



SW Washington Regional Transportation Council

Regional Active Transportation Plan for Clark County, WA

APPENDICES

September 2021

alta

Table of Contents

Appendix A. Scoring Methodology for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects.....	1
Appendix B. Complete Prioritized Project Lists	3
Appendix C. Funding Sources.....	5

APPENDIX A: Scoring Methodology for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Bicycle Project Scoring Methodology

Criteria	Data	Source	Scoring	Notes
Demand	Maximum Composite Demand Score intersected by the project alignment	Existing	3 points for highest demand scores (4-5)	
		Conditions	2 points for medium demand score (3)	
		Analysis	1 point for lowest demand score (1-2)	
Safety	Sum of bicycle-involved crashes within a half-mile of the project alignment	Existing	3 points for highest number of crashes (33-61)	These three categories/levels were broken down using natural breaks.
		Conditions	2 points for medium number of crashes (12-32)	
		Analysis	1 point for lowest number of crashes (1-11)	
Equity	Maximum Equity score intersected by the project alignment	Existing	3 points for highest equity scores (20-25)	These three categories/levels were broken down using natural breaks.
		Conditions	2 points for medium equity score (17-19)	
		Analysis	1 point for lowest equity score (11-16)	
Transit Access	C-Tran Stops accessible along the project alignment; C-Tran Demand-Responsive Transit service areas intersected by project alignment	Existing	3 points for segments that provide access to at least one C-Tran stop	
		Conditions	2 points for segments abutting a demand-responsive transit service area	
		Analysis	1 point for segments not connecting to C-Tran system	
Plan Concurrence	State and federal potential project descriptions	WSDOT	3 points for a segment also prioritized or recommended as an active transportation route in state or federal plans	
			1 point for all other segments	
Inclusive Access	Routes with recommended buffered/protected bike lanes or multi-use paths (which provide access to bicyclists of all ages and abilities)	Recommended Facility Types	3 points for segments with a recommended buffered/protected bike lane or multi-use path	
			1 point for all other recommended facilities	

Pedestrian Project Scoring Methodology

Criteria	Data	Source	Scoring	Notes
Demand	Maximum Composite Demand Score intersected by the project alignment	Existing Conditions Analysis	3 points for highest demand scores (4-5) 2 points for medium demand score (3) 1 point for lowest demand score (1-2)	
Safety	Sum of pedestrian-involved crashes within a half-mile of the project alignment	Existing Conditions Analysis	3 points for highest number of crashes (44-75) 2 points for medium number of crashes (16-43) 1 point for lowest number of crashes (1-15)	These three categories/levels were broken down using natural breaks.
Equity	Maximum Equity score intersected by the project alignment	Existing Conditions Analysis	3 points for highest equity scores (20-25) 2 points for medium equity score (17-19) 1 point for lowest equity score (11-16)	These three categories/levels were broken down using natural breaks.
Transit Access	C-Tran Stops accessible along the project alignment; C-Tran Demand-Responsive Transit service areas intersected by project alignment	Existing Conditions Analysis	3 points for segments that provide access to at least one C-Tran stop 2 points for segments abutting a demand-responsive transit service area 1 point for segments not connecting to C-Tran system	
Plan Concurrence	State and federal potential project descriptions	WSDOT	3 points for a segment also prioritized or recommended as an active transportation route in state or federal plans 1 point for all other segments	

APPENDIX B: Project Lists

Typology Legend

Abbreviation	Typology
BBL/PBL	Buffered/Protected Bike Lane
BL	Bike Lane
SR	Shared Roadway
SB4	Four-foot Shoulder Bikeway
SB6	Six-foot Shoulder Bikeway
PMUP	Paved Multi-Use Path
UGR	Unpaved Gravel Road

