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Executive Summary

Introduction
Located at the north end of Puget Sound, Island County has a rich rural, agricultural and maritime character marked by scenic vistas, open farmland, forested landscapes, historic sites, open roads, and diverse coastal environments. Towns offer services, accommodations, art galleries, restaurants and retail shops. The outdoor recreational opportunities found in the islands are a key asset, often not available in more urban settings. Together, these qualities make Island County an attractive place to live, work and visit.

Background: Roads, Trails & Shorelines
The roads on Whidbey and Camano Islands offer a range of scenic bicycling routes with relatively little car traffic, making them appealing to recreational cyclists, bicycle tourists, and people who ride for transportation. Many of these roads have paved shoulders that also support walking and jogging, while others may be less comfortable for the inexperienced bicyclist or walker who desires greater separation from traffic.

Island County also offers high quality, off-road trails that support walking, running, hiking, mountain biking and horseback riding. These trails are located within County parks and open spaces, state parks, and in easements on private property. Island County residents value existing trails and support the development of additional trails.

The shoreline in Island County supports a wide range of activities including walking, running, beach combing, picnicking, wildlife viewing, fishing, swimming, diving, shell fishing, and paddling. These activities occur at a limited number of public shoreline locations, such as in town centers, County and state parks, and where public roads abut the water. Island County residents have expressed a desire to have better access to the shoreline.

Trails Plan Update
The 2018 Island County Non-Motorized Trails Plan provides a comprehensive framework for future investment in facilities that support all forms of human-powered recreation on both land and water. The plan identifies specific physical projects that can be advanced for funding and implementation, as well as County-wide projects that are programmatic in nature.

The plan addresses two different but related infrastructure systems. The first is the non-motorized trail network consisting of on and off-street routes and sites. The second is the network of waterfront sites that provides public access to Island County’s shoreline. The waterfront sites provide important destinations within the overall non-motorized network that are highly desirable to Island County residents and visitors, as well as gateways to miles of publicly owned tidelands and the waters of Puget Sound.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Plan Goals
Goals from the 2006 Non-Motorized Trails Plan were carried over to the 2018 plan. However, references to shoreline access and water activities were added to the policy statements. The plan goals include:

1. Develop a comprehensive, high-quality non-motorized transportation system in Island County.
2. Develop an expanded, high-quality recreational trails system in Island County.
3. Encourage public use and enjoyment of non-motorized transportation facilities and recreational trails.
4. Endeavor to allocate sufficient local resources, including staff support and funding, for implementing the recommendations of this plan over the next five to twenty years.

Planning Process
The planning process used a combination of quantitative Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis and broad-based community input. This process offered numerous in-person and online opportunities for community members to review and comment on the plan, including twelve different open houses throughout the County, an online survey, online interactive map, and the ability to comment directly to County staff. An Advisory Committee representing a wide range of outdoor activity interest groups contributed to the plan. Collaborative planning meetings with regional partners also informed development of the plan.

Community Input
Community non-motorized activity patterns and needs were identified through the community involvement process.

Walking and Running
Walking and running in Island County usually involve shorter trips that are close to home. Although some walking trips are made to reach transit stops, most are for recreation and often occur along the edge of a road. Some County roadways have higher speed vehicular traffic and limited sight lines, which may be less appealing for some users. Feedback from some community members included requests for wider road shoulders, sidepaths or shared use trails, and intersection safety improvements.

Bicycling
Both road and mountain biking are popular in Island County. Road biking in the County is predominantly recreational, but some commuting and utility trips occur in proximity to towns and within range of the Clinton ferry. Like walkers, some road cyclists are uncomfortable with higher speed vehicular traffic and limited sight lines. Comments from cyclists included requests for increased maintenance of existing road shoulders, more shoulders, bike lanes, shared lane markings and trails.

Shoreline Use
A majority of residents visit the shoreline in Island County, but sometimes uncertainty exists about what is public and private property. Public feedback indicated that the most popular shoreline activities are walking, beachcombing, wildlife viewing, and kayaking. Improving signage and wayfinding for public shoreline sites was a consistent need expressed in surveys and open houses. Kayaking, in particular, was indicated as a popular activity and commenters indicated that paddlers would benefit from better water-oriented signage identifying public shorelines and more kayak camps with better distribution.

Equestrian
Most equestrian use is limited to specific trails in parks and other open spaces that allow horses. Feedback indicated that accommodation of equestrians along roadways and shared use trails could be improved. Barriers to horseback riding included limited road shoulders, not enough places to ride, incompatible trails, lack of horse trailer parking, and vehicular conflicts.
Project Prioritization
Unlike the 2006 plan, this update does not recommend a prioritized list of projects. Instead, the plan is a menu of potential projects to be analyzed using a priority array methodology, similar to that used by the County for road projects. Non-motorized projects can be evaluated against each other in any given year and recommendations to the Board of Island County Commissioners made based on the outcome of that process.

Recommendations
The planning process yielded a group of potential projects aimed at increasing opportunities for human powered activities. These projects fall into three categories, including: 1) County-wide projects addressing regional and system-wide needs, 2) specific on- and off-road trail projects that improve an existing or establish a new non-motorized route, and 3) shoreline access projects that upgrade existing public shoreline access sites.

A number of trail and shoreline “demonstration” projects, were selected from the project recommendations to help community members envision the different types of non-motorized improvements being proposed. These demonstration projects were only developed to help illustrate features that might be considered, and non-motorized networks that could be established, as a result of a project(s) being selected. However, the demonstration projects are not prioritized or necessarily more likely to go forward than other projects identified during the planning process.

Like all of the potential projects, the demonstration trail and shoreline projects are conceptual in nature and for visualization purposes only. They may ultimately be found to have feasibility concerns, such as property ownership issues or environmental impact constraints.
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Purpose of the Plan

The 2018 Island County Non-Motorized Trails Plan provides a comprehensive framework for future investment in facilities that support all forms of non-motorized transportation and recreation in the County. The plan identifies specific projects and programs that can be considered by the Board of Island County Commissioners as opportunities become available.

The 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan addresses two different but related infrastructure systems. The first is the non-motorized trail network comprising on- and off-street routes and sites for such activities as walking, running, hiking, road and mountain bicycling, horseback riding. The second is the network of waterfront sites that provides public access to Island County’s shoreline for activities such as walking, running, beach combing, picnicking, fishing and swimming, but also for those pursuing water-based activities, such as sea kayaking and stand-up paddleboarding. The waterfront sites provide important destinations within the overall non-motorized network that are highly desirable to Island County residents and visitors, as well as access to miles of publicly owned tidelands and the waters of Puget Sound.

All forms of transportation in Island County are addressed in the Transportation Element of the Island County Comprehensive Plan, however it only describes and maps the types of non-motorized facilities present in the transportation network. This Plan serves as a component of the County Transportation Element and describes specific conditions and improvements that can serve human-powered activities.

Having an up to date Non-Motorized Trails Plan is a requirement for the County to pursue funding for non-motorized improvement projects. It is important to note that the projects identified within this plan are conceptual and likely to change in scope as they are developed based on funding, physical constraints and evolving community needs.

Unlike the 2006 Non-Motorized Trails Plan, this update does not recommend a prioritized list of projects. Instead, the plan offers a menu of potential projects to be analyzed using a priority array methodology, similar to that currently used by the County for road projects. Non-motorized projects can be evaluated against each other in any given year and recommendations to the Board of Island County Commissioners will be made based on the outcome of that process.

Outreach for the 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan update has been extensive and included four meetings of an advisory group, online surveys, a project website, and three series of open houses. Collaborative planning meetings with regional partners have also informed plan development.

“This update does not recommend a prioritized list of projects. Instead the plan offers a menu of potential projects to be analyzed using a priority array methodology.”
The geographic extents for projects identified in the 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan are the entirety of Whidbey and Camano Islands. While the 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan is consistent with existing and planned non-motorized facilities in the cities of Oak Harbor, Coupeville and Langley, the plan does not address improvement projects within those jurisdictions. The plan also recognizes the potential connections with, and demand for, trails on Camano Island by residents in the City of Stanwood.
Plan Organization

The 2018 Island County Non-Motorized Trails Plan update covers a range of topics organized into the following sections:

**Introduction** briefly explains the rationale for the plan, states the plan’s goals and objectives, describes the planning process, and summarizes the community’s input. More detail on these topics is located in the appendices.

**Recommendations** presents the on- and off-road non-motorized networks and a list of recommended trail and shoreline projects, a subset of which are illustrated as “demonstration” projects.

**Reference Tools** presents facility design and signage and wayfinding concepts.

**Implementation** identifies implementation strategies including project selection methods, programmatic suggestions, performance measures, and funding opportunities.

**Appendices** contain the bulk of the supporting data for the plan, including the plan background and context, existing conditions, explanation of the project identification process, community involvement results, and items for further study.

---

**Island County Non-Motorized Trails Plan Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 Plan</th>
<th>2018 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Extensive inventory of existing (mostly land-based) non-motorized facilities</td>
<td>• Selective inventory of on-road and off-road routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Qualitative needs assessment (Advisory Group, citizen, and staff input)</td>
<td>• Extensive inventory of public shoreline access and site specific improvement potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Field surveys</td>
<td>• Qualitative needs assessment (Advisory Group, citizen and staff input)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result: Prioritized list of projects</strong></td>
<td>• Field Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnership needs assessment &amp; coordination (outreach to local, state, federal government partners and non-profit organizations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quantitative analysis using Geographic Information Systems and user route data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus on connecting on-road and off-road routes including water trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Result: List of high value potential projects, shoreline public access inventory, new project selection methodology</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Non-Motorized Trails Plan Comparison*
Goals and Objectives

Goals and objectives from the 2006 Non-Motorized Trails Plan were revisited and carried over to the 2018 plan with only a few minor revisions that addressed the shoreline access component of the plan. These goals are consistent with the Transportation Element of the 2016 Island County Comprehensive Plan.

**Goal #1**

*Develop a comprehensive, high-quality non-motorized transportation system in Island County in order to:*

- Encourage and support the development of on- and off-street facilities for non-motorized travel, such as new and existing trails (including water trails), designated bikeways, public beach access, and the public road system, that serve and connect communities and destinations throughout the County.

- Ensure that facilities are designed, built, and maintained to an appropriate standard in order to accommodate safe and efficient non-motorized travel that meets the needs of users.

**Goal #2**

*Develop an expanded, high-quality recreational trails system in Island County that:*

- Encourages and supports the development of recreational trails, and where appropriate, trailheads, parking, signing, sanitation, visitor amenities, and related facilities that can equitably serve communities and destinations throughout the County.

- Ensures that trail facilities are built and maintained to an appropriate standard utilizing low-impact and low-maintenance design, while accommodating safe and efficient use by a variety of user groups.

- Accommodates the needs of the physically disadvantaged through the application of universal design techniques at trailheads and along trails that are best suited to such use.
### Goal #3

**Encourage public use and enjoyment of non-motorized transportation facilities and recreational trails in order to:**

- Help develop and support educational efforts that encourage non-motorized travel as a cost-efficient, environmentally friendly, and sustainable alternative to motorized travel.
- Be responsive to the public’s desire for new and enhanced trail-based recreation opportunities in urban, suburban, rural, and wildland environments, and serving a diversity of users.
- Promote the development of facilities that are aesthetically pleasing and complementary to their natural surroundings.
- Encourage volunteer efforts, cooperative programs, and public-private partnerships in the development, improvement, and maintenance of trails and related facilities.
- Provide, where appropriate, for the posting and enforcement of rules and regulations that apply to trails, water activities and public roads in order to enhance public safety, reduce conflicts, and ensure adequate protection of private property, public facilities, and the natural environment.
- Help build awareness among motorists of the rights and responsibilities of both motorists and cyclists and the importance of “sharing the road.”
- Promote community and school-based educational programs that teach or encourage safe bicycling for all riders, including the importance of wearing helmets.
- Support the production of trail and non-motorized travel maps and information in the form of brochures, visitor kiosks, websites, signs, or other means.

### Goal #4

**Endeavor to allocate sufficient local resources, including staff support and funding, for implementing the recommendations of this plan over the next five to twenty years, specifically by:**

- Dedicating staff and local resources while actively pursuing state and federal grant funding necessary to develop trails, bikeways, trailheads, and related facilities as outlined in this plan.
- Establishing an ongoing, multi-agency coordinating committee to assist with the management of resources, project selection and priorities, property or easement acquisitions, community outreach, volunteer support, as well as the actual development or improvement of recommended facilities.
- Carefully integrating the implementation of this plan with related planning, funding, permitting, development, and maintenance programs administered by the Island County public works, parks, planning, and/or community development departments.
- Facilitating adjustments to the plan’s recommendations or priorities in response to new or unique opportunities, emerging needs, or other changed circumstances.
Planning Process

The planning approach employed in the 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan consisted of an iterative process that relied on a combination of quantitative Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis and broad-based community input. This approach was similar for the two different but related elements of the plan; the non-motorized trail network and the network of shoreline access sites.

The general steps for both the trails and shoreline access components involved:

1. Gathering information and data, assessing planning parameters and receiving input from County staff, Advisory Committee members, and the community.
2. Development of baseline conditions, including both a user based on-road network assessment and a current level of service assessment of shoreline access sites.
3. Review of baseline assessments by County staff, Advisory Committee members, and the community.
4. Development of the draft non-motorized network and identification of potential trails projects and shoreline access improvement sites through a combination of GIS analysis and feedback from Advisory Committee members, County staff, and the community.
5. Review of draft non-motorized network and trail and shoreline projects by County staff, Advisory Committee members, and the community.
6. Finalization of the non-motorized network, proposed projects, and potential shoreline access sites.

The network development process is described in more detail in Appendix C.

The planning process offered numerous in-person and online opportunities for community members to review and comment on the plan, including three sets of four open houses throughout the County, an online survey, online interactive map, and the ability to comment directly to County staff. An Advisory Committee representing a wide range of outdoor activity interest groups was also formed for the project. The Committee met four times and provided valuable background information, critique, and suggestions.

The full results of the community involvement process are located in Appendix B.
Planning Areas

The Island County government divides the County into four subareas for planning purposes to ensure that residents in each part of the County are being served equitably. These areas are:

- Camano Island
- North Whidbey Island
- Central Whidbey Island
- South Whidbey Island

The 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan structured the community involvement process around these planning areas. Plan concepts and materials for the entire County were available at each of the meetings, however the focus for each planning area tended to be on the issues and ideas important to the residents of that area. The planning areas were also factored into the project identification process to ensure that future non-motorized investments are equitably distributed across the County.

*Figure 2. Island County Planning Areas*
Figure 3. Planning Process Diagram
Community Involvement

This section summarizes the community involvement approach and the key themes that were expressed by the community. The full results of the community involvement process are in Appendix B.

Approach

The approach to community involvement was comprehensive and tailored to Island County. Given the size of the County, the different characteristics and needs of its various communities, and the fact that travel between Whidbey and Camano Islands is circuitous, opportunities to provide input were made as accessible and inclusive as possible.

Community members were offered a number of different platforms to provide input on the plan and review and comment on the preliminary projects. Three sets of community open houses were held in each of the four County planning areas to give residents every opportunity to attend in person. For those with busy schedules or transportation constraints, both an online survey and an online interactive mapping tool were made available throughout the information gathering and draft reviewing phases of the project.

