	1,907	2,055	2,214	2,385
	Speyers Rd	W. City Limits	Hinton Lane	1,920 ³	2,008	2,163	2,330	2,510
	N 1st St	Goodlander Rd	McGonagle Rd	4,104 ³	4,291	4,623	4,980	5,365
Collector	Pleasant Hill Rd	Tenth St	Brigit Rd	1,516 ²	1,585	1,708	1,840	1,982

¹ WSDOT 2015 – calculated to 2017 using 1.5% growth rate.

² Yakima County 2011 – calculated to 2017 using 1.5% growth rate.

³ Yakima County 2012 – calculated to 2017 using 1.5% growth rate.

VI. EXISTING DEFICIENCIES, FUTURE NEEDS AND ALTERNATIVES

As the City of Selah's roads are well below capacity, the existing deficiencies of the road network reflect maintenance, safety, and design concerns, rather than capacity problems. The City of Selah has identified transportation projects through its Transportation Improvement Program 2017-2022, adopted June 16, 2016 (Table 3.8). Beyond the next six years, Selah would like to focus on xx prior to the end of the 20-year planning period in 2037.

Using the existing street conditions as a reference, the following issues and deficiencies have been identified:

Deficiencies and Issues

1. Congestion – within the 20-year planning period, Selah may begin to experience serious congestion issues on S. First Street and possibly in other corridors. Selah should consider further studies to further refine forecasts and to identify the best ways to either increase capacity on S. 1st Street, and/or to reduce traffic demand through demand management strategies.

Table 3.9. Transportation Improvement Program, City of Selah, 2016 to 2021

Priority Number	Project Title	Street	Functional Class	Length (miles)	Start Year	Improvements Needed	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
1	East Goodlander Road Reconstruction	East Goodlander Road	Urban Collector	0.4	2020	Reconstruct and widen existing two lanes to add a turn lane. Phase 2 of this project to be funding when STP(U) funds become available. Construction	\$1,325,800	STP
2	Valleyview Avenue Reconstruction	Valleyview Avenue	Urban Collector	0.65	2021	Reconstruct and widen existing two lanes. Acquire r/w as needed, construct sidewalks, curb and gutter, storm drainage, street lights and signalization	\$2,079,500	STP
3	Civic Center Parking Improvements	Civic Center	NA	NA	2017	Expand parking lot/park and ride including excavation, gravel base, asphalt, curb and gutter, storm drainage improvements, and illumination.	\$379,580	CMAQ
4	Park Avenue Reconstruction	Park Avenue	Urban Collector	0.65		Reconstruct and widen existing two lanes, sidewalk on both sides, curb and gutter, storm drainage and street lighting.	\$394,400	Local, TIB, PWTF
5	N. First Street Grind and Overlay	N. First Street	Urban Minor Arterial	0.63	2017	Plane and overlay asphalt, and replace ADA ramps. Relocate traffic signal pole.	\$815,870	Local, TIB, PWTF
6	Selah Pedestrian / Bicycle Path Study	NA	NA	NA	2018	Pedestrian/bicycle path study.	\$53,000	Local
7	Southern Avenue Reconstruction	Southern Avenue	Urban Collector	0.15	2021	Reconstruct and widen existing two lanes. Construct sidewalks, curb and gutter, storm drainage, street lights and signalization.	\$542,920	Local, TIB, PWTF
8	West Goodlander Road Reconstruction	West Goodlander Road	Urban Collector	0.71	2022	Reconstruct and widen existing two lanes. Construct sidewalks, curb and gutter, storm drainage.	\$3,134,000	Local, TIB, PWTF
9	South Third Street Reconstruction	South Third Street	Urban Collector	0.38	2022	Reconstruct road add curb and gutter, drainage, sidewalks and grading. Acquire right of way.	\$1,726,710	STP
10	East Naches Avenue Reconstruction	East Naches Avenue	Urban Collector	0.30	2022	Drainage, replace curb and gutter, sidewalk on both sides, grading, paving and street lighting.	\$1,389,000	Local, TIB, PWTF