Prioritized Bicycle Projects

Project Number	Street Name	Primary Typology	Network	Demand	Safety	Equity	Transit Access	Plan Conc.	Inclusive Access	Total Score	Time Horizon
121	99th	BBL/PBL	Secondary	3	3	2	3	1	3	15	Near-term
123	7th	BBL/PBL	Secondary	3	2	3	3	1	3	15	Near-term
151	Fourth Plain	SUP	Secondary	1	2	3	3	3	3	15	Near-term
1	Main	BBL/PBL	Primary	2	2	3	3	1	3	14	Near-term
53	117th	BBL/PBL	Primary	2	2	1	3	3	3	14	Near-term
68	78th	BBL/PBL	Primary	3	2	2	3	1	3	14	Near-term
71	Minnehaha	BBL/PBL	Primary	2	2	3	3	1	3	14	Near-term
75	Union	BBL/PBL	Primary	3	3	1	3	1	3	14	Near-term
125	Hazel Dell	BBL/PBL	Primary	3	3	1	3	1	3	14	Near-term

Project Number	Street Name	Primary Typology	Network	Demand	Safety	Equity	Transit Access	Plan Conc.	Inclusive Access	Total Score	Time Horizon
48	76th	BBL/PBL	Secondary	2	2	2	3	1	3	13	Near-term
49	Shared-Use Path	PMUP	Primary	2	2	2	3	1	3	13	Near-term
52	94th	BBL/PBL	Secondary	2	2	2	3	1	3	13	Near-term
118	Bliss	BBL/PBL	Primary	3	2	1	3	1	3	13	Near-term
141	139th	BBL/PBL	Secondary	3	1	2	3	1	3	13	Near-term
60	Shared-Use Path	PMUP	Primary	1	1	1	3	3	3	12	Near-term
126	Shared-Use Path	PMUP	Primary	1	1	3	3	1	3	12	Near-term
51	63rd	SR	Primary	1	2	3	3	1	1	11	Medium-term
56	117th	BBL/PBL	Primary	2	2	2	1	1	3	11	Medium-term
67	Saint Johns	BBL/PBL	Primary	1	2	1	3	1	3	11	Medium-term
72	58th	BL	Secondary	2	2	2	3	1	1	11	Medium-term
73	44th	BL	Secondary	2	1	3	3	1	1	11	Medium-term
112	10th	BBL/PBL	Primary	1	1	3	2	1	3	11	Medium-term
113	Carty	BBL/PBL	Primary	1	1	3	2	1	3	11	Medium-term
127	36th	BBL/PBL	Primary	1	1	2	3	1	3	11	Medium-term
130	Delfel	BBL/PBL	Primary	1	1	2	3	1	3	11	Medium-term
133	9th	BL	Secondary	1	2	3	3	1	1	11	Medium-term
7	Erwin O Rieger Memorial	SB4	Secondary	3	1	3	1	1	1	10	Medium-term
33	Edmunds	BL	Primary, Secondary	2	1	2	3	1	1	10	Medium-term
36	172nd	BL	Primary	1	1	3	3	1	1	10	Medium-term
37	Ward	BBL/PBL	Secondary, Primary	1	1	1	3	1	3	10	Medium-term

Project Number	Street Name	Primary Typology	Network	Demand	Safety	Equity	Transit Access	Plan Conc.	Inclusive Access	Total Score	Time Horizon
74	56th	BL	Secondary	2	2	3	1	1	1	10	Medium-term
124	Stutz	SR	Secondary	2	2	1	3	1	1	10	Medium-term
128	Shared-Use Path	PMUP	Primary	1	1	1	3	1	3	10	Medium-term
129	119th	BBL/PBL	Primary	1	1	1	3	1	3	10	Medium-term
23	Gibson	SB6	Primary	1	1	2	3	1	1	9	Medium-term
24	Evergreen	BBL/PBL	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	3	9	Medium-term
32	Ingle	SB4	Secondary	1	1	3	2	1	1	9	Medium-term
35	162nd	BL	Primary	1	1	2	3	1	1	9	Medium-term
46	99th	BL	Secondary	2	1	1	3	1	1	9	Medium-term
47	137th	BL	Primary	1	1	2	3	1	1	9	Medium-term
50	107th	SB4	Secondary	2	2	2	1	1	1	9	Medium-term
59	144th	SB4	Secondary	2	1	1	3	1	1	9	Medium-term
69	58th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	3	1	1	9	Medium-term
79	259th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	3	2	1	1	9	Medium-term
88	Amboy	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	3	1	1	9	Medium-term
135	149th	BL	Secondary	1	1	2	3	1	1	9	Medium-term
148	Lower River	SB4	Primary	2	1	3	1	1	1	9	Medium-term
16	Blair	SB4	Primary	1	1	3	1	1	1	8	Long-Term
26	Woodburn	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	3	1	1	8	Long-Term
64	72nd	BBL/PBL	Primary	1	1	1	1	1	3	8	Long-Term
66	88th	BL	Secondary	1	2	2	1	1	1	8	Long-Term
76	29th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	3	1	1	8	Long-Term
101	21st	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	2	1	1	8	Long-Term