In addition, an Advisory Committee was formed with local experts and specific user groups to make sure all potential non-motorized stakeholders were able to participate, including walkers, hikers and runners, road cyclists and mountain bikers, kayakers and standup paddleboarders, beach-goers and equestrians.

Specific outreach was also made to special organizations, interest groups and potential partners, such as the Whidbey Camano Land Trust, Washington State Parks, the Washington State Department of Transportation, Island Transit and the U.S. Navy.
Community Open Houses

Three rounds of open houses were held in each of the four County planning areas and promoted through the County’s project website, email updates, informal social media, local newspapers, school districts, outdoor activity interest groups, flyers and word of mouth. The full results from the Community Open Houses can be found in “Appendix B: Community Involvement”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open House</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1/31/17 to 2/3/17</td>
<td>• Provide input on non-motorized trails and shoreline access sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>6/12/17 to 6/23/17</td>
<td>• Summarize input received at Open House #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review and comment on preliminary routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review and comment on shoreline access sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review and comment on sample projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review draft project list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>10/24/17 to 11/1/17</td>
<td>• Presentation of final project list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Voting on final projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Online Survey

An online survey was used to elicit feedback on residents’ human-powered activities, asking questions about destinations, barriers to activities, and preferred improvements. The URL and QR code for the survey were included on project promotional fliers, emails and on the County’s project website. The survey had 252 registered users and received 206 complete responses.

The Survey was open to public input from January 23rd to October 14th, 2017.

Online Map

Community members were invited to use an interactive online map or “wikimap” to provide location-specific input about their walking, biking, paddling and equestrian activities in Island County. Users were invited to draw their existing and desired routes with a line tool and also add site specific comments or recommendations with a point tool. The interactive map was promoted through newspaper announcements, project promotional fliers, emails, and on the County’s project website. The map was also promoted at libraries for residents without internet access.

In tandem with the online survey, the WikiMap was open to public input from January 23rd to October 14th, 2017.
**Direct Comments**

Community members were encouraged to submit comments directly to the County through email or written comment forms that were distributed at the open houses.

**Advisory Committee**

An Advisory Committee comprised of representatives of various non-motorized stakeholder groups was also formed to provide more specialized input on specific modes and review the draft plans and projects prior to presentation to the broader community.

**Focused Outreach**

In addition to input from community members, focused outreach was made to current and potential trail partners, including:

- Washington State Parks
- Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
- U.S. Navy
- Whidbey Camano Land Trust (WCLT)
- Pacific Rim Institute (PRI)
- Island Transit
- Friends of Camano Island Parks (FOCIP)
- Ebey’s Landing National Historic Reserve
- South Whidbey Parks & Recreation
- Island County Parks & Recreation
- City of Stanwood
- Cities of Oak Harbor and Langley
- Town of Coupeville

The Board of Island County Commissioners was updated on progress and reviewed materials in October, 2017, and again in February, 2018. The final draft of the plan was presented to the Island County Planning Commission in late February, 2018.

**Strava Data**

The plan also utilized Strava data, activity data generated by non-motorized users through a smartphone application or other networked device. The Strava data were used to determine where people were walking, biking and mountain biking and represent another form of community input, albeit one that is unlikely to be representative of the entire County population.
INTRODUCTION | COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

**Open Houses**
In person, face-to-face discussions, in each of the four planning areas.

- **212**

**WikiMap**
Online mapping app that allows users to identify routes and points of interest.

- **96**

**Online Survey**
Broad study of users, modes, likes & dislikes, wants, and comments.

- **206**

**What routes were identified?**
- 24 Route I Bike
- 12 Route I’d Like to Bike
- 15 Route I Walk
- 3 Route I’d like to Walk
- 4 Route I Kayak
- 5 Route I Horseback Ride

**Who is responding, by mode?**

**By region?**

- 15% Barriers to Biking
- 13% Barriers to Walking
- 20% Barriers to Kayaking
- 42% Barriers to Horseback
- 10% Barriers to Horseback

*Figure 4. Community Involvement Summary*
Key Themes

Walking and Running
Walking and running are mainly local activities characterized by shorter trips closer to home. Most walking is for recreation in Island County and home-based trips often occur on the edge of the road, where off-road trails are not close at hand, so many residents walk on the edge of the road. Many roadways have higher speed vehicular traffic and limited sight lines, decreasing the actual and perceived safety and comfort when walking.

- Most walking trips are for recreation.
- Most walking trips range between 1 and 5 miles.
- Most residents walk on the side of the road.
- Vehicle speeds and volumes are cited as the biggest concerns by people walking.
- People who walk would like wider road shoulders, sidepaths or shared use trails, and intersection safety improvements.
- People with mobility challenges would like improved ease of access (including trails and facilities built to ADA standards)

Bicycling
Both road and mountain biking are popular in Island County. Road biking in the County is predominantly recreational, but commute and utility trips are also common, especially in proximity to cities and populations centers, and within range of the ferry terminals. Road cyclists face many of the same concerns as people walking, namely higher speed vehicular traffic and limited sight lines, which are mitigated to some degree on roads with wide shoulders.

- Vehicle speeds and volumes are cited as the biggest concerns of people currently or interested in bicycling on the road.
- Road cycling is the primary type of bicycling in Island County.
- Most bicycling in Island County is recreational.
- Mountain biking opportunities are concentrated in select locations that offer high quality trails, such as the Kettles Trails.
- Many roadways in the County lack bicycle facilities, such as bike lanes, though many have wide shoulders.
- Maintenance of existing shoulders (i.e. sweeping debris after a windstorm) was frequently cited as an important need.
- People would like to see more shoulders, bike lanes, shared lane markings and trails.
Shoreline Use
Shorelines are underutilized due to limited public access sites and uncertainty about private property. A number of potential and underutilized shoreline access points exist presenting an opportunity to increase shoreline access in Island County.

- 92% of survey respondents visit shorelines in Island County.
- The most popular shoreline activities are walking, beachcombing, wildlife viewing, and kayaking.
- The most important shoreline amenities are trails, signage/wayfinding, trash cans, parking, and restrooms.
- Improving signage and wayfinding for public shoreline sites was a consistent request in the survey and open houses.
- Kayaking is part of the cultural identity of the islands.
- Kayaking is a popular activity. While kayak camps are only relevant to a niche subset of the population, there is a need for more and better locations.
- Up to a quarter of paddlers kayak on a monthly basis, while over two-thirds kayak on an annual basis.
- Most kayakers paddle less than 5 miles per outing.

Equestrian
Most equestrian use is limited to specific trails in parks and other open space that allow horses. Few longer equestrian trails exist in the County, and to date, there has been poor accommodation for equestrians along roadways and shared use trails.

- 10% of survey respondents ride horses.
- Three quarters of all rides are over 5 miles, suggesting the need for a variety of longer trail options.
- Barriers to horseback riding included inadequate road shoulders, not enough places to ride, lack of compatible trails, lack of horse trailer parking, and vehicular conflicts.
RECOMMENDATIONS

ON-ROAD NETWORK

OFF-ROAD NETWORK

PAVED SHOULDER VS SHARED USE PATHS

COUNTY-WIDE PROJECTS

TRAIL PROJECTS

SPOT IMPROVEMENTS

DEMONSTRATION TRAIL PROJECTS

DEMONSTRATION SHORELINE PROJECTS
This section presents the recommended non-motorized network and projects developed through the planning process. These recommendations are conceptual in nature and require additional analysis to determine their ultimate feasibility.

The recommended projects identified in the plan are not prioritized. Instead, the plan offers a menu of potential projects to be analyzed using a priority array methodology, similar to that currently used by the County for road projects. Non-motorized projects will be evaluated against each other in any given year and recommendations will be made to the Board of Island County Commissioners based on the outcome of that process.

**On-Road Network**

The on-road, non-motorized network was developed through an iterative process involving a technical bicycle level of service (BLOS) analysis performed in GIS, numerous field surveys, and input from community members, especially those who frequently walk and bicycle the different routes throughout the County.

The bicycle level of service method, called “Rural Bicycle Level of Comfort,” rated each segment of the non-motorized network using roadway data associated with improved safety and comfort for people bicycling (see "Bicycle Level of Comfort" on page C-3). This level of service approach is based on research showing that high vehicle speeds and high volumes of traffic are the primary deterrent for less experienced cyclists and people who don’t currently bicycle, but have considered it\(^1\),\(^2\).

Surveys of the general population in urban areas have found that almost two-thirds of the overall population, would consider bicycling more if they could ride on facilities that provided at least some separation from traffic\(^3\). While these percentages likely differ in rural settings, providing a safe and comfortable bicycle network with facilities that support this “interested but concerned” population will increase bicycling in Island County.

---

This chart shows the proportion of each type of bicyclist relative to the overall population. A small percentage of bicyclists, identified as “Strong and Fearless” and “Enthused and Confident,” will bicycle despite a lack of dedicated bike facilities. Almost two-thirds of the population, the “Interested but Concerned” group, would consider bicycling more if they could ride on facilities that provided at least some separation from traffic, such as wide shoulders or protected bike lanes.

*Figure 5. Four Types of Transportation Cyclists*
In a rural setting where there are no dedicated walking facilities, such as sidewalks, the same factors that make bicycling safe and comfortable generally improve the walking experience. However, bicyclists and walkers have different characteristics and needs, particularly the distances each can comfortably travel, so using Bicycle Level of Comfort as a proxy for rural walkability, while informative, has limits.

**Route Selection**

While anybody can walk or bicycle along any road in the County, the proposed non-motorized network consists of the routes that are most comfortable and appealing. Many of the proposed routes are already popular among local cyclists, have high scenic value, and have shoulders that provide some separation from traffic.

A subsequent GIS analysis helped identify gaps in the proposed non-motorized network where stretches of road might be relatively less comfortable, for example, a segment lacking paved shoulders (see "Project Identification" on page C-14). A number of these gaps were identified as projects in the plan.

**Network Hierarchy**

The on-road, non-motorized network consists of two types of routes: Primary Bike Routes and Secondary Bike Routes. This distinction is based on a combination of non-motorized trips rates, or popularity, derived from user uploaded data (Strava Metro), the signed bicycle touring routes already planned by the County, and other popular recreational bicycle routes identified by local cyclists.

Primary Bike Routes are routes that demonstrate higher demand and more directly connect major destinations.

Secondary routes have lower volumes of bicyclists and fewer signed route segments, but are still relatively safe, comfortable and attractive routes appropriate for the non-motorized network.

**Loops and Branding**

Along with specific bicycle or walking routes, the non-motorized network could be branded based on its character, configuration or location in the County. These potential regions are illustrated on the proposed network plan. The five different regions are:

- Camano Tour (Camano Island)
- Northern Parks (North Whidbey Island)
- Kettles Pinch (Coupeville environs)
- Greenbank Crazy-Eight (Greenbank Farm)
- Southern Triangle (South Whidbey Island)

Custom signage and wayfinding signs and pavement markers could communicate these different areas (see "Wayfinding Concepts" on page 105).
Figure 6. Proposed On-Road Walking and Bicycling Network
Off-Road Network

Shared Use Paths

Shared use paths, such as the Rhododendron Trail and Kettles Trail, are paved trails that are completely separated from traffic and accommodate all non-motorized users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, in-line skaters, joggers, people in wheelchairs and other users. An important aspect of shared use paths is that they accommodate bicyclists of all ages and abilities who might otherwise be unwilling to ride on the road.

While shared use paths are typically more expensive to build than other non-motorized facilities, they support a much wider range of users and activities and can improve the identity of the community. Studies have also shown that properties near shared use paths have relatively higher values than other properties, and the presence of trails in a community ranks very high for prospective home owners.

"... shared use paths ... support a much wider range of users and activities and can improve the identity of the community."

Whidbey Isle Trail (aka Bridge to Boat Trail)

The concept of a continuous, low-stress route for all ages and abilities from the Deception Pass Bridge to the Clinton-Mukilteo Ferry was adopted in 2009 as an amendment to the 2006 Non-Motorized Trails Plan. This concept is officially named the “Whidbey Isle Trail,” but is commonly referred to as the “Bridge to Boat Trail.” Although the concept was originally conceived of as a continuous shared use path, parallel roads with low traffic volumes and speeds can be viable links in this trail. Such on-road connections can likely be developed at a lower cost per mile than shared use paths (see "Paved Shoulders vs Shared Use Paths" on page 32).
Figure 7. Shared Use Paths - Potential Project Phases
Along with the contiguous Kettles and Rhododendron trails near Coupeville, a half-mile shared use path was constructed in Freeland in 2017, and development of another segment of the trail from Clinton to Ken’s corner is planned to get under way in 2019.

Along with supporting recreational use, the Bridge to Boat trail would provide an important transportation function. A number of Island Transit routes follow SR 20 and SR 525, including routes 1SB, 1NB, 411W, 58, 57NB, and 57SB. The Bridge to Boat Trail segments will provide an all ages and abilities connection separated from highway traffic from the proposed non-motorized network to these transit stops.

While people will generally walk up to one-half a mile to a transit stop, bicycling extends that distance three to four times increasing the transit catchment area about ten-fold. The Bridge to Boat Trail will provide a low-stress connection to the transit stops along the highway that will make this critical “last mile” connection attractive for existing and potential bicyclists. Island Transit buses are also equipped with bike racks, expanding these routes’ service areas. In South Whidbey Island, the Bridge to Boat Trail is likely to support an increasing number of transportation related trips to the Clinton-Mukilteo ferry terminal as well as encourage more bicycle touring trips onto the Island.

Just as State Routes 20 and 525 are the backbone of the motorized transportation network in Island County, the Bridge to Boat Trail concept would create a central, low-stress route that could serve as a central spine of the non-motorized network providing comfortable access to destinations up and down Whidbey Island.

**Bridge to Boat Trail Phasing**

The Bridge to Boat Trail concept extends almost 50 miles from Clinton to the Deception Pass Bridge. The cost of building a shared use path can vary widely, but averages about $2 million per mile. Given available funding sources and other competing priorities, the Bridge to Boat Trail concept is clearly a long term vision. Even though bicycling the length of Whidbey Island won’t be possible in the short term, development of interim segments can still have high value for the surrounding communities. Specific trail project evaluation criteria should be factored into the priority array process (see "Priority Array" on page 116) to determine which segments should be implemented.

These criteria include:

**Continuity**

New trail segments that connect to existing trails create longer, contiguous facilities that have more value than disconnected trail segments.

**Alternatives**

If a safe and comfortable on-road route parallels the proposed Bridge to Boat alignment along SR 20/525 and does not detour from the highway corridor by more than about 25%, the shared use path segment should be a lower priority.

**Demand**

Trail segments with high non-motorized demand, such as those near cities and higher density rural areas, should get prioritized over locations with lower demand.

**Equity**

Each of the four Island County planning areas should benefit, as should all socioeconomic groups.

“The Bridge to Boat Trail would provide an important transportation function.”
Admiralty Bay Trail
Another shared use path concept identified in the 2018 plan connects the intersection of SR 20 and SR 525 with the Port Townsend/Coupeville ferry terminal, with the path following SR 20. The Admiralty Bay Trail concept intersects another potential separated trail project, the Crockett Lake Loop (see "Crockett Lake Loop" on page 38).