Priority Number	Project Title	Street	Functional Class	Length (miles)	Start Year	Improvements Needed	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
11	North Fourth Street Reconstruction	North Fourth Street	Urban Collector	0.13	2022	Construct curb and gutter, sidewalk, retaining wall, grading and paving.	\$495,000	Local, TIB, PWTF
12	Valleyview Avenue & South Fifth Street Reconstruction	Valleyview Avenue, South Fifth Street	Urban Collector	0.52	2022	Clearing, grubbing, sidewalk, curb and gutter, storm drainage, street lighting, grading and paving.	\$2,284,000	Local, TIB, PWTF
13	East Goodlander Road/Lancaster Road Traffic Signal	East Goodlander Road/Lancaster Road	Urban Collector	NA	2019	Install new four-leg traffic signal with camera detection.	\$325,000	Local, TIB, PWTF
14	Third Street/W. Fremont School Zone Beacons	Third Street/W. Fremont	Urban Collector	NA	2018	Furnish and install two new school zone beacons.	\$20,000	Local, WTSC

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Consider conducting additional studies into future congestion issues on S. 1st Street and plan for capacity increases, transportation demand management, or other strategies to plan for addressing congestion issues.
2. Consider formation of a Transportation Benefit District to help support local funding of transportation infrastructure improvements.
3. Street and sidewalk maintenance in Selah has been and will continue to be based upon the greatest need. Budget constraints limit available funding for these projects, and maintenance needs should be identified and prioritized on a continual basis.
4. All the streets in the City need seal coating on a regular basis to maintain their good quality. A maintenance schedule should be developed and followed. If seal coating is a priority, all seal coating needs can be listed as a single item in the City's Transportation Improvement Program.
5. All new streets should be built to the City's street standards.
6. Whenever technically and financially feasible, street improvement projects should include widening of narrow streets and installation of sidewalks.
7. Continue to support the Yakima Transit Route 10 and Yakima-Ellensburg Commuter, seek funds earmarked for additional alternative transportation options, and partner with organizations such as People for People to expand on existing transportation options and explore new options. A public survey of transportation needs could help to focus efforts.

VIII. FINANCING

The City's most recent six-year TIP was adopted on June 14, 2016, for the years 2017-2022. The transportation projects included in the TIP are typically funded by user fees. Initially, that funding came from a dedicated portion of the property tax, because property owners were the prime beneficiaries of the transportation system. Over time, other fees and taxes were imposed to supplement the revenues. Today, the major tax sources to fund transportation are the gas tax, the Motor Vehicle Excise Tax (MVET), and vehicle registration fees.

State and Federal Funding Sources

Larger projects have received funding assistance from the Washington State Transportation Improvement Board (TIB). As a federally designated urban area, there are three state-funded grant programs that the City can pursue through TIB, including the Urban Arterial Program (UAP), the Urban Sidewalk Program (SP) and the Arterial Preservation Program (APP). There are also federal grant programs such as the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) programs, which the City can pursue through the authorization of FAST Act, the federal transportation legislation. In addition, the Washington State Public Works Trust Fund has loans available for road projects and anticipates having grant funding available in the future. The Washington State Safe Routes to School and Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Programs, Washington State Traffic Safety Commission grant programs, as well as some federal programs, fund non-motorized transportation and safety improvements.

The street budget should be reviewed annually and adjustments made to optimize the use of available funds and ensure competitiveness when competing for funds.

Local Funding Sources

In 1987, the Legislature created Transportation Benefit Districts (TBD) as an option for local governments to fund transportation improvements. Since 2005, the Legislature has amended the TBD statute to expand its uses and revenue authority. Most recently in 2015, the Legislature amended the TBD statute to authorize TBDs to impose vehicle license fees of up to \$50 without a public vote, and also made it possible for cities to absorb the TBD in cases where the TBD has the same boundaries as the city.

A TBD is a quasi-municipal corporation and independent taxing district created for the sole purpose of constructing, improving and funding transportation improvements within the district. The legislative authority of a county or city may create a TBD by ordinance following the procedures set forth in RCW 36.73. The county or city proposing to create the TBD may include other counties, cities, or transit districts through interlocal agreements.