Project Number	Street Name	Primary Typology	Network	Demand	Safety	Equity	Transit Access	Plan Conc.	Inclusive Access	Total Score	Time Horizon
102	Pacific	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	2	1	1	8	Long-Term
105	244th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	3	1	1	1	8	Long-Term
114	Lambert	SB4	Secondary	1	1	3	1	1	1	8	Long-Term
122	93rd	SR	Secondary	2	2	1	1	1	1	8	Long-Term
136	10th	SB4	Primary	1	1	3	1	1	1	8	Long-Term
139	Shared-Use Path	PMUP	Secondary, Primary	1	1	1	1	1	3	8	Long-Term
143	11th	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	2	1	1	8	Long-Term
144	51st	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	2	1	1	8	Long-Term
145	289th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	2	1	1	8	Long-Term
147	31st	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	2	1	1	8	Long-Term
10	Sunset Falls	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
12	L1000S	UGR	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
13	Livingston	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
15	292nd	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
17	Washougal River	SB4	Secondary, Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
20	Stiles	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
25	Crown	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	Long-Term
27	Goodwin	SB6	Primary	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	Long-Term
28	267th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	Long-Term
30	Leadbetter	SB4	Primary	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	Long-Term
31	68th	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term

Project Number	Street Name	Primary Typology	Network	Demand	Safety	Equity	Transit Access	Plan Conc.	Inclusive Access	Total Score	Time Horizon
34	83rd	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
39	83rd	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
40	182nd	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
41	212th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
42	164th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
44	159th	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
45	172nd	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
54	87th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
65	88th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
70	47th	SR	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
80	Charity	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
81	Lewisville	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
82	Reid	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
83	399th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
84	Fargher Lake	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
85	Kelly	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
86	Kelly	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
87	Lucia Falls	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
89	Gerber McKee	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
90	419th	SB6	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
91	419th	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
92	Cedar Creek	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
93	Etna	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term

Project Number	Street Name	Primary Typology	Network	Demand	Safety	Equity	Transit Access	Plan Conc.	Inclusive Access	Total Score	Time Horizon
94	Munch	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
95	Sorenson	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
96	94th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
97	339th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	Long-Term
98	359th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
100	Gabriel	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
103	Hayes	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
104	Dobler Hill	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
107	Basket Flat	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
108	172nd	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
109	279th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
115	31st	SB4	Primary	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	Long-Term
119	Salmon Creek	BL	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
132	61st	SB4	Primary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
134	21st	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
146	Main	BL	Secondary	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	Long-Term
150	151st	SB4	Secondary	1	1	2	1	1	1	7	Long-Term
2	219th	SB4	Primary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
3	182nd	SB4	Primary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
4	232nd	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
5	199th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
6	229th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
8	139th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term

Project Number	Street Name	Primary Typology	Network	Demand	Safety	Equity	Transit Access	Plan Conc.	Inclusive Access	Total Score	Time Horizon
9	Berry	UGR	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
11	L1000N	UGR	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
14	53rd	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
18	357th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
19	20th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
21	W	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
22	Moffet	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
29	3rd	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
38	109th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
43	154th	SB4	Primary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
55	139th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
57	167th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
58	144th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
61	142nd	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
62	179th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
63	199th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
77	50th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
78	72nd	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
99	JR Anderson	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
106	182nd	SB4	Secondary, Primary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
110	112th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
111	299th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term

Project Number	Street Name	Primary Typology	Network	Demand	Safety	Equity	Transit Access	Plan Conc.	Inclusive Access	Total Score	Time Horizon
116	209th	SB4	Primary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
117	41st	SB4	Secondary, Primary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
120	50th	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
131	179th	SB4	Primary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
137	Krieger	SB4	Primary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
138	61st	SB4	Secondary, Primary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
140	158th	SR	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term
142	Salmon Creek	SB4	Secondary	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	Long-Term