Bridge to Books Trail
A shared use path is proposed between the City of Stanwood and Terry’s Corner on Camano Island, and is called the “Bridge to Books” Trail, since the Camano Island library is a terminus. This trail would likely follow the SR 532 right of way.

As the primary route between Stanwood and Terry’s Corner, the Bridge to Books trail will serve both a recreation and transportation function. At a distance of four miles, the trip between these destinations is relatively easy for most bicyclists. This trail would provide much improved non-motorized access to services in Stanwood for Camano Island residents, and better non-motorized access to Camano’s parks and trails for Stanwood residents. Secondary schools for Camano Island residents are also located in Stanwood, so the Bridge to Books trail would provide safe and comfortable bicycle access for some Camano students attending Stanwood schools.

The City of Stanwood supports this concept (see "Plan Endorsements" on page B-116), which would connect to proposed protected bike lanes along SR 532 extending east from the Davis Slough bridge to the center of Stanwood.
Paved Shoulders vs Shared Use Paths

Cost
- $1 million per mile (both sides of roadway)

Variables
- Topography
- Environmental impacts
- Subgrade

Benefits for Non-Motorized Users
- 71% reduction in crashes involving pedestrians (FHWA)
- More comfort for bicyclists
- Lower cost means more miles of shoulder can be constructed than shared use path
- Increases attractiveness for confident bicycle users

Drawbacks for Non-Motorized Users
- Does not accommodate bicycle riders of all ages and abilities
- Collects glass and hazardous debris
- Uncomfortable for people on foot and bicycles as vehicle speeds and volumes increase
- Spray from vehicles on to walkers and bicyclists

Benefits for Motorists
- Provides margin for error for driver
- Moderately increases sight distances
- Provides break-down space for vehicles
- Can provide space for vehicle acceleration and deceleration from roadway
- Increases effective turning radii at intersections
- Reduces vehicular crash types from 15-75%

Other Benefits
- Typically requires less right of way
- Provides structural support for pavement prolonging pavement life
- May improve stormwater management
- Safer for enforcement and maintenance
Shared Use Path

Cost
- $2 million per mile (two-way facility)

Variables
- Topography
- Environmental impacts
- Subgrade
- Shorter segments can access low speed, rural roads to increase effective benefit

Benefits for Non-Motorized Users
- Separates vulnerable users from vehicle traffic
- Family friendly, accommodating all ages and abilities and serving more people
- Induces more activity, promoting healthier communities
- Allows more face-to-face interaction between community members
- Matches preferences of “interested, but concerned” bicycle riders
- Equitable transportation facility for lower income and other non-driver populations
- Reduced noise from passing vehicles
- Provides an increased level of comfort
- Reduces potential for roadway crashes for vulnerable travelers
- Increases community identity and pride
- May be more attractive to bicycle tourists, increasing economic activity
- Can increase transit ridership if the shared use path serves transit stops
- More community access to preserved open space
- May offer space for equestrian activity

Drawbacks for Non-Motorized Users
- Potentially less appealing to confident or higher speed road cyclists

Benefits for Motorists
- Increased driver comfort with non-motorized users off travel way
- Less traffic impact due to singular mode

Drawbacks for Motorists
- Less funding for road shoulders

Other Benefits
- Increases property values
County-Wide Projects

The following table contains projects that are regional in scale, planning level efforts, or are placeholders for projects that may be identified and defined subsequent to adoption of the plan. Some of these projects are intended to make the non-motorized network, including water trails and shoreline access sites, easier to find and use. Others are categories of improvements that are typical ongoing engineering practices, such as improving the safety of a trail crossing.

Projects are numbered for identification purposes only. The numbering does not indicate their priority. All projects will be subject to the County’s priority array methodology (see "Priority Array" on page 116).

Project costs shown in the “Cost” column are very rough order of magnitude estimates. They are only intended to give a project’s conceptual cost relative to other projects.
### County-Wide Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Complete Streets Ordinance</td>
<td>Investigate adoption of a countywide complete streets ordinance (see “Complete Streets Policy” on page 118).</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Plan recommendations are already well aligned to Complete Streets concepts. Ordinance would help access funding for non-motorized improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>On-Road Bicycle Signage &amp; Wayfinding System and Information Kiosks</td>
<td>Develop a consistent signage and wayfinding system identifying non-motorized routes and attractions, as well as shoreline access sites. Nomenclature and graphic design should be consistent with the Bicycle Touring Map. Incorporate QR codes in this system. Work toward coordinating with proposed Recreation &amp; Conservation Office mapping efforts.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Can tie into the signage being developed for the bicycle touring routes in the TIP. Coordinate with WSDOT for signage along state highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bicycle Map Update</td>
<td>Update the Island County Bicycle Touring Map routes based on the 2017 plan. Provide more detailed information on routes, such as qualitative descriptions and level of comfort, so that visitors can make more informed decisions on routes. Name or brand specific routes and regions of the Island based on characteristics unique to each region. Include mountain biking sites, descriptions and respective regulations.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Current project likely to update bicycle map to electronic form. Ongoing improvements to the mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Non-Motorized Data Collection Program</td>
<td>Establish a system for collecting and analyzing non-motorized data in the County to justify and prioritize future non-motorized investment.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Can comprise 3rd party data (Strava) along with strategic count locations maintained by the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>WSDOT Coordination Projects</td>
<td>Coordinate with WSDOT on all projects along SR 20, SR 525 and SR 532 to evaluate conditions and feasibility of highway crossings, signals, access, signage and the availability of ROW. Work together to identify ways to leverage funding to improve connectivity, comfort and access.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>County improvements of Bridge to Boat or Kettles Trailhead Parking will be coordinated with WSDOT to improve access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Non-Motorized Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>Miscellaneous non-motorized improvements including, but not limited to access to transit stops, route parking, overlooks, shoulder widening, trails, wayfinding and crossing safety devices.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Consider alternative safety improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Trail Signage and Wayfinding System Update, Consistent Across Trail Systems</td>
<td>Develop a trail signage and wayfinding system identifying trails and attractions, as well as shoreline access sites. Incorporate QR codes in this system.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Could relate to bicycle and shoreline signage and wayfinding system. Although in process this could be an ongoing update project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walking, Hiking, Running  
Full or Partial ADA Accessibility  
Paved or compacted gravel surface for biking  
Unpaved trail for mountain or cyclo-cross biking  
Equestrian  
Kayak, Stand-up Paddleboard, Canoe

*Figure 10. County-Wide Project Table*
## County-Wide Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Off-Road Trail Network Maps</td>
<td>Develop a consistent set of maps, with trail descriptions, and a signing plan for the soft surface trails. Update as additional trails are constructed. This should be an on-line resource, but could also be published as a guide similar to the &quot;Getting to the Water’s Edge&quot; guide for shoreline access.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Includes a County-wide network overview map and maps for individual sites. Integrate Avenza mapping application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Private Trails Toolkit</td>
<td>Develop a protocol enabling private property owners to establish new trails or formalize existing trails that cross private property.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Soft-Surface Trail Improvements</td>
<td>Miscellaneous improvements including: additional soft surface trails, signage, parking and amenities that support a variety of non-motorized activities.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Shared Use Path Equestrian Accommodation</td>
<td>Consider an unpaved equestrian trail along existing and proposed shared use paths.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Shoreline Signage and Wayfinding</td>
<td>Develop a consistent signage and wayfinding system identifying shoreline access sites from land as well as from the water. Incorporate QR codes in this system.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Should relate to bicycle signage and wayfinding system. Separate land based and water based systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Water Trails Maps</td>
<td>Develop a Water Trails map showing pullout and kayak camp sites, including nearby amenities.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Land-Side Shoreline Access &amp; Use Improvements</td>
<td>Miscellaneous shoreline access improvements including, but not limited to: parking improvements, ADA facilities, picnic tables, etc.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Shoreline Access Improvements for Non-Motorized Watercraft</td>
<td>Miscellaneous shoreline access improvements for non-motorized watercraft, such as designation of strategic safe harbors (including sites with no land-side access), and potential partnerships with other organizations to establish and maintain limited, primitive water-oriented camp sites at certain locations.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Walking, Hiking, Running
- Full or Partial ADA Accessibility
- Paved or compacted gravel surface for biking
- Unpaved trail for mountain or cyclo-cross biking
- Equestrian
- Kayak, Stand-up Paddleboard, Canoe
Island County Bicycle Map Update

Washington State DOT Coordination
Trail Projects

The following section contains the overall project list for Island County projects and tables describing the projects proposed for each County planning area. These non-motorized projects are numbered only to reference the project key map. They have not been prioritized or evaluated for feasibility. All projects have an equal likelihood of being selected by the Board of Island County Commissioners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Iverson Road Advisory Shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Elger Bay Area to State Parks Trail Loops &amp; Connectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bridge to Books Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Road Shoulders or Sidepaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Barnum Point Preserve Trail System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sleeper Road Trailhead Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Inter-Park Connection and Pacific Northwest Trail Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bos Lake Loop Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jones Road Shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Scenic Heights Road Advisory Shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Scenic Heights Road Shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Balda Road Property Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Northgate Community Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hoffman to City of Oak Harbor Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Navy Jet Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Navy Outlying Field Bypass Loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Crockett Lake Loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kettles Connector Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kettles Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Greenbank - Smugglers Cove Road Parking and Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Clinton Non-Motorized Improvements Plan Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>South Whidbey Road Shoulder Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Maxwelton to Craw Shared Use Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Freeland Community Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Deer Lagoon Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Whidbey Airpark Access Road and Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Hammons Preserve Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Lakes to Sound Trail Connectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walking, Hiking, Running
Full or Partial ADA Accessibility
Unpaved trail for mountain or cyclo-cross biking
Equestrian
Kayak, Stand-up Paddleboard, Canoe

Figure 11. Trail Projects Table
Figure 12. Trail Project Map
## Camano Island Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Iverson Road Advisory Shoulders</strong></td>
<td>Implement advisory shoulders along Iverson Road from the abandoned Iverson Beach Road ROW to Iverson Trail Preserve.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Experimental treatment requiring FHWA approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>Elger Bay Area to State Parks Trail Loops &amp; Connectors</strong></td>
<td>Provide shoulders or soft-surface trails along Dry Lake Road from Elger Bay Road to the Cama Beach State Park trailhead at Ivy Way Trail, along Mountain View Road to Lowell Point Road, and down Parker Road. Consider trail crossing safety improvements on Elger Bay Road, Mountain View Road and SW Camano Drive.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Part of long-term shoulder widening effort for arterials / collector roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>Bridge to Books Trail</strong></td>
<td>Create a non-motorized route between Stanwood and Terry's Corner comprising trails and other roads.</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Two phases. Prioritization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Road Shoulders or Sidepaths</strong></td>
<td>Provide paved shoulders or sidepaths along various roads including but not limited to: West Camano Drive from Camano Hill Road to Cama Beach State Park, East Camano Drive from Terry's Corner to Can Ku Road/Camano Park, and North Camano Drive from Terry's Corner to Utsalady.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Part of long-term shoulder widening effort for arterials / collector roads. Includes segment of the Camano Bicycle Touring Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>Barnum Point Preserve Trail System</strong></td>
<td>In conjunction with WCLT, develop new trails for a range of users at Barnum Point Preserve.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Off-road bike use could be seasonal. Acquisition of the 40-acre Holly Farm to the north is under consideration. An additional 70 acres to the east has been identified for potential expansion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14. Camano Island Trail Project Map
# North Whidbey Island Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sleeper Road Trailhead Improvements</td>
<td>Partner with State Parks to improve the trailhead and develop parking at Dugualla State Park.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>What amenities currently exist? Mountain bike and equestrian allowed on Dugualla SP trails?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Inter-Park Connection and Pacific Northwest Trail</td>
<td>Construct an enhanced shoulder or sidepath on the north side of Cornet Bay Road between SR20 and the Cornet Bay Marine Area for pedestrians and cyclists.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>50’-80’ ROW, topography may be prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bos Lake Loop Trail</td>
<td>Identify and develop a continuous bicycling and walking loop around Bos Lake using a combination of road shoulders, sidepaths and soft surface trails. Extend the proposed paved shoulders and/or sidepath along Swantown Road from Fairway lane (Oak Harbor city limits) to Wieldraayer Road to connect to the City of Oak Harbor.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Portions may be easy and safe for all ages/abilities. Within the City of Oak Harbor, the south side of Swantown Road where a parking lane currently exists could be converted to a two-way protected bike lane. This facility could be extended into the County on the south side of the Swantown Road ROW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jones Road Shoulders</td>
<td>Improve shoulders along Jones Road between Imperial Lane and Dike Road.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Part of long-term arterial and collector shoulder widening program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Scenic Heights Road Advisory Shoulder</td>
<td>Between SW Balda Street (in the City of Oak Harbor) and Miller Road, convert Scenic Heights Road into a shared use facility using advisory shoulders or delineators to create a bicycle and pedestrian trail on the water side of the existing road.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>With the road closure, this section of Scenic Heights Road has very little traffic, so can be converted into a slow, shared lane where bicycles and pedestrians have priority. Potentially high demand from Oak Harbor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Scenic Heights Road Shoulders</td>
<td>Provide shoulders on Scenic Heights Road between Miller Road and View Ridge Drive.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>50’ ROW, 24’ pavement width, no shoulders, typical. Part of long-term arterial and collector shoulder widening program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Balda Road Property Parking</td>
<td>Develop a parking area on the County owned property on Balda Road.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Parking to serve trail and hobby airplane users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Northgate Community Connector</td>
<td>Trail along SR waterside from Monkey Hill to Sound View Shopper. Planned intersection improvement at Banta Road allows highway crossing. Community can access grocery to North and rural De Graff loop route to south. As part of the Northgate Community Connector Project, create a signed shared roadway along West Sullivan and Degraff Roads completing a loop with the shared use path along SR 20.</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>Part of the Whidbey Isle Trail concept. Based on shared use path prioritization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Walking, Hiking, Running
- Full or Partial ADA Accessibility
- Equestrian
- Paved or compacted gravel surface for biking
- Unpaved trail for mountain or cyclo-cross biking
- Kayak, Stand-up Paddleboard, Canoe