A TBD can fund any transportation improvement contained in any existing state or regional transportation plan that is necessitated by existing or reasonably foreseeable congestion levels. TBD funds can be used for maintenance, preservation and reconstruction improvements to city streets and county roads. Funds can also be used for public transportation and transportation demand management strategies. TBDs have several revenue options that are subject to voter approval, and other revenue options that can be imposed without voter approval. However, to impose fees those are not subject to voter approval, the TBD boundaries must be countywide or citywide, or if applicable, unincorporated countywide.

Property owners in a particular area in need of infrastructure upgrades can also create a Local Improvement District (LID). A LID is a financial instrument that allows the property owners to share the costs of infrastructure improvements, including improving streets and constructing sidewalks.

Finance Plan

Proposed funding of the recommended roadway projects is the continued use of a combination of tax monies, the State TIB programs, federal FAST Act, and other sources. Selah's 2017 to 2022 Six Year Transportation Improvement Program, adopted via Resolution 2542, shows City of Selah transportation projects and their associated financing. The Six Year Transportation Improvement Program for Selah, summarized in Table 3.8., is incorporated by reference.

IX. GOALS AND POLICIES

GOAL: *Develop an efficient transportation system that supports the community vision.*

Objective TRAN 1: **Provide a safe and efficient transportation network within the City of Selah UGA.**

Policy TRAN 1.1: Streets and highways should be located and designed to meet the demands of both existing and projected land uses as provided for in the Selah Comprehensive Plan.

Policy TRAN 1.2: Street and highway improvements should be located and designed to respect the residential character of the community and its quality living environment.

Policy TRAN 1.3: Develop a right-of-way policy for future transportation improvements.

Policy TRAN 1.4: Curb cuts onto collector and arterial streets should be kept to a minimum through the following techniques:

1. The provision of reverse frontage roads;
2. The use of intersecting streets as access points; and
3. Internal design of subdivisions.

Policy TRAN 1.5: Local streets shall be designed and signed to discourage through traffic.

Policy TRAN 1.6: Establish a plan of landscaping along major street rights-of-way.

Policy TRAN 1.7: Establish a street improvement fund through the building permit fee process that would match any comparable Yakima County fee.

Policy TRAN 1.8: Encourage the expansion of public transportation.

Policy TRAN 1.9: Encourage multi-agency cooperation with WSDOT, YVCOG, Yakima County, and the City of Yakima, and ensure that improvements in Selah are coordinated with adjacent communities.

Policy TRAN 1.10: Ensure mobility for all residents, including the elderly and persons with disabilities, by providing accessible transportation services:

1. Identify existing transportation facilities and locations that are not accessible or usable by persons with disabilities or special needs and improve the facilities;
2. Apply street and sidewalk design standards and develop a system that respond to the needs of persons who are elderly, disabled or have other special needs; and
3. Ensure parking areas comply with accessibility requirements of the Uniform Building Code and Americans with Disabilities Act.

Objective TRAN 2: Improve circulation within the City of Selah UGA.

Policy TRAN 2.1: Develop and implement a program of upgrading existing streets, including street lights and sidewalks.

Policy TRAN 2.2: Develop and implement a truck routing plan, including proper signage. Limit commercial truck traffic to designated truck routes to avoid intrusion into neighborhoods, except to delivery trucks.

Policy TRAN 2.3: Develop and implement an annual street, sidewalk, and lighting inspection program.

Policy TRAN 2.4: Encourage the connection of streets when considering subdivisions or street improvement proposals unless topographic or environmental constraints would prevent it. Limit the use of cul-de-sacs, dead-end streets, loops, and other designs that form barriers in the community. Recognize that increasing connections can reduce traffic congestion and increase neighborhood unity.

Objective TRAN 3: Improve pedestrian safety and circulation within the City of Selah UGA.

Policy TRAN 3.1: Require sidewalks on one side of all local streets and both sides of all collectors and arterials (sidewalk construction along arterials and collectors should be within one foot of the private property line).