Prioritized Pedestrian Projects

Project Number	Street Name	Demand	Safety	Equity	Transit Access	Plan Conc.	Total Score	Time Horizon
9	Hazel Dell	3	3	3	3	1	13	Near-term
13	Highway 99	3	3	3	3	1	13	Near-term
10	99th	3	2	3	3	1	12	Near-term
11	78th	3	2	3	3	1	12	Near-term
31	117th	2	2	2	3	3	12	Near-term
22	Minnehaha	2	2	3	3	1	11	Near-term
25	Andresen	2	2	3	3	1	11	Near-term
14	Union	3	2	1	3	1	10	Medium-term
18	139th	3	2	1	3	1	10	Medium-term
23	Saint Johns	2	1	3	3	1	10	Medium-term
28	Covington	2	2	2	3	1	10	Medium-term
30	76th	2	2	2	3	1	10	Medium-term
16	Tenney	3	1	1	3	1	9	Medium-term
29	63rd	1	2	2	3	1	9	Medium-term
32	99th	2	1	2	3	1	9	Medium-term
37	Goodwin	1	1	1	3	3	9	Medium-term
38	Shared-Use Path	1	1	1	3	3	9	Medium-term
2	Erwin O Rieger Memorial	3	1	2	1	1	8	Medium-term
8	9th	1	1	2	3	1	8	Medium-term
26	Shared-Use Path	2	2	2	1	1	8	Medium-term
35	162nd	1	1	2	3	1	8	Medium-term

Project Number	Street Name	Demand	Safety	Equity	Transit Access	Plan Conc.	Total Score	Time Horizon
3	36th	1	1	1	3	1	7	Long-term
5	21st	1	1	1	3	1	7	Long-term
6	119th	1	1	1	3	1	7	Long-term
15	134th	3	1	1	1	1	7	Long-term
17	Bliss	1	1	1	3	1	7	Long-term
19	29th	1	1	1	3	1	7	Long-term
24	Saint Johns	1	1	1	3	1	7	Long-term
33	152nd	1	1	1	3	1	7	Long-term
4	Lakeshore	1	1	2	1	1	6	Long-term
7	Salmon Creek	2	1	1	1	1	6	Long-term
27	94th	1	1	2	1	1	6	Long-term
34	Ward	1	1	2	1	1	6	Long-term
36	Fourth Plan (Shared-Use Path)	1	1	2	1	1	6	Long-term
1	11th	1	1	1	1	1	5	Long-term
12	Shared-Use Path	1	1	1	1	1	5	Long-term
20	Salmon Creek	1	1	1	1	1	5	Long-term
21	Shared-Use Path	1	1	1	1	1	5	Long-term
39	Lewisville	1	1	1	1	1	5	Long-term

APPENDIX B: Funding Sources

Local Funding Options

Active transportation facilities can be funded locally through:

- Voter-approved local bonds or tax levies
- Business/cooperate sponsorship of trail improvements
- Development Impact Fees, especially for projects along corridors in need of new/repared sidewalks, on-street bicycle facilities and/or within ½ mile of a trail access point
- General fund
- Tax increment financing
- System development charges

Other Funding Resources

The following table summarizes available funding resources and their potential relevance to the SW Washington RTC Active Transportation Plan. In addition, the table notes relevant eligibility considerations and whether Clark County currently utilizes the resource for infrastructure development. This list is intended to capture the full range of possible funding sources at federal, state, regional, and local levels, recognizing that funding sources may derive (trickle down) from larger funding sources, and that project funding requirements and awards are largely dependent on respective funding streams.