Figure 15. North Whidbey Island Trail Project Table
## Recommendations

### Trail Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hoffman to City of Oak Harbor Connector</td>
<td>Connects the Park &amp; Ride, Liberty Grocery, and City of Oak Harbor. Serves lower income communities when transit is not available. Existing crossing at Ault Field Road. Part of the Bridge-to-Boat Trail concept along SR20. Connects to the Navy Jet Trail.</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>This project provides a non-motorized connection to NAS Whidbey Island from Oak Harbor and the Bridge-to-Boat Trail. Requires coordination with the Navy, as it would mostly be on Navy property. Based on shared use path prioritization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Navy Jet Trail</td>
<td>New paved or soft-surface trail on the north side of Clover Valley and Ault Field roads from the SR20 to Rocky Point. A Langley Road spur can lead up the main gate of NAS Whidbey Island and the display aircraft. Connects to the Hoffman to City of Oak Harbor Connector.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Leverages Saratoga gate parking. Outside of the Navy fence. Audio tour application?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 16. North Whidbey Island Trail Project Map*
## Central Whidbey Island Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Navy Outlying Field Bypass Loop</td>
<td>Establish one or more signed alternate routes around the section of SR20 between Morris and Race Roads where no shoulders exist.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Priority “easy win” project. These bypass routes can also serve as a recreational loop around the Navy Outlying Field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Crockett Lake Loop</td>
<td>Develop an easy, safe and continuous bicycle and walking loop around Crockett Lake for all ages and abilities. Add shoulders or a sidepath to Wanamaker Road/SR20 between Keystone Hill Road and the SR20-SR525 intersection. Consider enhanced shoulder with double stripes and delineators on one side. Develop a shared use path or wide sidepath from the Coupeville Ferry along SR 20 to the intersection of Wanamaker Road.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Begin with route signage, with the long-term goal of developing a route for all ages and abilities. WSDOT coordination on SR 20 segment. 60’ ROW, 11’ travel lanes, 27’ overall pavement width typical. Based on shared use path prioritization. Feasibility of steep section from Koenig Lane to SR20/SR525/ Race Road intersection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kettles Connector Trail</td>
<td>Develop a firm and stable surface ADA Accessible and road bike-friendly trail connection between the north terminus of the paved Kettles shared use path along SR 20 and Point Partridge Road in Fort Ebey State Park. Stripe shoulders along Hill Valley Road from Libbey Road to Fort Ebey State Park for non-motorized users. Part of Bridge-to-Boat Trail concept.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Tentative alignment to follow the existing Kettles and Grancy’s Run Trails within the Kettles trail/Ebey’s State Park area. Coordination with Washington State Parks on Grancy’s Run and Point Partridge Road improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kettles Parking</td>
<td>Work with WSDOT to develop parking at south entrance to Kettles Forest.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Infrequent /intermittent use by WSDOT for paving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Greenbank - Smugglers Cove Road Parking</td>
<td>Develop a small parking area on the west side of SR 525 to serve a soft surface trail along Smuggler’s Cove Road.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Navy coordination. This trail may ultimately connect to Trillium Woods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Walking, Hiking, Running
- Full or Partial ADA Accessibility
- Paved or compacted gravel surface for biking
- Equestrian
- Unpaved trail for mountain or cyclo-cross biking
- Kayak, Stand-up Paddleboard, Canoe

### Figure 17. Central Whidbey Island Trail Project Table
Figure 18. Central Whidbey Island Trail Project Map
## South Whidbey Island Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Clinton Non-Motorized Improvements Plan</td>
<td>Based on the Clinton Non-Motorized Improvements Plan, develop recommended bicycle and pedestrian facilities serving Clinton and the ferry terminal.</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>Partner with WSDOT/WSF, Island Transit, Port of South Whidbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>South Whidbey Road Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>Construct paved shoulders on roads comprising the non-motorized network, including but not limited to: East Harbor Road, Saratoga Road, Bob Galbreath Road and Sandy Point Road.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Part of long-term shoulder widening effort for arterials / collector roads. Partially complete. Confirm alignment with Langley’s Bicycle Priority Routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Maxwelton to Craw Shared Use Path</td>
<td>Construct a shared use path from Maxwelton Road to Craw Road along SR 525 in partnership with South Whidbey Parks and Recreation. Part of the Bridge-to-Boat Trail concept.</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>Based on shared use path prioritization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Freeland Community Trails</td>
<td>Improve street shoulders or develop new sidepaths along streets, with an emphasis on creating an attractive walkable loop.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Identified in the Freeland Subarea Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Deer Lagoon Trails</td>
<td>Improve and expand Deer Lagoon trail system around lagoon and across dikes. Consider “community” connections to Shore Avenue, Useless Bay and Sunlight Beach communities.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Would require an agreement with the Shore Avenue community to use Shore Avenue, which is partially privately owned, and cross certain properties in proximity to the dike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Whidbey Airpark Access Road and Parking</td>
<td>Incorporate non-motorized trail access and parking into the proposed Whidbey Airpark Access Road project to provide access to undeveloped South Whidbey Parks and Recreation property between SR525 and the Airpark.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Partnership between Island County and S. Whidbey Parks and Recreation District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Hammons Preserve Trail</td>
<td>Extend trail from Hammons Preserve to County owned property.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Lakes to Sound Trail Connectors</td>
<td>Establish non-motorized trail connections between Saratoga Woods and the DNR Trails property; Goss Lake and Putney Woods; and Putney Woods, current and future Hurt properties, and Lone Lake Park.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Trails could be established within the public ROW or through easements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walking, Hiking, Running, Full or Partial ADA Accessibility, Equestrian, Demonstrated Projects

Paved or compacted gravel surface for biking, Unpaved trail for mountain or cyclo-cross biking, Kayak, Stand-up Paddleboard, Canoe

Figure 19. South Whidbey Island Trail Project Table
Figure 20. South Whidbey Island Trail Project Map
## Considerations on Washington State Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Non-Motorized Crossing at Libbey Road, SR 20 and Madrona Way</td>
<td>Work with WSDOT to evaluate conditions and feasibility for better connections for pedestrians and bicycles at the intersection of Libbey Road and Madrona Way at SR 20.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Consider user actuated HAWK, RRFB or half signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>SR 20 Shoulder and/or Other Non-Motorized Improvements East of Coupeville</td>
<td>Work with WSDOT to evaluate conditions and feasibility for shoulders and/or other non-motorized improvements, such as a Bridge to Boat Trail segment, along SR 20 where there are no shoulders from Morris Road to Race Road.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Look for ways to leverage funding to support better access. Possibility for Bridge to Boat extension and/or Crockett Lake Loop linkage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Northbound Penn Cove Road Access and Investigation of Southbound Non-Motorized</td>
<td>Work with WSDOT to evaluate conditions and feasibility for better connections for pedestrian and bicycles at SR 20 between Power Road and Penn Cove Road.</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>SR 20 Shoulder enhancement at Grasser Lagoon</td>
<td>Work with WSDOT to evaluate conditions and feasibility for better connections for pedestrian and bicycle access on the shoulders of SR 20 between Madrona Way and Zylstra Road.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Widen shoulder and provide a double edge stripe and delineators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Coupeville Ferry Shared Use Path</td>
<td>Work with WSDOT to evaluate conditions and feasibility for a shared use path from the Coupeville Ferry along SR 20 to the intersection of SR 20 and 525. Part of the Crockett Lake Loop and Bridge-to-Boat Trail concept.</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>Based on shared use path prioritization. Feasibility of steep section from Koenig Lane to SR20/SR525/Race Road intersection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Rhododendron Trail Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>Work with WSDOT to evaluate conditions and feasibility for safer trail crossings along the Rhododendron Trail where it crosses Terry and Jacobs Roads along SR 20 to enhance visibility of trail users to motorized traffic (see &quot;Intersection and Trail Crossing Concepts&quot; on page 94).</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>Requires coordination with WSDOT. May comprise short- and long-term improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Kettles Trail Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>Work with WSDOT to evaluate conditions and feasibility for safer trail crossings along the Kettles Trail where it crosses S. Ebey, S. Sherman, 110 S. Roads and Winterhawk Lane along SR 20 to enhance visibility of trail users to motorized traffic (see &quot;Intersection and Trail Crossing Concepts&quot; on page 94).</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>WSDOT coordination for deceleration/acceleration lanes, explore parking options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Highway Crossing Safety Improvements at Sherman Road</td>
<td>Work with WSDOT to evaluate conditions and feasibility for better connections for pedestrians and bicyclists at the intersection of Sherman Rd at SR 20</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Highway Crossing Safety Improvements at Greenbank</td>
<td>Work with WSDOT to evaluate conditions and feasibility for better connections on SR 525 at Greenbank Farms near the intersection of Smuggler’s Cove Road to support connectivity of the non-motorized network and transit access.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Highway Crossing Safety Improvements in Freeland</td>
<td>Working with WSDOT to evaluate conditions and feasibility for better connections for pedestrians and bicyclists in the vicinity of the Freeland subarea.</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walking, Hiking, Running
Full or Partial ADA Accessibility
Paved or compacted gravel surface for biking
Unpaved trail for mountain or cyclo-cross biking
Equestrian
Kayak, Stand-up Paddleboard, Canoe

*Figure 21. Considerations on Washington State Highways Table*
Figure 22. Considerations on Washington State Highways Map
Spot Improvements

During the planning process, a number of smaller improvements were identified that did not constitute full projects. These improvements consist of both on- and off-road projects.

On-Road Spot Improvements

On-road spot improvements are relatively easy and inexpensive actions that can be taken to address problems at locations such as intersections and short gaps in trails or routes. They can be distinguished from other bicycle and pedestrian projects, such as development of new trails, in that they connect physical or functional gaps in the network rather than providing entirely new routes. Improving safety should be a high priority for selection of on-road spot improvements.

On-road spot improvements fall under County-wide project #5, Miscellaneous Non-Motorized Roadway Improvements. The County should consider an ongoing program within the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) similar to the shoulder widening program called “Spot Improvements for Bicycle and Pedestrian Access.”

Potential on-road spot improvements identified in the planning process are listed in Figure 23 on page 51.
### RECOMMENDATIONS | SPOT IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Barnum Point Trailhead</td>
<td>Camano</td>
<td>Expanded parking lot and trailhead at Barnum Point Preserve. Install bike rack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Barnum Point ADA Access</td>
<td>Camano</td>
<td>Develop ADA parking stalls and beach access at Barnum Point Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Elger Bay Road Shoulders</td>
<td>Camano</td>
<td>Elger Bay Road shoulder widening for parking to access Whidbey Camano Land Trust viewing platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Penn Cove Road</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Short connector path between SR 20 and Penn Cove Road (behind guard rail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Scenic Heights Road</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Trail bollards and other small improvements at Scenic Heights Road (slide site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Hastie Lake Road to Boon Road Connection</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Mini Bridge to Boat segment between Hastie Lake Road and Boon Road to allow for short, two-way, lower elevation gain, non-motorized loops out of Oak Harbor (without needing to cross SR 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Monkey Hill Road to North Gate Connection</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Connection between Monkey Hill Road and North Gate community to take advantage of future SR 20 crossing improvements (also to access potential Bridge to Boat trail if implemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Boon Road to SW 24th Avenue Connection</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Mini Boat to Bridge segment between Boon Road and SW 24th Avenue to connection between the communities of Oak Harbor. This segment would tie into the Bridge to Boat segment between Hastie Lake Road and Boon Road and provide a link to Fort Nugent Road and West Beach Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Midway Boulevard to Ault Field Road Connection</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Bridge to Boat Segment between Midway Boulevard and Ault Field Road in Oak Harbor (this would need to be discussed with WSDOT, NAS Whidbey Island and the City of Oak Harbor). This segment would provide bicyclists, runners and walkers a safe alternative route away from SR 20 and provide a safe connection to the surrounding communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Banta Road and Soundview Lane Connection</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Mini Bridge to Boat segment between Banta Road and Troxell Road to provide residents in that live in the North Gate community a safe route to Soundview Shopper away from vehicle traffic. This segment would tie into the Monkey Hill to North Gate Connection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Engle Road Crossing</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Pedestrian and bike crossing south of Hill Road on Engle Road at Admiralty Inlet Preserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Fort Casey Road Crossing</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Pedestrian and bike crossing on Fort Casey Road north of Patmore Road to connect Whidbey Camano Land Trust trails to Rhododendron Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Engle Road Crossing at Crockett Lake</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Pedestrian and bike crossing on Engle Road to connect the Crockett Lake Loop with existing Whidbey Camano Land Trust trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Smugglers Cove Road Crossing</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Smugglers Cove crossing at Trillium Woods trailhead to access South Whidbey State Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Smugglers Cove Road Shoulders</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Smugglers Cove Road shoulder widening for parking and connection between Smugglers Cove trail and Trillium Woods trailhead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 23. On-Road Spot Improvements Table*
Figure 24. Spot Improvements Map
Off-Road Spot Improvements

Off-road spot improvements consist of small-scale improvements located at specific sites in the County. These improvements generally fall under County-wide projects #9, Miscellaneous Soft-Surface Trail Improvements, and #14, Miscellaneous Shoreline Access Improvements for Non-Motorized Watercraft.

Potential off-road spot improvements identified in the planning process are listed in Figure 25 on page 53.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Mountain Biking Skills Park</td>
<td>County-Wide</td>
<td>Coordinate with mountain biking advocate groups to develop a mountain biking skills park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Barnum Point Kayak Campsite</td>
<td>Camano</td>
<td>Consider developing a kayak campsite at Barnum Point Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Ander Park Trails</td>
<td>South Whidbey</td>
<td>Ander Park trail improvements to connect to Whidbey Camano Land Trust trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Brainers Forest Trust Land Trails</td>
<td>South Whidbey</td>
<td>Develop trails on the Brainers Forest trust land site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Walking Ebey’s Trail Corridor</td>
<td>Central Whidbey</td>
<td>Work with the Whidbey Camano Land Trust to address non-motorized trail connectivity associated with the Walking Ebey’s Trail Corridor project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25. Off-Road Spot Improvements Table
Demonstration Trail Projects

In order to help community members envision the different types of non-motorized improvements being proposed, “demonstration” projects were developed for both trails and shoreline access sites. The demonstration projects were chosen to illustrate a range of possible improvement projects.

Demonstration projects are not more likely to go forward than other projects, but were included to help illustrate features that might be considered, and non-motorized networks that could be established, as a result of a project(s) being selected.

Selections included projects that:

- Developed a network
- Appeared feasible at a first pass
- Provided high value
- Considered equity
- Emphasized partnerships
- Served a number of people/communities

Selections did not include:

- County-Wide projects
- WSDOT projects
- Isolated shoulder widening
- Projects flagged for feasibility
- Single point road crossings

The demonstration projects were first reviewed by the Board of Island County Commissioners. The displays were then taken to the final round of open houses to provide inspiration, elicit comments, and engage attendees in the voting exercise for all of the potential projects identified.

Both the demonstration trail and shoreline projects are conceptual in nature and for visualization purposes only. They may ultimately be found to have feasibility issues, such as property ownership conflicts or environmental impact constraints.
Figure 26. Demonstration Trail Projects Map
Camano Island

**State Parks to Elger Bay Preserve Connectors**

This project develops a network of on- and off-road trails that connects Camano Island and Cama Beach State Parks with Elger Bay Preserve, Cranberry Lake, and a future Park & Ride lot.

**Elements**
- Paved shoulders or unpaved sidepath within the Dry Lake Road right-of-way from Elger Bay Road to the Dry Lake Road trailhead.
- Paved shoulders or unpaved sidepath within the Mountain View Road right-of-way from Elger Bay Road to Lowell Point Road/Camano Island State Park.
- Trail crossing safety improvements along SW Camano Drive at Cama Beach State Park. Improvements could include marked crosswalk and/or "trail crossing" signs.
- Trail crossing safety improvements where Elger Bay Preserve trails cross Elger Bay Road. Improvements could include marked crosswalk and/or "trail crossing" signs.

**Benefits**
- Serves residents as well as tourists
- Emphasizes partnerships (State Parks and Whidbey Camano Land Trust)
- Reasonable cost and high return on investment

*Figure 27. State Parks to Elger Bay Preserve Connectors*
**Barnum Point Park Improvements**  
(also a Shoreline Project)

This project develops a network of soft-surface trails at Barnum Point Preserve, a property acquired by the Whidbey Camano Land Trust. Acquisition of the 40-acre Holly Farm to the north is under consideration. An additional 70 acres to the east has been identified as a potential expansion.