Policy TRAN 3.2: Safe and efficient movement of bicycle and pedestrian traffic throughout Selah, especially in school and recreational areas, in the business district and points of congestion should be provided.

Policy TRAN 3.3: Prioritize sidewalk improvements on arterials and local streets. The first priority should be completing the sidewalk system on arterial streets. The second priority should be to improve the sidewalk system on local streets.

Policy TRAN 3.4: As part of the pedestrian network, provide crosswalks at key locations such as Downtown, intersections of City arterials, the local street network near schools, and other locations with significant pedestrian volumes.

GOAL: Provide a safe and convenient access through the City of Selah.

Objective TRAN 4: Improve access to the City of Selah while maintaining and improving the economic viability of First Street and other commercial corridors.

Policy TRAN 4.1: Improve access to undeveloped areas within the Selah UGA.

1. Coordinate development and transportation planning with Yakima County and other regional agencies.
2. Establish consistent rights-of-way within the Selah UGA.

Policy TRAN 4.2: Promote direct and quality roadway linkages between First Street, Interstate 82, the City of Yakima, and State Route 12.

Policy TRAN 4.3: Limit and provide access to the street network in a manner consistent with the function and purpose of each roadway.

Policy TRAN 4.4: Ensure that roads are designed to allow emergency vehicle passage 24-hours a day. Dead-end street lengths and turnarounds, travel lane widths, maximum road grades, parking location, and other road design features should accommodate emergency and service vehicles.

GOAL: Provide transportation facilities that support existing needs and future growth consistent with the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Objective TRAN 5: Provide an integrated street network of different classes of streets designed to facilitate different types of traffic flows and access needs.

Policy TRAN 5.1: Implement a functional classification system to ensure that transportation system improvements are compatible with adjacent land uses and will minimize potential conflicts.

Policy TRAN 5.2: Periodically review existing street classifications to adjust the classification when appropriate.

Policy TRAN 5.3: Adopt levels of service for principal, minor, and collector arterials that reflect the preference of the community. The City of Selah has adopted a standard of LOS D for principal arterials, and LOS C for all other minor arterials, collectors and local access roads.

Objective TRAN 6: Review and monitor the transportation system to provide adequate service to existing and future land uses.

Policy TRAN 6.1: Fund and establish a data collection system including traffic counts and accidents to support studies, operational changes, and designs.

Policy TRAN 6.2: Allow major land use changes only when those proposals accompany specific documentation or plans showing how the transportation system can adequately support existing and proposed development needs.

Policy TRAN 6.3: Monitor major intersections and initiate traffic impact studies when deemed necessary.

Policy TRAN 6.4: Develop and maintain a traffic model for Selah and its UGA. Forecast travel to identify needed transportation improvements. The forecasts should:

1. Account for expected changes in personal travel behavior and feasibility of mode choices;
2. Use current data and policies;
3. Be compatible with other jurisdictions; and
4. Reflect land use policies.

Policy TRAN 6.5: Identify improvements and strategies needed to carry out the land use vision and meet LOS requirements for transportation.

Policy TRAN 6.6: Monitor growth in population and employment in relation to the land use and growth assumptions of the Transportation Element. Re-assess the Land Use and Transportation Elements as needed to ensure that planned improvements will address the potential impacts of growth.

GOAL: *To ensure that transportation facilities and services needed to support development are available concurrent with the impacts of such development. Concurrency protects investments in existing transportation facilities and services, maximizes the use of these facilities and services, and promotes orderly compact growth.*

- Policy 2.3 The City shall not issue development permits where the project requires transportation improvements that the City is not able to provide in accordance with adopted LOS standards, unless the developer provides either the necessary improvements, or provides acceptable strategies to mitigate the impacts of development.
- Policy 2.4 Produce a financially feasible plan in the Capital Facilities Element demonstrating its ability to achieve and maintain adopted levels of service.
- Policy 2.5 Accommodate design and improvements to Selah's transportation system based on both existing conditions and projected growth.