Level	Program Name	Agency	Short Description / Purpose	Who or what is eligible?	Match Required?	Presently Utilized by Clark County?
Federal	Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)- Urban	USDOT/RTC	Surface Transportation Block Grant - Urban funds (STBG-U) are provided to RTC based on a population-based formula set by the Federal Government in the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act transportation bill. These funds are managed by the Regional Transportation Council (RTC).	STBG-U funds are available for all roads not functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors. Transit capital projects and bicycle-pedestrian projects area also eligible under this program. Projects are funded through a competitive selection process.	Yes - 13.5% match	Yes
<i>Federal</i>	Transportation Alternatives (TA)	USDOT/RTC	Transportation Alternatives funds are allocated as a portion of STBG-U funds, and provide flexible funding for smaller scale projects that can include pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, recreational trails, and safe routes to school projects. For the 2019 grant cycle, approximately \$2.35 million was made available for RTC's three-county area.	Projects are funded through a competitive selection process.	Yes - 13.5% match	Yes
Federal	Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Program (CMAQ)	USDOT/RTC	The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program is a funding source for transportation projects and programs that reduce traffic congestion and contribute to air quality improvements.	Bicycle and pedestrian improvements are eligible for this funding, and projects are funded through a competitive selection process.	Yes - 13.5% match	Yes

Level	Program Name	Agency	Short Description / Purpose	Who or what is eligible?	Match Required?	Presently Utilized by Clark County?
Federal	Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) Grant Program	USDOT	Funds projects that are very large, multi-modal, or multi-jurisdictional. Projects are expected to help achieve national objectives.	States and local jurisdictions, including municipalities, counties, port authorities, tribal governments, MPOs, or others	Urban areas: Federal share cannot exceed 80%; Rural areas: Federal share can account for 100% of project funds	Yes
Federal	Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Entitlement Program	HUD	The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program provides annual grants on a formula basis to states, cities, and counties to develop viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment (including street improvements), and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons. (At least 70 percent of CDBG funds must be used for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons)	Principal cities of Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs); Other metropolitan cities with populations of at least 50,000; Qualified urban counties with populations of at least 200,000 (excluding the population of entitled cities)	CDBG funds can also be used as non-federal match for other programs requiring state or local matching funds	
Federal	USFS Secure Rural Schools	USFS	The Secure Rural Schools program provides critical funding for schools, roads, and other municipal services to more than 700 counties across the U.S. and Puerto Rico. (Title I Funds Road Improvements)	Counties		Yes

Level	Program Name	Agency	Short Description / Purpose	Who or what is eligible?	Match Required?	Presently Utilized by Clark County?
Federal	Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP)	USDOT FHWA	Funds improvements to transportation facilities that provide access to, are adjacent to, or are located within Federal lands. Funds are allocated among the States using a statutory formula based on road mileage, number of bridges, land area, and visitation.	Forest Highway Funds are administered to participating jurisdictions and agencies through a call for projects.	Yes – generally 20%, but Washington is eligible for a higher Federal share ¹	Yes
Federal	Local Highway Bridge Program (LHBP)	USDOT FHWA	Funds highway bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects on public roads. Projects must demonstrate cost savings through bundling two or more similar bridge projects with the same	State DOTs in states with a population density of less than 100 people per square mile based on the 2010 census and a State’s total land area. Applications are limited to 3 per state and must be ranked by the state in order of priority.	Yes – 20% or sliding scale	Yes
Federal	National Historic Covered Bridge Preservation (NHCBP)	USDOT FHWA	Provides funding to assist the States in their efforts to preserve, rehabilitate, or restore the Nation’s historic covered bridges (those listed or eligible for listing on the National Register for Historic Places).	Counties	Yes – generally 20%, but Washington is eligible for a higher Federal share	

¹ See Federal Highway Administration’s Sliding Scale Rates in Public Land States, effective 1992. Retrieved from <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/directives/notices/n4540-12a1.cfm>

Level	Program Name	Agency	Short Description / Purpose	Who or what is eligible?	Match Required?	Presently Utilized by Clark County?
Federal	Federal Railway-Highway Crossings (Section 130)	USDOT FHWA	Provides funds for the elimination of hazards at railway-highway crossings. Funds are eligible for projects at all public crossings including roadways, bike trails and pedestrian paths.	The funds are apportioned to states by formula.	Yes – 10% match	Yes
Federal	Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	USDOT FHWA	HSIP is a federal program that provides funding to infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects to improve safety on all public roads. As part of this program, the FHWA also funds a High-Risk Rural Roads (HRRR) program that funds improvements on rural major or minor collectors or rural local roads.	To be eligible under HSIP, a project must be consistent with a State Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). HSIP requires that grantees use a data-driven approach and prioritizes projects in demonstrated problem areas	Yes – 10% match	Yes
Federal	FTA Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program	FTA/WSDOT/ RTC	The program makes federal resources available to improve mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities by removing barriers to transportation service and expanding transportation mobility options. 45% of funding is dedicated to “nontraditional” projects that can include improvements such as pathways to transit, accessible wayfinding, accessible pedestrian signals or other crossing features.	State or local government entity. Based on Census data, the formula funds are apportioned to each State based on the number of older adults and individuals with disabilities and allocated by area: o Large UZAs: 60% o Small UZAs: 20% o Rural: 20%	Yes – 20% match	Yes