**Elements**
- Network of unpaved trails, each of which fits the site and offers a unique experience.
- Overlook and trail through wetlands.
- Trailhead with parking and information about the site.

**Benefits**
- Serves residents as well as tourists (likely to be a very high interest property)
- Develops a trail network
- Public access to up to 1 mile of shoreline
- Emphasizes partnerships (Whidbey Camano Land Trust, important to the City of Stanwood)
- Feasible (property already purchased, site plan being developed)

*Figure 28. Barnum Point Park Improvements*
North Whidbey Island

Bos Lake Loop Trail

This project develops walking and possibly biking loop around Bos Lake. The loop trail would be comprised of a soft surface trail and road shoulders.

Elements

- Soft surface trail from the end of Wieldraayer Road to West Beach Road through conservation easement on Fakkema property and county owned property.
- Paved shoulders or unpaved sidepath within the West Beach Road right-of-way between West Beach County Park and the Sunset Beach/Joseph Whidbey State Park.
- Shoulders along Swantown Road from Oak Harbor to Joseph Whidbey State Park.
- Trail crossing safety improvements at West Beach County Park. Improvements could include marked crosswalk and/or signs.

Benefits

- Develops a network (existing parking, develops walking trail and on-road shoulders, connects to shoreline county parks).
- Serves a number of people/community (significant natural environment component for tourists as well as residents, ties to dense urban area).
- Emphasizes partnerships (worked with Land Trust, discussed with City of Oak Harbor to connect to proposed trails plan, Navy partnership trail can access).
- Appears feasible at a first pass (reasonable cost, no obvious fatal flaws and offers a high return on investment).

Figure 29. Bos Lake Loop Trail
28 Northgate Community Link Trail

This project develops a segment of the Bridge to Boat Trail from Troxell Road to Monkey Hill Road. This shared use path segment will serve the residents of Northgate and facilitate both non-motorized recreation and transportation to the Navy base and Soundview Shopper. The path would enable a loop route using low traffic Sullivan and Degraff Roads. Navy coordination may bring additional “outside the fence” trail opportunities.

**Elements**
- Shared use path from Troxell Road to Monkey Hill Road.
- Loop Route signage along W Sullivan and Degraff Roads.
- Leverages crossing improvements at Banta Road (WSDOT 2019).

**Benefits**
- Develops a network (connects Northgate Community with commercial RAID services and, on south leg to a scenic, rural tour loop).
- Serves a number of people/community (bicycle tourists as well as residents of very high density North Whidbey residential development).
- Emphasizes partnerships (WSDOT and Navy).
- Appears feasible at a first pass (reasonable cost, no obvious fatal flaws).
- Equity Considerations (lower income community).
29 Hoffman Road to City of Oak Harbor

This project develops a network of paved trails connecting NAS Whidbey Island with SR 20 and the City of Oak Harbor.

**Elements**
- Shared use path or sidepath along the north side of Ault Field Road from the proposed Whidbey Isle Trail at SR20 to Rocky Point.
- A trail stub following the Navy’s Langley Road north to the main gate and jet display.
- Shared use path along SR 20 from Hoffman Road to the Oak Harbor city limits.
- Bicycle connection along Goldie Road consistent with Oak Harbor’s Bicycle Priority Network.

**Benefits**
- Develops a network (connects low traffic Frostad and Hoffman road to downtown, completes a leg of Whidbey Isle Trail, connects to services and Navy Jets planes and proposed trail).
- Serves a number of people/community (residents of North Whidbey, Park & Ride users, bicycle tourists).
- Emphasizes partnerships (WSDOT and Navy collaboration).
- Appears feasible at a first pass (reasonable cost, no obvious fatal flaws).
- Equity Considerations (access for lower income community).

---

**Navy Jets Trail**

**Figure 31. Hoffman Road to City of Oak Harbor and Navy Jets Trail**
Central Whidbey Island

32 Crockett Lake Loop

Crockett Lake Loop would be an easy, safe and continuous bicycle and walking loop around Crockett Lake for all ages and abilities.

Elements
- Sidepath or enhanced paved shoulder along Fort Casey Road and Wanamaker Road between Fort Casey and SR 20 (at Driftwood Park).
- Sidepath or shared use path from Driftwood Park to the Keystone Ferry Terminal.
- Existing parking area/trailhead at the ferry terminal.
- Possible route through Fort Casey between the ferry terminal and Fort Casey Road.

Benefits
- Develops a network (continuous bike/walk loop, unique environment with historic elements).
- Serves a number of people/community (bicycle tourists, ferry travelers, State Park goers, Seattle Pacific University conference center users, Fort Casey event attendees, historic hotel guests, potentially less physically able and young/old, residents of Whidbey).
- Emphasizes partnerships (worked with Navy and WCLT to identify need, emphasizes County/State/Federal/Land Trust lands).
- Appears feasible at a first pass (reasonable cost for some portions, no obvious fatal flaws for lowest level of implementation [shoulders] and if WCLT plans for wetland access work out).

Figure 32. Crockett Lake Loop

Crockett Lake from Wanamaker Road

Wanamaker Road
This project develops a safe walking and biking connection between Coupeville and points north of Libbey Road. This trail would be constructed to be road bike-friendly and meet ADA accessibility standards for unpaved trails.

**Elements**
- Unpaved but regraded and compacted trail from the Kettles shared use path at SR 20 to Grancy’s Run Trail.
- Regraded and compacted Grancy’s Run Trail connecting to Point Partridge Road.
- Possible coordination with State Parks to improve Point Partridge Road for trail use.
- Possible paved shoulders on Hill Valley Drive.

**Benefits**
- Serves residents as well as tourists.
- Improves an existing trail network.
- Provides an important low stress bicycle connection.
- Feasible (improves existing public facilities).
Hammons Preserve Trails

Ten acre Hammons Preserve, which Whidbey Camano Land Trust oversees, provides access to 40 acre Island County Parks parcel. This project would improve the connector trail and develop new trails from Hammons Preserve to the county-owned parcel.

**Elements**
- Trailhead with parking
- Extending existing soft-surface trails into County property.

**Benefits**
- Develops a network.
- Serves a number of people/community (residents, potential for tourist use by nearby boat launch users).
- Emphasizes partnerships (WCLT has access land to open County Parks land).
- Appears feasible at a first pass (very low cost, no obvious fatal flaws, high value for small investment).

*Figure 35. Hammons Preserve Trails*

*Hammons Preserve*

*View from Hammons Preserve (photo by Tom Trimbath)*
Lakes to Sound Trail Connectors

This project would establish non-motorized connections between an number of existing public recreation sites in South Whidbey Island, including Saratoga Woods, the DNR Trails property, the Goss Lake County Park, Putney Woods, the current and future Hurt properties, and Lone Lake Park.

**Elements**
- Trail easement between Saratoga Woods and DNR Trails property.
- Trail or enhanced shoulder along Traverse Road and Lakeside Drive between Goss Lake County Park and the Goss Lake-High Point Trail.
- Trail or enhanced shoulder along Lone Lake Road between Putney Woods, the Hurt Properties and Lone Lake Park.

**Benefits**
- Develops a network.
- Serves a number of people/community (residents, potential for tourist use).
- Emphasizes partnerships.
- Appears feasible at a first pass (very low cost, no obvious fatal flaws, high value for small investment).

*Figure 36. South Whidbey Community Connections*
Demonstration Shoreline Projects

To the extent possible, all public shoreline access sites were identified in this plan. Sites with the highest potential for public access projects were determined through GIS analysis and Island County engineering input. These highest potential sites underwent additional public ownership evaluation, but have not been prioritized or further evaluated for feasibility.

Shoreline Site Analysis Process

1. Inventory of all potential public shoreline access sites.
2. GIS weighting analysis #1: parking, quality & extent, ease of access, connection to non-motorized network.
3. GIS weighting analysis #2: removal of private & community sites, accessibility and existing amenities weighting.
4. GIS results reviewed by: Island County staff, Trails Plan Advisory Committee, and the public.
5. Sites ranked by planning area based on weighting and reviewer input.
6. Island County senior management review: List of Highest Potential sites examined and reduced based on presence of fatal flaws.
7. Island County senior management review: Remaining sites examined for known conflicts, three primary and two secondary sites selected per planning area.
8. Primary and secondary sites reviewed by public.
9. Public ownership evaluation of primary and secondary sites by surveyor (and additional sites as funding allowed).
10. Ongoing post-plan legal review of final recommendations

Three demonstration projects from each of the four planning areas were included to help illustrate features that might be considered as a result of the project being selected. Although demonstration projects were selected from higher potential candidates, actual site feasibility remains uncertain.

Site recommendations with the highest value and potential to advance will be forwarded to the Board of Island County Commissioners.
Figure 37. Shoreline Projects
Camano Island

Utsalady Street Ends

These two street-ends are part of the street grid and provide beach access in Utsalady. The two sites are about 500 feet apart, so can work in tandem. One consideration is to use the two sites as “bookends” to help create a walkable, slow-speed segment of Utsalady Road by installing advisory shoulders.

Elements
- The Ekle Street right of way on the south side of Utsalady Road can accommodate parking for about 8 vehicles.
- The State Street right of way on the south side of Utsalady Road can accommodate parking for 6-8 vehicles.
- Some parking can also occur along Utsalady Road.
- Both sites could accommodate picnic facilities, kayak put-in and pull-out, and bike racks.
- Possible ADA parking and top-of-bluff accommodation.
- These two sites are currently being used by surrounding property owners for small boat storage.

Benefits
- In conjunction with advisory shoulders on Utsalady Road (which would also improve ADA access along the road), slows vehicles, improves safety and creates a shared neighborhood space.
- Serves people in the community who do not have beach access.
- Appears feasible at a first pass (very low cost, no obvious fatal flaws, high value for small investment).

Figure 38. Utsalady Street Ends Plan
Barnum Point Park (also a Trail Project)

Barnum Point Preserve represents one of Island County’s most significant and highest value parkland additions. In addition to providing a network of soft surface trails, this project will provide low-bank shoreline access to a mile of scenic beach.

**Elements**
- Beach walk
- Picnic facilities
- Possible ADA accessible beach
- Visitor information
- Accessible parking

**Benefits**
- High interest “gem” property
- Serves residents/tourists
- Emphasizes partnerships (Whidbey Camano Land Trust)
- Feasible (portions of property already purchased, site plan available)

---

Figure 39. Barnum Point Park
**C Tillicum Beach**

Tillicum Beach has great views across Port Susan to Mount Baker and Glacier Peak and provides relatively easy access to the shoreline, though has lots of driftwood. The site could accommodate another picnic table or two, BBQ grill, and is suitable for kayak put-in and pull-out. A few boats are currently being stored on this site.

**Elements**
- Defined parking
- Grass area
- Picnic facilities
- Secure bike parking
- Water-oriented wayfinding

**Benefits**
- Improves a shoreline site that fills a gap along the east shore of Camano Island.
- Provides good kayak put-in/pull-out.
- Appears feasible at a first pass (very low cost, no obvious fatal flaws, high value for small investment).
North Whidbey Island

D Sunset Beach

This site provides county parking for a popular beach recreation and sunset viewing area. The site also provides low bank access to the Joseph Whidbey State Park picnic area and beach trail. Additionally, Sunset Beach can serve as a launching point for future trail networks including a proposed Bos Lake Loop Trail.

**Elements**
- Designated parking
- Picnic facilities
- ADA access to Joseph Whidbey State Park picnic area
- Secure bike parking
- Water-oriented wayfinding

**Benefits**
- Provides space for additional amenities
- Improve trailhead for Joseph Whidbey State Park beach trail.
- Improve vehicular ingress and egress safety at corner of West Beach Road
- Possible partnership with Washington State Parks
- Appears feasible at a first pass (very low cost, no obvious fatal flaws, high value for small investment).

*Figure 41. Sunset Beach Plan*
**West Beach Vista**

These sites comprise five contiguous parcels along West Beach Road, which currently provide a popular sunset viewing location and access to a bluffside beach walk. The southernmost site is across from a public right of way that provides access to the south side of Bos Lake, thus providing a key starting location or waypoint for the proposed Bos Lake Loop Trail.

**Elements**
- Improve existing parking area and install secure bike parking
- Bos Lake Loop trailhead
- Trail to viewpoint and picnic area on bluff
- Potential for revocable lease agreement to extend beach walk all the way to Hastie Lake Park
- West Beach Road crossing safety improvements
- Context sensitive safety elements along high bank
- Potential for off-leash dog park
- Water-oriented wayfinding

**Benefits**
- Adds value to the Bos Lake Loop Trail.
- Appears feasible at a first pass (very low cost, no obvious fatal flaws, high value for small investment)

![Figure 42. West Beach Vista Plan](image-url)
Penn Cove Park

Popular beach location with access to gently sloping inter-tidal zone and the relatively protected waters of Penn Cove. Great views of Coupeville and opportunities for long shoreline walks. Potential to increase usable upland park area by swapping nearshore parking to lot across the street.

**Elements**
- Picnic facilities
- ADA accessibility to upland park features
- Interpretive signage
- Improved parking area, including boat trailer parking and secure bike parking
- Existing boat ramp
- Water-oriented wayfinding

**Benefits**
- Potential partnership with State for parking improvements

*Figure 43. Penn Cove Park Plan*
Central Whidbey Island

**G Long Point**

With the beach “point” surrounded by water on three sides, this gently sloping shoreline site allows expansive views of Penn Cove and Saratoga Passage.

**Elements**
- Possible ADA accessible beach areas
- Picnic facilities
- Parking expansion and accessible parking spaces
- Water-oriented wayfinding
- Low tide loop walk potential
- Secure bike parking

**Benefits**
- Access to public tidelands that may extend to Town of Coupeville
- Appears feasible (very low cost, high value for small investment)
- Close to urban center

*Figure 44. Long Point Plan*
**Hidden Beach**

Hidden Beach is a relatively large site with views of Saratoga Passage and Camano Island. With good parking potential, and located in a region with less beach access opportunities, Hidden Beach appears to offer a high value opportunity.

**Elements**
- Picnic facilities
- Sports court
- Parking improvements
- Secure bike parking
- Water-oriented wayfinding

**Benefits**
- Feasibility (very low cost, high value for small investment)
- Larger beach access area near popular Greenbank Farm center
- Potential beach restoration partnerships
- Provides access to public tidelands

![Hidden Beach Plan](image)

*Figure 45. Hidden Beach Plan*
Lagoon Point County Park is a relatively small site, but offers great views of the Puget Sound and Olympic Mountains and is a very popular fishing spot. This site has limited tideland access, but there may be an opportunity to connect it to the extensive public tidelands to the north through crossing agreements with private tideland owners.

**Elements**
- Establish connection to public tidelands to the north
- Evaluate existing parking
- Picnic facilities
- Secure bike parking
- Water-oriented wayfinding

**Benefits**
- Fills a large gap in public shoreline access
- Very low cost

*Figure 46. Lagoon Point Plan*
**K Sunlight Beach**

This site provides access to extensive public tidelands that surround the end of the Sunlight Beach spit. This unique environment offers views of the Puget Sound, Kitsap Peninsula and Deer Lagoon. Property agreements, such as with the diking district, may connect site with a network of trails associated with Deer Lagoon area.