- Policy 2.6 Allow new development only when and where all transportation facilities are adequate at the time of development, or unless a financial commitment is in place to complete the necessary improvements or strategies which will accommodate the impacts within six years; and only when and where such development can be adequately served by transportation facilities without reducing LOS elsewhere.
- Policy 2.7 Actively solicit action by the State and Yakima County to program and construct those improvements to State and County arterial systems which are needed to maintain the adopted LOS standards for the City of Selah.
- Policy 2.8 Require developers to construct streets directly serving new development, and pay a fair-share fee for specific off-site improvements needed to mitigate the impacts of development. Explore with developers, when appropriate, ways that new development can encourage van pooling, carpooling, public transit use and other alternatives and strategies to reduce single-occupant vehicle travel.
- Policy 2.9 Coordinate land use and public works planning activities with an ongoing program of long range financial planning, to conserve fiscal resources available to implement the TIP.
- Policy 2.10 Encourage the maintenance and safety improvements of Selah's existing roads as a priority over the creation of new roads, wherever such use is consistent with other objectives.
- Policy 2.11 Implement actions outlined under the comprehensive plan based in part on the financial resources available to fund the necessary public facilities.
- Policy 2.12 Accord high priorities for funding to projects which are consistent with goals and objectives adopted by the City Council.
- Policy 2.13 Fund projects only when incorporated into the City budget, as adopted by the City Council.

GOAL: To manage, conserve and protect Selah's natural resources through a balance of development activities complemented with sound environmental practices.

- Policy 5.1 Design new transportation facilities in a manner which minimizes impacts on natural drainage patterns.
- Policy 5.2 Promote the use and development of routes and methods of alternative modes of transportation, such as transit, bicycling and walking, which reduce Selah's consumption of non-renewable energy sources.
- Policy 5.3 Implement programs to reduce the number of employees commuting by single-occupancy vehicles through such transportation demand strategies as preferential parking for carpools/vanpools, alternative work hours, bicycle parking, and distribution of transit and ridesharing information based on current federal and state policies aimed at reducing auto-related air pollution.
- Policy 5.4 Site, design, and buffer (through screening and/or landscaping) transportation facilities and services to fit in harmoniously with their surroundings. Give special attention to minimizing noise, light and glare impacts when these facilities are sited within or adjacent to residential areas.


GOAL: To actively influence the future character of the City by managing land use change and by developing City facilities and services in a manner that directs and controls land use patterns and intensities.

- Policy 6.1 Coordinate land use planning with the facility/utility planning activities of agencies and utilities identified in this Comprehensive Plan element. Adopt procedures that encourage providers of public services and private utilities to utilize the Land Use Element of this Plan in planning future facilities.
- Policy 6.2 The cities and counties in the region should coordinate transportation planning and infrastructure development to:
- Ensure a supply of buildable land sufficient in area and services to meet the region's housing, commercial and employment needs; located so as to be efficiently provided with public facilities and services;
 - Ensure protection of important natural resources;
 - Avoid unnecessary duplication of services; and
 - Avoid overbuilding of public infrastructure in relation to future needs.
- Policy 6.3 Recognize the important role that public facilities and programs such as sidewalks and street lights play in providing a healthy family environment within the community.
- Policy 6.4 Work with local, regional and state jurisdictions to develop land use development strategies that will support public transportation.
- Policy 6.5 Consider the impacts of land use decisions on adjacent roads. Likewise, road improvements should be consistent with proposed land use densities.

GOAL: To provide a comprehensive system of parks and open spaces that responds to the recreational, cultural, environmental and aesthetic needs and desires of the City's residents.

- Policy 7.1 Recognize the important recreational transportation roles played by regional bicycle/trail systems, and support efforts to develop a regional trail system through Selah.
- Policy 7.2 Support the development of paths and marked roads which link bicycle trails with Selah's other resources.

City of Selah, WA Transportation Network 2016



Yakima Valley Conference of Governments
311 North 4th Street SUITE 204
Yakima, WA 98901
August 2016

Selah City Boundary
 Selah UGA