Level	Program Name	Agency	Short Description / Purpose	Who or what is eligible?	Match Required?	Presently Utilized by Clark County?
Federal	FTA Section 5311 Formula Grants for Rural Areas Program	FTA	The Formula Grants for Rural Areas program provides capital, planning, and operating assistance to states and federally recognized Indian tribes to support public transportation in rural areas with populations less than 50,000. It also provides funding for state and national training and technical assistance through the Rural Transportation Assistance Program	Rural areas with populations less than 50,000.	Yes – 20% match	Yes
State	Local Government Traffic Engineering Services	WSDOT	WSDOT provides engineering assistance from six Regional Local Programs offices across the state. These engineers provide guidance and assistance with many aspects of transportation project planning and implementation.	Staff and elected officials from local jurisdictions within the state.	N/A – no monetary assistance	
State	Urban Arterial Program (UAP)	Transportation Improvement Board (TIB)	The Urban Arterial Program funds projects in the areas of Safety, Growth and Development, Mobility, and Physical Condition. Eligible projects must be located on a federally classified route (principal, minor, collector) within the federally designated urban area and be in compliance with the Growth Management Act.	Cities with a population of 5,000 or more and counties with urban unincorporated areas.	Dependent on the city's valuation or a county's road levy valuation (Minimum local match ranges from 10 to 20 percent)	Yes

Level	Program Name	Agency	Short Description / Purpose	Who or what is eligible?	Match Required?	Presently Utilized by Clark County?
State	Sidewalk Program (SP)	Transportation Improvement Board (TIB)	This program funds sidewalk projects on federally classified routes (principal, minor, collector). Eligible projects must be located within the federally designated urban area and be in compliance with the Growth Management Act.	Cities with a population of 5,000 or more and counties with urban unincorporated areas.	Yes – 20% minimum	Yes
State	Arterial Preservation Program (APP)	Transportation Improvement Board (TIB)	The APP provides funding for overlay of federally classified arterial streets. Eligible projects must be located within the federally designated urban area and be in compliance with the Growth Management Act.	Cities with a population greater than 5,000 and assessed valuation less than \$2 billion	Yes, but it depends on the city	
State	Small City Arterial Program (SCAP)	Transportation Improvement Board (TIB)	Projects preserve and improve TIB-classified arterials consistent with local needs.	Cities with a population less than 5,000	No match for cities/towns under 1,000 people; 5% for those over 1,000	Yes
State	Small City Sidewalk Program (SCSP)	Transportation Improvement Board (TIB)	Small City Sidewalk Program projects improve safety, access, connectivity, and address system continuity.	Small city and urban agencies	No match for cities/towns under 1,000 people; 5% for those over 1,000	Yes

Level	Program Name	Agency	Short Description / Purpose	Who or what is eligible?	Match Required?	Presently Utilized by Clark County?
State	Construction Loan Program	Public Works Board	The Construction Loan Program focuses on the activities that repair, replace, or create a facility, including roads or streets. A construction loan project may comprise any combination of pre-construction and construction elements.	Counties, cities, and special purpose districts	N/A – loan	
State	Rural Arterial Program (RAP)	County Road Administration Board	The RAP is a biennial road and bridge reconstruction funding program that funds the reconstruction of rural arterial roads.	Counties	Yes – 10% match	Yes
State	County Arterial Preservation Program (CAPP)	County Road Administration Board	The CAPP program is designed to help counties preserve their existing paved arterial road networks. In order to retain their eligibility for CAPP funds year to year, counties are required to use a pavement management system (PMS) to assist their project selection and decision process.	Counties		Yes