**Elements**
- Redefine and establish additional parking
- Potential dike walk with connections a system of trails
- Potential picnic facilities
- Secure bike parking

**Benefits**
- Proximity to a potential trail network
- Serves residents, visitors and bird enthusiasts
- Accesses extensive public tidelands
- Emphasizes partnerships (communities and diking district)
- Appears feasible (reasonable cost and high value)
- Existing dock

**Figure 48. Sunlight Beach Plan**
**Baby Island Heights**

This difficult to reach site provides over half a mile of secluded shoreline that looks out on Saratoga Passage, Central Whidbey and Camano Islands. At low tide the beach walk can be extended out to the popular Baby Island, which is a popular hangout for seals.

**Elements**
- Improve existing parking
- Explore new parking opportunities
- Secure bike parking
- Improve access down bluff to beach

**Benefits**
- County tideland ownership
- Offers potential for improved access by local community and visitors
- Provides a long stretch of public shoreline access, including access to Baby Island at low tide.
- Emphasizes partnerships (work with communities to increase public access to the shoreline)

*Figure 49. Baby Island Heights Plan*
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SHORELINE SITE DESIGN CONCEPTS
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Reference Tools

The following section contains non-motorized facility reference materials and design concepts. These concepts require further assessment to be advanced to design standards.

Trail Facility Design Concepts

Non-motorized transportation infrastructure in rural areas is often limited due to:

- Prior emphasis on motor vehicle-focused design standards
- High cost to develop facilities spanning long distances
- Lack of perceived demand
- Topological and/or environmental constraints

Island County faces many of these challenges. Utilization of the current toolbox of rural non-motorized facilities, both on-road and separated trails, can, over time, result in a safe, accessible, and comfortable multimodal network in the County.

The following section provides design guidance on non-motorized facilities that are suitable for rural road networks typical of Island County. This guidance is presented for consideration and potential integration into Island County Public Works’ design standards. The design guidelines are conceptual and require further assessment when advanced to detailed design. These guidelines are consistent with current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) guidance and recommendations, most notably the Small Town and Rural Design Multimodal Networks guide (FHWA, 2016).

Other relevant guidance for more urban contexts such as Freeland, Clinton, and parts of Camano Island can be found in the following guidelines:

- Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Design Manual, Division 15 – Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities.

The following guidelines are assembled from these sources.


FHWA Design Guides
Shared Lane

Roads that have low speeds can be comfortably shared by people walking and cycling. Traffic calming measures can help reduce speeds on some roads to make them more appealing to non-motorized users.

**Characteristics**
- Bicyclist shares the travel lane with vehicles
- With or without shared lane markings
- “Share the Road” signs (MUTCD W11-1 / W16-1)
- Under 500 vehicles per day
- Under 25 MPH posted speed limit
- No accommodation for pedestrians
- Pedestrians walk on the edge of the road or on separate path or sidewalk
Paved Shoulder

The County’s standard rural pedestrian and bicycle facility is a 4-foot wide paved shoulder. However, in cases where non-motorized volumes are high or along bike routes categorized as “Primary” in the proposed network, wide or enhanced paved shoulders can provide additional separation from traffic, allow two bicyclists to ride abreast, and provide adequate width for a cyclist to pass somebody walking without having to cross into the vehicle travel lane.

Characteristics

• Minimum 4-foot wide shoulder
• Minimum 5-foot wide shoulder width when a curb, guardrail or other roadside barrier is present
• 8-inch wide stripe
• Rumble strips should not encroach on the usable width, rumble “stripes” preferred
• Over 25 MPH posted speed limit
• Under 10,000 vehicles per day
• No separate accommodation for pedestrians
• Pedestrians share shoulder or walk on separate path or sidewalk
Wide Paved Shoulder

On roads with higher traffic speeds and volumes, or more frequent freight or bus traffic, wide paved shoulders provide additional separation from vehicles.

Characteristics

- 6-foot wide shoulder
- 8-inch wide stripe
- Over 25 MPH posted speed limit
- Under 10,000 vehicles per day
- Rumble strips can encroach 2-feet on the usable width (provide gaps, rumble “stripes” preferred)
- No separate accommodation for pedestrians
- Pedestrians share shoulder or walk on separate path or sidewalk
Enhanced Paved Shoulder

Paved shoulders can be enhanced to provide a higher level of service for bicyclists and pedestrians. Treatment can include a painted buffer and vertical delineators.

Characteristics

- Minimum 4-foot wide usable width
- Separated from vehicle traffic by a minimum 2-foot wide buffer
- Consider using delineators at corners, intersections and driveways
- Two 4- to 6-inch wide stripes for buffer
- Over 25 MPH posted speed limit
- Under 10,000 vehicles per day
- No separate accommodation for pedestrians
- Pedestrians share shoulder or walk on separate path or sidewalk

Enhanced Paved Shoulder, Lihue, Hawaii

Buffered Bike Lane, Lyndonville VT (Western Transportation Institute)
**Bike Lane**

Bike lanes provide an exclusive space for bicyclists through the use of pavement markings. Bike lanes are located adjacent to vehicle travel lanes.

**Characteristics**
- Width varies based on presence of curb and/or parking lane
- Exclusive lane for bicyclists
- Solid lines
- Consider using delineators at corners, intersections and driveways
- Under 40 MPH posted speed limit
- Under 9,000 vehicles per day
- Signs and pavement markings
- Pedestrians walk on sidewalk or separate trail
Advisory Shoulder

This facility type fits the character of Island County, which has a number of low traffic streets within village-like residential neighborhoods where people often walk on the edge of the road. Often, the right of way in these locations is constrained, making the construction of sidewalks difficult. Advisory shoulders are much less expensive than sidewalk construction, so implementation is more likely.

Advisory shoulders have the added benefit of slowing down traffic by visually narrowing the roadway for people driving.

Potential locations include:

- Iverson Road, Camano Island
- Utsalady Road, Camano Island
- Beach Drive, Camano Island
- Keystone Avenue, Whidbey Island
- Shore Avenue, Whidbey Island
- Sunlight Beach Road, Whidbey Island
- Maxwelton Road (in Maxwelton), Whidbey Island

Characteristics

- Provides separated space when standard bicycle lanes or pedestrian path will not fit
- Pedestrian and bicycle lane into which motor vehicles may legally encroach
- 10-to 16-foot wide two-way center travel lane (18-feet maximum)
- 4- to 6-foot wide shoulders
- Dashed lane lines with no centerline
- Under 25 MPH posted speed limit
- Under 3,000 vehicles per day
- Pedestrians walk on shoulder
- Currently experimental (FHWA)
Pedestrian Lane

Pedestrian lanes are similar to advisory shoulders, but are only on one side of a road and not meant to be encroached upon by vehicles. Pedestrian lanes could be considered on slow speed and volume roads within residential clusters where demand for walking is high. Pedestrian lanes visually narrow the driving lanes, so have a traffic calming effect.

Characteristics

- Intended pedestrians
- Bicyclists ride in vehicle travel lane
- Under 25 MPH posted speed limit
- Under 2,000 vehicles per day
- Solid white line
- As a pedestrian facility, must meet accessibility guidelines for a pedestrian access route.
- Consider a tactile ribbon in lieu of stripe

Pedestrian Lane, Detroit, OR
**Sidepath**

Sidepaths are appropriate on rural County roads that have higher traffic volumes and speeds, creating separation between non-motorized users and vehicles. In some cases, right of way constraints will make meeting the minimum width and separation standards challenging.

**Characteristics**
- Physically separated from traffic
- Minimum 8-foot width with 5-foot separation from road edge
- Intended for shared use by pedestrians and bicyclists
- Pedestrians share path with bicycles, so there is potential for conflicts between modes
- Accommodates all ages and abilities
- Equestrian surface can be provided along the outside edge of the sidepath, space permitting.
Shared Use Path

Shared use paths are completely separated from vehicular traffic providing a low stress experience for bicyclists, pedestrians, inline skaters, wheelchair users, and joggers. They are similar to sidepaths and typically wider and do not closely parallel roads.

**Characteristics**

- Physically separated from traffic
- Recommended 12-foot width in high demand locations
- Minimum 10-foot width
- Intended for shared use by pedestrians and bicyclists
- May or may not include a center line
- Pedestrians share path with bicycles, so there is potential for conflicts between modes
- Accommodates all ages and abilities
- Equestrian surface can be provided along the outside edge of the shared use path, space permitting.
Soft Surface Trail

Soft surface trails can accommodate a variety of users including pedestrians, trail runners, mountain bikers, equestrians and wheelchair users. Surface and width varies depending on user groups, volumes and terrain.

**Characteristics**
- Intended for shared use by pedestrians, hikers, equestrians and mountain bikers (conditional)
- Width variable
- Accommodates all ages and abilities

*Soft Surface Trail, Deception Pass State Park*
Intersection and Trail Crossing Concepts

Road intersections and trail crossings are significant conflict points between people walking and bicycling and motor vehicles. Under the Bicycle Level of Comfort approach used to develop the non-motorized network, creating safe intersections and trail crossings with clear expectations for all users is just as important as providing safe and comfortable routes between.

Intersections

**Right Turn Lanes**

A common intersection condition that people walking or bicycling encounter in the County is negotiating a right turn lane from the road shoulder. This is a common location for right-hook conflicts. For through movements, where right turn lanes exist, shoulders can either be treated as on-street bike lanes and carried across the turn lane next to the through lane or treated like a protected bike lane and separated from the roadway up to the intersection. The former are more appropriate for lower speed County roads, while the latter are appropriate for higher speed roads, such as East Camano Drive.

Where the bike lane treatment is chosen (Figure 50 on page 95), dotted line extensions and/or green paint can be used to define the bike lane where it crosses the right-turn lane and “Turn Lane Yield to Bikes” signs (MUTCD R4-4) can be used to direct motorists to yield to bicyclists. In this scenario, pedestrians continue along the shoulder outside of the turn lane to the intersection.

On roads with high traffic speeds and/or volumes or where turn lanes are extremely long, and if the right of way has adequate width, the shoulder can transition into a separated bike lane or sidepath before the turn lane (Figure 51 on page 95). Pedestrians and cyclists can then cross at the crosswalk where vehicle speeds will be lower. In this scenario, bicyclists share the separated bike lane with pedestrians up to and through the intersection.

Island Transit bus pullouts also present a potential safety concern for bicyclists. At stops with transit shelters, the shoulder is often impassable, forcing bicyclists to ride through the pullout. Educating bus drivers about this risk is a first step. Installation of shared lane markings is also a possibility.
Figure 50. Right Turn Lane with Bike Lane (FHWA, 2016)

Figure 51. Right Turn Lane with Bike Lane (FHWA, 2016)
Left Turns
On busy roads, such as the state highways, only confident cyclists are likely to use left turn lanes to make a left turn. Less confident cyclists can make a two-stage left turn, which can be facilitated with a green box with left arrow on the far side of the intersection.

Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons
Located at uncontrolled intersections, Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFB) are user-actuated warning signs with LEDs that have a high intensity and irregular flash pattern. They can be activated by cyclists or pedestrians manually by a push button or passively by a video or infrared detection system.

Installation of RRFB’s at uncontrolled intersections or trail crossings increases driver yielding behavior significantly. RRFB’s should be considered at uncontrolled intersections or trail crossings in the non-motorized network that have the highest traffic and non-motorized volumes. Solar powered RRFB’s can be used at locations lacking power.

HAWK Signal
A HAWK signal (High-Intensity Activated crossWalk beacon), also know as a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (PHB), is similar to an Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacon in that it is used at uncontrolled intersections or trail crossings, but unlike an RRFB, A HAWK signal flashes red bringing traffic to a complete stop. HAWK signals are more appropriate for locations where traffic volumes and speeds make it difficult for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross the street.
Crossing Islands

Crossing islands are raised areas located in the center of the road that provide pedestrians a place to safely pause while crossing a road. Crossing islands let people on foot navigate traffic one direction at a time and stop halfway across the street to wait for an adequate gap in traffic before continuing across. Although primarily for pedestrians, crossing islands can be beneficial for bicyclists as well where popular bicycle routes cross busy streets at unsignalized locations. Crossing islands can be designed so that people crossing must face oncoming traffic.

Benefits of crossing islands include:

- Allows people on foot and bicycle to more comfortably cross streets.
- Provides a protected space for pedestrians and bicyclists to wait for an gap in traffic.
- Decreases delay when crossing a street.
- Calms traffic.
- Increases drivers’ awareness of the non-motorized crossing.

Raised Crossings

Important trail crossings can be raised to slow traffic and increase drivers’ awareness of trail users. Raised crossings can be combined with crossing islands to provide additional safety at unsignalized trail crossings.
Equestrian Accommodation

While it is undesirable to mix equestrians and bicyclists on paved shared use paths, equestrians can be accommodated along the sides of shared use paths provided there is adequate space alongside the trail. Along a shared use path, equestrians should have a 4- to 6-foot wide flat grass, granular stone or dirt shoulder.

Accommodation of equestrians on mixed mode trails should be determined on a case by case basis. Equestrians can be accommodated on many of the same soft surface trails as hikers and mountain bikers provided all users are educated about shared trail use. Where horses are allowed, signs at trailheads should indicate that equestrians have the right of way and encourage a “share the trail” ethic.

On single track horse trails, the tread should be at least 1 feet 6 inches wide, with an additional 2 to 3 feet of clearance on either side. Equestrian trails should have a minimum 10-foot overhead clearance.

Trailheads at trail sites that accommodate horses should have support facilities for equestrians, particularly trailer parking stalls and staging areas. Horse trailer stalls should be about 45 feet long to accommodate a vehicle, horse trailer, and an unloading space, and 15 feet wide. Hitching posts are also desirable at trailheads that accommodate equestrians.
Shoreline Site Design Concepts

Established public shoreline access sites offer a range of amenities that help people access the shoreline and tidelands. The most basic amenities include parking and a foot trail down to the shoreline. Additional amenities include picnic facilities, information kiosks, restrooms, bike parking, horse trailer parking and ADA accessibility features.

In addition to facilitating shoreline access, the appearance of site improvements and amenities across the County should be consistent. The design and layout of amenities should communicate that the site is public and also be harmonious with Island County’s scenic character.

Design Elements

The design of site improvements should express a rural maritime character. Durable but natural or natural-looking materials should be used wherever possible to blend in with the surrounding environment, and the design of site improvements should be simple and unobtrusive.

Guardrails and Barriers
Where needed to define parking areas or provide safety along access roads, timber guardrails with stone or wood posts should be used, not standard steel guardrails.

Fences and Railings
The appearance of safety fences and railings should be consistent with the guardrails and barriers, and be constructed with dimensioned timbers where possible.
Picnic Facilities

Picnic tables should be heavy timber construction (steel legs acceptable) and picnic shelters should use wood and stone, but can have dark green or brown metal roofing. Simple post-mounted or ground level cast iron picnic grills should be used where allowed. At picnic facilities containing two or fewer picnic tables, each picnic table shall be accessible. Where picnic facilities contain more than two picnic tables, at least 20 percent of the picnic tables shall be accessible.
Information Kiosks
Information kiosks should be made of dimensioned wood and can have dark green or brown metal roofing consistent with picnic shelters.