Level	Program Name	Agency	Short Description / Purpose	Who or what is eligible?	Match Required?	Presently Utilized by Clark County?
Region	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)	SW Washington RTC	<p>This program is funded through federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. It is a four-year program funding regionally-significant transportation projects drawn from the Clark County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).</p> <p>For the 2020-2023 allocation cycle, \$14.7 million was available for projects in Clark County.</p>	The STBG funds can be used for a wide range of transportation purposes. The CMAQ funds can be used for transportation projects that will contribute to meeting the attainment of national air quality standards within the Clark County Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area (basically the Vancouver, Camas, and Washougal urban areas).	Yes – minimum 13.5% match	Yes
County	General Fund	Clark County	The General Fund is the County’s primary operating fund and supports a multitude of the County’s core services including public safety, public health and general government services.	The majority of the resources available within the General Fund are discretionary and vary from year to year.	N/A	Yes
County	Clark County Road Fund	Clark County	Clark County allocates a portion of their property tax revenue to the County Road Fund at a rate of about \$2.25 per \$1,000 of assessed property value.		N/A	Yes

Level	Program Name	Agency	Short Description / Purpose	Who or what is eligible?	Match Required?	Presently Utilized by Clark County?
Local	People for Bikes Community Grants	People for Bikes	The People for Bikes Community Grant Program provides funding for projects that build momentum for bicycling in communities across the U.S. These projects include bike paths and rail trails, as well as mountain bike trails, bike parks, BMX facilities, and large-scale bicycle advocacy initiatives.	Applications are accepted from non-profit organizations with a focus on bicycling, active transportation, or community development, from city or county agencies or departments, and from state or federal agencies working locally.	No	
Local	System Development Charges (SDCs)	Local jurisdiction	SDCs are a one-time charge collected by a City when a development permit is issued. By law, SDCs are limited to use for capacity improvements necessary to accommodate new development. This funding is a common source of local match for other grant programs and is particularly appropriate for projects that are not good candidates for other funding sources. Jurisdictions within Clark County have established Transportation Impact Fee programs, which usually apply to new developments or redevelopments.	Governmental jurisdictions with the authority to approve development permits.	N/A	Yes

Level	Program Name	Agency	Short Description / Purpose	Who or what is eligible?	Match Required?	Presently Utilized by Clark County?
Local	Frontage Improvement Agreements	Local jurisdictions	Most developers are required to construct improvements along their street frontage. When a development abuts a proposed road improvement project, the developer can be asked to pay for their share of the improvement.	Governmental jurisdictions with the authority to negotiate development agreements.	N/A	Yes
Local	User Fees	Local jurisdiction	A user fee is added to a monthly utility bill or included in the annual vehicle registration to fund improvements, expansion, and maintenance of the surface street system.	Governmental jurisdictions with the authority to levy user fees.	N/A	
Local	Street Utility Fees / Road Maintenance Fee	Local jurisdiction	The fee is based on the number of trips a particular land use generates and is usually collected through a regular utility bill.	Governmental jurisdictions with the authority to levy fees.	N/A	
Local	Road Improvement Districts (RID)	Local jurisdiction	Road Improvement Districts can be formed and funded by properties within a designated zone determined to benefit from these improvements.	Governmental jurisdictions with the authority to establish RIDs.	N/A	Yes
Local	Local Gas Tax	Local jurisdiction	In addition to the Washington State gas tax, some cities and counties charge an additional gas tax to fund transportation improvements.	Governmental jurisdictions with the authority to levy taxes	N/A	

Level	Program Name	Agency	Short Description / Purpose	Who or what is eligible?	Match Required?	Presently Utilized by Clark County?
Local	Exactions	Local jurisdiction	<p>These are improvements that are obtained as conditions of development approval. Developers are required to improve their street frontage and, in some cases, provide off-site improvements depending upon the level of traffic generation and the impact to the transportation system. This has been a common method of funding sidewalk improvements within a city, but is a difficult funding source to plan for because exactions are highly variable and it's not easy to plan for future improvements accurately.</p>	Governmental jurisdictions with the authority to approve development permits.	N/A	Yes