Bike Racks
Secure bike racks should be installed at every public shoreline access site. Racks should be an “inverted U” or “wave” design, have a galvanized carbon steel finish to withstand marine conditions, and be set in a concrete base. The bike rack should be fabricated with a minimum 2” schedule 40 steel pipe (2.375” OD) conforming to ASTM A53. Sites expected to have high non-motorized access should have larger racks that accommodate 8 bikes, while smaller, more remote sites should have racks that accommodate 4 bikes.
Beach Access

Access from the parking area to other facilities and the shoreline can be provided by paved or soft surface trails. Where ADA accessibility standards cannot be reasonably met, trails at shoreline access sites should be designed to maximize ease of access and accommodate all people with mobility challenges. Trails should be laid out to follow the gentlest slope to the shoreline.

Outdoor Recreation Access Routes

An outdoor recreation access route (ORAR) is an accessible route used to connect accessible elements at a recreation site, such as ADA accessible parking areas, restrooms, picnic facilities and shoreline overlooks. These connecting routes should be paved with asphalt or concrete, or consist of a firm and stable material, such as compacted gravel, that resists deformation by indentations. This firm and stable surface must remain unchanged by applied force so that when the force is removed, the surface returns to its original condition. If paved with asphalt or concrete, the slope of the clear ground space should not exceed 2.08 percent (1:48) in any direction. For other surfaces, slopes not steeper than 3.03 percent (1:33) are allowed to facilitate drainage. The route should have a minimum tread width of 36 inches.

Accessible Beach Access Guidelines

The 2013 Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas requires at least one permanent or removable beach access route to be provided for each 1/2 mile of beach shoreline administered or managed by an entity where:

- Circulation paths, parking facilities, toilet facilities, or bathing facilities serving the beach are constructed or altered; or
- A beach nourishment project is undertaken.

Not more than 20 percent of the costs of constructing or altering facilities serving the beach or a beach nourishment project are required to be expended on beach access routes.

Agencies are exempt from these guidelines when:

1. Compliance is not practicable due to terrain.
2. Compliance cannot be accomplished with the prevailing construction practices.
3. Compliance would fundamentally alter the function or purpose of the facility or the setting.
4. Compliance is limited or precluded by any of the following laws, or by decisions or opinions issued or agreements executed pursuant to any of the following laws:
   - Endangered Species Act
   - National Environmental Policy Act
   - National Historic Preservation Act
   - Wilderness Act
   - Other federal, state, or local law the purpose of which is to preserve threatened or endangered species; the environment; or archaeological, cultural, historical, or other significant natural features.

Unpaved ADA Trail, Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge (photo by Stuart Macdonald)
**Beach Mats**
Seasonal access to the beach for people in wheelchairs or other mobility limitations can be provided with beach mats, which create a stable surface across the sand and gravel. Shoreline sites that are appropriate for beach mats should have the following characteristics:

1. Minimal grade change between the parking area and the inter-tidal zone.
2. Short distance between the parking area and the inter-tidal zone.
3. Relatively protected shoreline with minimal driftwood accretion.
4. High quality coastal environment.

**Additional Accessibility Guidelines**
Additional accessibility design guidance for outdoor recreation access routes can be found in the [Final Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas](#) (2013), [Forest Service Outdoor Recreation Accessibility Guidelines](#) (2013) and the [Forest Service Trail Accessibility Guidelines](#) (2013).
Kayak Campsites

The Cascadia Marine Trail (CMT) is a network of campsites and shoreline access sites for beachable non-motorized watercraft. The goal of the CMT is to provide camping areas for human-powered watercraft every five to eight miles, which is the distance that the average person can paddle in one day. Development of a few kayak campsites at strategic locations, along with additional launch sites and safe harbors for emergency use, would attract a wider range of paddlers to Island County. Kayak campsites should have the following features:

- A beach or small landing area
- Stable access to uplands from high tide line
- A signed, designated camping site near the beach which is suitable for up to 16 people and includes table and camp grill
- A nearby toilet facility
- Space to secure boats overnight above high tide line
- A fee collection station/shelter
- Water, if available

In order for Island County to develop additional kayak camp sites, maintenance concerns should be addressed and steps should be taken to ensure that such camp sites meet their intended use.
Wayfinding Concepts

On-Road

A bicycle wayfinding system is a family of signs and pavement markings that guides bicyclists to their destinations along preferred routes. Signs are usually located at key decision points along bicycle routes. A bicycle wayfinding system can not only help provide decision making and route finding information to bicyclists, but also reinforce the use of safe and popular routes and increase awareness of the non-motorized network by all users.

The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD 2009 edition) has standards for a range of bicycle traffic control facilities, including regulatory signs, warning signs, plaques and object markers. In addition, the MUTCD has standards for bicycle guide signs, which most cities with bicycle networks use.

Compared to a typical urban area, Island County has a higher prevalence of recreational bicyclists and bicycle tourists, who are attracted to the County in large part by its rural character, historic sites, landscape and water views. One way to enhance the bicycling experience and not detract from the scenic quality of the County is to develop a custom bicycle wayfinding system that fits the rural island character. This system could comprise a family of sign types ranging from system informational kiosks to route finding. Elements of a custom system would still need to be designed using MUTCD standards for font size, sign height and placement relative to roadway geometry. Investing in a unique wayfinding design will reinforce the scenic quality and attractiveness of Island County for cyclists.

Information Kiosks

Information kiosks could be located at major intersections on the non-motorized network and provide information, including detailed maps, regional destinations, historical sites and services.

The non-motorized network is broken into sub-networks in each region of the County. Information kiosks could be located at the nodes where these sub-networks intersect and at town centers, the Clinton and Coupeville ferry terminals, the Deception Pass Bridge, and major trail/route confluences.
Decision Signs
Decision signs typically have place names, arrows, and distances. These can be located on the near-side of important intersections on the non-motorized network. Where a bicycle route intersects with another route that is not on the non-motorized network, a route finding sign or pavement marking can be used to keep the bicyclist on the correct route.

Route Confirmation Signs
Route confirmation signs indicate to bicyclists that they are on a designated route, but also increase drivers’ awareness that they are on a bicycle route and to watch for cyclists. Route confirmation signs can be located after decision signs.
Pavement Markings

Pavement markings can be used to reinforce and brand routes on the non-motorized network. These on-pavement route markers can have directional arrows at decision points and different colors indicating significant recreational or touring routes.

Pavement marking are less expensive and less obtrusive than installing route finding signs, so will not detract from the scenery in the County. They are also more visible to cyclists, who tend to look down at the road, and are less likely to become obscured by vegetation, as a sign on the side of the road might.
Off-Road

Trailhead and Decision Signs
Trailheads and trail intersections could have directional signs with distance information. The County could use a standard palette of colors, fonts and materials for off-road trail signs that is consistent with the design of the on-road signage and wayfinding system.

Trail Markers
Trail markers are discrete signs mounted on trees or posts that identify the route. The design of trail markers could be consistent with trailhead and decision signs.
Shoreline Sites

Public shoreline sites have unique signage and wayfinding requirements. Public encroachment on private property is a sensitive issue and complicates shoreline access. Public shoreline sites also need to be identifiable from the water for people kayaking, standup paddleboarding or pursuing other water-based activities.

Property Ownership Signs

Open house attendees and survey respondents often reported confusion over distinguishing between public and private shoreline property. Signs installed by property owners along the shoreline vary widely in appearance and wording, and are not consistently used from one location to the next. The County has installed signs with maps illustrating the extents of public property at public access locations, but these also vary in format.

Developing a consistent sign format for public shoreline access sites could have both practical and aesthetic benefits. Standards could address messages, layout, color, and font style and size. Consistent signage would require coordination among the different entities that own or administer public shoreline property.

Reference Tools
Wayfinding Concepts

Shoreline Sites

Property Ownership Signs

Property Ownership Sign at Lagoon Point County Park

Property Ownership Sign at Iverson Spit Preserve

Property Ownership Sign at Wonn Road
**Water-Oriented Signage**

Public shoreline sites need to be identifiable from the water by paddlers and other non-motorized boaters who want to land or need safe places to pull out in the case of bad weather, illness, injury or boat damage. While private property signs tend to proliferate along the shoreline, spotting public sites from the water can be extremely difficult when they lack consistent and conspicuous signage.

Water-oriented signage could include a low site identification sign that provides the name of the site, any regulations, and possibly a map of the site with campsites illustrated.

A water-oriented wayfinding navigation marker or pylon could be developed and used consistently throughout Island County to identify public landing sites. A better strategy could include coordinated efforts to promote statewide standards. The design should meet the following criteria:

- Visible from land
- Visible in low light conditions
- High enough to be visible from the water at mid-tidal conditions
- Durable and weather-resistant
- Fits the natural environment; noticeable but not overly obtrusive

Examples of navigation markers are shown on the following page.
Navigation Marker (by Jim Champion, via Wikimedia Commons)

Navigation Marker (by Andrew Smith, via Wikimedia Commons)

Waterfront Historical Marker, San Francisco

Navigation Marker (by Alison Rawson, via Wikimedia Commons)
IMPLEMENTATION

PROJECT SELECTION
PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS
PERFORMANCE MEASURES
FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES
Project Selection

The 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan provides a menu of potential projects that were identified through the planning process. Trail projects were screened for obvious fatal flaws, but did not receive a detailed feasibility analysis. High potential shoreline access projects were evaluated for public ownership.

While the plan provides some indication of public interest in projects, it does not recommend a prioritized list of projects. Recommendations for project prioritization occurs subsequent to adoption of the plan through the County’s “priority array” methodology.
**Transportation Improvement Program**

The County’s road shoulder program is part of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and has its own protocol for prioritizing shoulder projects. Recommended on-road, non-motorized network projects consisting of paved shoulders can be fed into the TIP road shoulder program prioritization process. Such projects might be given additional weight based on their inclusion in the 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan.

**Priority Array**

The County’s priority array methodology uses a qualitative and quantitative evaluation system to score projects based on a number of criteria (Figure 52 and Figure 53). This method is consistent with the approach currently used for road projects. Projects are evaluated against each other in any given year. Recommendations to the Board of Island County Commissioners are based on the outcome of the priority array process. All projects are selected by the Board.

The current process in developing the plans for infrastructure projects is as follows:

1. Request public input through legal advertisement and email updates
   - Summary of inputs provided to the Board
2. Use priority arrays to evaluate and prioritize any backlog of projects
   - Enter values for new possible projects gathered from public input or staff input
   - Priority arrays include:
     - Road Intersections
     - Road Segments
     - Drainage Projects
     - Clean Water Utility
3. Develop first draft of six year plans by reviewing existing project timing and budget
   - Move all current projects that extend to next year into the draft plans
   - Review draft TIP and CWU plans with Board
4. Run cash flow models to evaluate fund balances

---

**Possible Non-Motorized Priority Array Criteria**

- Community Interest
- Potential Partnerships
- Social Equity
- Bang for the Buck
- Property Ownership
- Funding Opportunities
- Environmental Impacts
- Geographic Balance
- Project Synergy with other Projects
- Improved Safety
Figure 53. Non-Motorized Priority Array Diagram
Program Recommendations

Program recommendations are county-wide actions that support the 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan’s goals and policies and promote non-motorized use. Most of these program recommendations depend on partnerships between Island County and other interest groups. Some of these recommendations are included in the group of County-wide projects, but described here in more detail.

Complete Streets Policy

Complete Streets policies articulate a vision for streets that are safe, provide access to all users, provide choice, and increase mobility. These policies mandate that cities and counties plan, design, operate and maintain their streets while considering all transportation users and modes.

In conjunction with the 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan, Island County should consider developing and adopting a Complete Streets policy to ensure that the County designs and operates the entire right of way to enable safe access for all users, regardless of age, ability, or mode of transportation.

Adopting a Complete Streets policy will give Island County more weight with the Washington State Department of Transportation and make the non-motorized projects proposed in the plan eligible for Complete Streets funding. A Complete Streets policy will give County leadership more control to choose transportation investments that best serve residents and visitors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Elements of a Complete Streets Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Vision and intent:</strong> Includes an equitable vision for how and why the community wants to complete its streets. Specifies need to create complete, connected, network and specifies at least four modes, two of which must be biking or walking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Diverse users:</strong> Benefits all users equitably, particularly vulnerable users and the most under-invested and under-served communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Commitment in all projects and phases:</strong> Applies to new, retrofit/reconstruction, maintenance, and ongoing projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Clear, accountable expectations:</strong> Makes any exceptions specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval and public notice prior to exceptions being granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Jurisdiction:</strong> Requires interagency coordination between government departments and partner agencies on Complete Streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Design:</strong> Directs the use of the latest and best design criteria and guidelines and sets a time frame for their implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Land use and context sensitivity:</strong> Considers the surrounding community’s current and expected land use and transportation needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Performance measures:</strong> Establishes performance standards that are specific, equitable, and available to the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Project selection criteria:</strong> Provides specific criteria to encourage funding prioritization for Complete Streets implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>Implementation steps:</strong> Includes specific next steps for implementation of the policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 54. 10 Elements of a Complete Streets Policy, Smart Growth America
Intermodal Connectivity

Intermodal connectivity between different modes, including ferries, buses, private vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians, should be made as easy and efficient as possible. Mobility hubs could be developed at key locations, such as the ferry terminals, to improve these connections. These hubs can include transit information and ticketing, wayfinding and interpretive signage (analogue and digital), touch screen kiosks providing local transportation options, tourism and travel information, bike lockers or cages, car share, bike share, pocket maps/brochures of local retailers, tourist destinations, restaurants and lodging information.

Development of intermodal hubs will require coordination between Island County, WSDOT, Washington State Ferries, and Island Transit.
Non-Motorized Data Collection Program

Determining how many people are walking and bicycling in Island County has a number of benefits. A count program can help justify and prioritize non-motorized improvements, reveal trends in use of the non-motorized network, and put crash data in context.

The County is in discussions with WSDOT and Cascade Bicycle Club regarding application for grant funding to install a permanent automated counter at the south end of the Deception Pass Bridge. The County could identify a few permanent counting locations and supplement them with short duration automated counting locations. Factors could be developed that account for weather and seasons, but also provide a basis for extrapolating the Strava data.

Approach

2-4 Permanent counters in highest volume, bottleneck locations:

- Deception Pass Bridge
- Rhododendron Trail between Main Street and Terry Road
- Coupeville Ferry (use WSF counts)
- Clinton Ferry (use WSF counts)
- SR 532 west of the bridge

6-8 Temporary counters in intermediate high volume locations consistent with Strava data levels:

- Kettles Trail between Broadway Avenue and Sherman Road
- SR 20 between Frostad and Jones Roads
- West Beach Road between Crosby and Fort Nugent Roads
- Madrona Way at SR 20
- SR 525 at Greenbank Farm north of Smugglers Cove Road
- SR 525 west of Bayview Road
- East Camano Drive north of Monticello Drive
Community Trails Program

Island County residents can walk along any public right of way, but some routes may feel more stressful than others due to the road’s shoulder width, speed, and volume of traffic. People walking for transportation are less likely to want to meander, while people walking for recreation may prefer soft surface trails that are quieter and offer a more naturalistic setting. This sentiment was expressed numerous times in the community feedback.

Currently, most soft surface trails and trail networks are located on dispersed public lands, such as County and state parks, that do not connect to each other or provide immediate walking access to a majority of Island County residents (i.e., without having to drive). Alternatively, unofficial, informal trails located on private property do exist in some areas of the County providing neighbors valuable non-motorized intra-neighborhood connections and an alternative to the “drive-to-walk” approach to recreation.

Many community members expressed support for a “community trails” program that would facilitate the development of a network of soft surface trails across private property. Creating off-road trails through such a program would be relatively easy and inexpensive for the County, relying more on local trail advocates than County resources.

Along with promotion of the program, Island County’s main role would be to serve as the transferee of trail licenses or easements, and to provided indemnity to landowners. Although Washington’s Recreational Use Statute grants immunity to a property owner against liability for unintentional injuries when he or she allows public access for recreational purposes and does not charge a fee (RCWA 4.24.200 to .210), some property owners may still be reluctant to cooperate fearing liability. Island County could assuage these concerns by offering indemnification against any potential claims arising from trail use.

Planning a trail would be a collaborative community effort, but the County could have some oversight to ensure that any planned trails are consistent with existing public or private trails, do not impact existing roadways, and limit environmental impacts. Community members would then construct and maintain the trail.

The County would also maintain simple trail signage standards to ensure that a trail is navigable and property owners’ desired boundaries are respected.
**Education Programs**

Providing safe and comfortable non-motorized facilities can help to increase the appeal of bicycling for a variety of users. Educational programs that teach bicycle skills to existing and potential bicyclists are another tool for promoting bicycling. County staff might serve as a resource, or in some cases act as partners, in educational efforts.

**Adult Bicycle Education**

The County could encourage local bicycle clubs or instructors to offer classes covering basic mechanics (especially flat tire repair) and cycling skills. Class curricula could be geared toward longer distance recreational cycling and touring and address specific conditions in the County, such as positioning on shared roadways, climbing and descending steep hills, and visibility and lighting.

**Safe Routes to Schools Program**

The goal of Safe Routes to School Programs is to increase the number of children walking and biking to school, with a key component being education about walking and biking safety skills. The County could coordinate with local school districts to identify volunteeres and potentially a Safe Routes to School Coordinator to pursue WSDOT funding and plan educational events, such as Bike Rodeos.

**Driver Education/Multimodal Safety Campaigns**

In partnership with WSDOT, the County could develop an informational campaign to educate drivers about the rules of the road, with a focus on pedestrian and bicycle safety. In particular, this campaign could promote awareness of recreational and touring cyclists on rural roads and safe passing techniques to improve the culture of bicycling in the County. Such information could be communicated on road signs and/or disseminated via public service announcements, on the County’s website or through brochures placed in libraries or other public places.

**Staff Training**

Island County could offer non-motorized facility planning and engineering training for staff through conferences, online training sessions and memberships in bicycle and pedestrian advocacy organizations, such as the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP), so that the understanding and benefits of walking and bicycling become more pervasive and integrated across departments and disciplines.
### Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Program</th>
<th>Potential Lead/Partners</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Possible Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Safe Routes to School Program         | School Districts/Cities         | Increase walking and biking to school                  | • Select a Program Coordinator  
• Identify volunteers  
• Plan educational events (e.g. Bike Rodeos) |
| Adult Bicycle Education               | Local Bicycle Clubs             | Increase adult participation in bicycling              | • Basic maintenance classes  
• Safety awareness  
• Skill courses |
| Driver Education / Multimodal Safety Campaigns | Law Enforcement / Driver Education Instructors | Reduce conflicts between drivers and bicyclists | • Promote non-motorized awareness,  
• Teach safe passing techniques |
| County Staff Training                 | Island County                  | Increase staff expertise and awareness for bicycling   | • Facility planning  
• Engineering courses,  
• Advocacy memberships (e.g. Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals) |

Figure 55. Potential Educational Programs

### Promotional Programs

**Open Streets Events**

Open Streets (also known as “Cyclovias”) are social events held on streets that are temporarily closed to motor vehicles. The intent of an open streets event is to engage community members of all ages and abilities in physical activity, such as walking, dancing, jogging, in-line skating and biking. Open Streets events give people, who otherwise might not try bicycling, the opportunity to ride in a safe and comfortable environment, and hopefully encourage them to ride more often.

Open Streets events can be held weekly or monthly during warmer and drier months. Candidate streets should be near population centers and offer convenient parallel routes for displaced vehicle traffic. For Open Streets events located in Oak Harbor, Coupeville or Langley, some coordination with the County may be required for traffic revisions.

**Running and Bicycling Events**

A number of bicycling and running events are held in Island County, including the Tour de Whidbey bicycle ride, Mussels in the Kettles mountain bike ride, the Fort Ebey Kettles Trail Run, the Whidbey Island full and half marathons, and the Crab Dash on Camano Island. These events are a great way to get people involved in running and bicycling, raise the profile of human powered activities, and benefit the County economically. Island County can partner with existing and potential event organizers to promote more of these events.

“The Tour de Whidbey is known as one of the most beautiful bicycle rides around! Travel the island’s back roads and enjoy breathtaking scenery, glimpses of abundant wildlife and varied terrain.”
Move-A-Thons

Human-powered fundraising and community building events called “Move-A-Thons” are a great way to get people out on foot and bike. Students collect per-mile or lump sum dollar pledges. The route can be an out-an-back stretch of road or trail, or a loop. Mileage is recorded on punch-cards by parent volunteers stationed at mileage checkpoints.
League of American Bicyclists’ Bicycle Friendly Community Program

The Bicycle Friendly Community (BFC) program is a bicycling promotion program administered by the League of American Bicyclists. The program provides a framework for improving conditions for bicycling and provides levels of recognition to communities that meet certain standards. Typically the BFC program is pursued by cities, but a number of counties that have high levels of cycling and bicycle tourism have attained BFC status as well, including Clallam County (WA), Jackson and Teton County (WY), and Summit County (CO). While Island County currently does not have the resources to pursue Bicycle Friendly Community status, attaining BFC status and recognition in the future would compliment other bicycling promotion efforts, in particular the promotion of bicycle tourism.

The League of American Bicyclists also ranks states under the Bicycle Friendly Community program. Each state is ranked based on its score in five categories: Infrastructure and Funding; Education and Encouragement; Legislation and Enforcement; Policies and Programs; Evaluation and Planning; and, Discretionary Scoring.

It is important to note that Washington State has ranked as the #1 “Bicycle Friendly State in America” every year since 2008 when the League began its program. Consequently, Island County exists within a supportive state-level non-motorized framework and will benefit from pursuit of Bicycle Friendly Community status.
Partnerships

The formation of partnerships will be critical for successful implementation of the trail and shoreline access projects in this plan. A number of local, regional and federal agencies and organizations have a vested interest in developing these projects, including:

- City of Langley
- City of Oak Harbor
- City of Coupeville
- City of Stanwood
- Ebey’s Landing National Historic Reserve
- Friends of Camano Island Parks
- Island County Chapter of the Back Country Horsemen of Washington
- Island Transit
- Pacific Rim Institute
- Port of Coupeville
- Port of South Whidbey
- South Whidbey Parks and Recreation
- Stanwood Parks and Recreation
- U.S. Navy
- Washington State Department of Transportation
- Washington State Parks
- Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office
- Washington Trails Association (WTA)
- Washington Water Trails Association (WWTA)
- Whidbey Camano Land Trust (WCLT)
- Whidbey Island Bicycle Club
- Whidbey Island Trails

Coordination with these groups is necessary for trail and site planning, property or easement acquisition, use agreements, and volunteer labor.

Figure 57. Potential Partnerships
Volunteer Trail Construction and Maintenance

A number of trails organizations in the Northwest offer volunteer trail building or maintenance, including:

- Washington Trails Association
- Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance
- Back Country Horsemen of Washington

Washington Water Trails Association volunteers also develop and maintain kayak campsites.

These organizations can play an important role in constructing and maintaining trails in Island County. They can provide trail maintenance, including brushing, logging out, drainage improvements, and restoring tread and construction assistance, including building new trails, rock walls, turnpikes, bridges and puncheons.
Maintenance

Like roadways, the condition of walking and bicycling facilities is constantly changing. Maintenance of shoulder pavement is addressed by the County’s Pavement Preservation Program so does not need to be addressed independently. However, deteriorating pavement can more adversely affect non-motorized users than vehicles. Likewise, wind storms or storm surges can deposit debris on paved road shoulders, which creates a hazard for bicyclists and can lead them to veer out in the travel lane increasing the risk of a crash. This concern was expressed by a number of people during the planning process.

Overgrown vegetation can also affect people walking and biking on road shoulders or shared use paths.

The County does have a maintenance hot-line that residents can use to report road hazards. The County also offers a service request application formatted for smartphone use available from their Maps and GIS webpage (https://islandcountygis.maps.arcgis.com/home/index.html). This information could be included on all of the County’s non-motorized materials, such as the bicycle map.
Performance Measures

Performance measures are specific measures that can be used to evaluate the progress and effectiveness of the non-motorized trails plan over time. They should be based on available sources of data, relatively easy to conduct and generated every few years. County tracking of performance measures can be helpful to future planning efforts and quantitatively support grant applications. Establishing pre-project baseline measures can help illustrate the impact of a project and justify funding on future projects. At this time Island County does not systematically collect non-motorized data or track performance measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Trails</strong></th>
<th><strong>Shoreline Access</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Level of Comfort</td>
<td>Number of public access sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle counts (establish baseline from Strava data, then future targets)</td>
<td>Percentage of public or quasi-public shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network completeness (e.g. % of County roads with 4’-wide shoulders) and connectivity (contiguous miles of non-motorized facilities)</td>
<td>Number of ADA accessible shoreline sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles of public (and private) soft-surface trails; miles per resident</td>
<td>Ocean and tourism related GDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of bicycle and pedestrian events annually, or number of participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle collisions over time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism related economic indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 58. Potential Performance Measures*
Funding Opportunities

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program
Under the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program is probably the most viable non-motorized project funding option. The STBG program is a flexible funding source that may be used to preserve and improve the conditions and performance of any federally aided project, including: highways, bridge and tunnel projects on any public road, and pedestrian and bicycle, pedestrian, and recreational trails. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) refers to these funds as the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside.

In addition to other transportation improvements, the STBG funds projects that qualify under the TA Set-Aside as federally funded, community-based projects that expand travel choices and enhance the transportation experience by integrating modes and improving the cultural, historic, and environmental aspects of transportation infrastructure.

Many of the County’s existing non-motorized projects have been funded under STBG, and most project types in the 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan are eligible for Surface Transportation Block Grants, including:

- On- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- Projects that enhance mobility or improve non-motorized access to public transportation
- Recreational trail projects
- Turnouts, overlooks, viewing areas
- Historic preservation
- Safe Routes to School projects

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is administered by WSDOT and funds projects that use engineering countermeasures and strategies to reduce fatal and serious injury crashes. Eligible projects include bicycle facilities, and intersection and crossing improvements. The HISP County Safety Program requires counties to have a local road safety plan, which is a data-driven, risk-based analysis and prioritization of an agency’s roadways.

Complete Streets Award Program
The Washington State Transportation Improvement Board administers the Complete Streets Award Program as an incentive to encourage city and county governments to adopt complete streets policies. Island County would need to adopt a system-wide complete streets policy to be eligible for this funding (see “Complete Streets Policy” on page 118). Even though the 2018 Non-Motorized Trails Plan embodies a complete streets ethic, the County needs to adopt a complete streets policy to establish eligibility.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program
The Pedestrian and Bicycle Program objective is to reduce collisions with pedestrian and bicyclists and improve the transportation system to enhance safety and mobility for people who choose to walk or bike for transportation.

Safe Routes to School
Safe Routes to School funding is for improvements within two-miles of primary, middle or high schools that provide children a safe, healthy alternative to riding the bus or being driven to school.

Washington Traffic Safety Commission
The Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC) offers traffic safety grants intended to reduce the number of deaths and serious injuries that result from traffic crashes. Their School Walk Route Improvement Project Grants support projects that increase safety for elementary and middle school students walking or bicycling within the areas designated as School Walk Routes.
Rural Arterial Program
Administered by the Washington County Road Administration Board, the Rural Arterial Program (RAP) provides funding for the reconstruction of deteriorating rural arterial roads due to freight traffic, but also to improve rural roads that primarily have local traffic and recreational use.

County Arterial Preservation Program
The Washington County Road Administration Board also provides funding through the County Arterial Preservation Program (CAPP), which helps counties avoid costly roadway failures due to overdue surface repairs.

People for Bikes Community Grants
The PeopleForBikes Community Grant Program provides funding for important and influential projects that leverage federal funding and 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.

Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office
The Washington Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) is a state agency that manages grant programs to support outdoor recreation opportunities, protect wildlife habitat and farmland, and support salmon recovery. A number of RCO grant programs apply to non-motorized transportation and non-motorized boating. These programs are listed below.

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account
Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) grants may be used for the acquisition, improvement, or protection of aquatic lands for public purposes. They also may be used to provide or improve public access to the waterfront.

The ALEA program is targeted at re-establishing the natural, self-sustaining ecological functions of the waterfront, providing or restoring public access to the water, and increasing public awareness of aquatic lands as a finite natural resource and irreplaceable public heritage.

Potential shoreline access site acquisition improvement projects would good candidates for ALEA grant funding.

Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program
The Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP) provides grants to protect and restore Puget Sound near-shore environments. All phases of project development from feasibility through implementation are eligible for funding. Typical projects include near-shore restoration and protection activities that restore natural ecosystem processes and functions.

Some potential shoreline access site projects could be candidates for ESRP grant funding.

Typical Projects
• Protection of near-shore and wetland habitat
• Removing or breaching dikes
• Removing bulkheads to restore sediment supply and transport to beaches
• Decommissioning roads and removing fill

Land and Water Conservation Fund
The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) provides funding to preserve and develop outdoor recreation resources, including parks, trails, and wildlife lands.

LWCF grants are applicable for a range of non-motorized improvements proposed in the plan including trails, trailhead facilities, and viewpoints.

Typical Projects
• Renovating community parks
• Building new skate parks, tennis courts, swimming pools, and trails
• Protecting wildlife habitat
• Marine facilities (boating, water access, etc.)
• Campgrounds, picnic shelters
• Natural areas, open space
• Swim beaches and pools
• Support facilities such as parking, restrooms, storage, and utilities
• Trails (including interpretive) and pathways
• Vistas and view points

Non-Highway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities Program
The Non-highway and Off-road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) program provides funding to develop and manage recreation opportunities for non-motorized activities including hiking, horseback riding, mountain biking and sightseeing.

Activities supported by this program must be accessed via a non-highway road, which is a public road that was not built or maintained with gasoline tax funding.

Typical Projects
• Building, renovating, and rerouting trails
• Maintaining trails and associated campgrounds and trail heads
• Education of trail users
• Land acquisition:
  • Parking, trails, and trail heads
• Sanitary facilities including sewer systems and other related utilities
• Route and interpretive signs and informational bulletin boards
• Picnic and camping areas
• Wildlife viewing facilities
• Non-motorized boating access facilities
• Utilities, including water, electric, and telephone service
• Reconstruction of existing improvements

Recreational Trails Program
The Recreational Trails Program (RTP) provides funds to rehabilitate and maintain recreational trails and facilities that provide a backcountry experience for motorized and non-motorized uses.

While RTP grants are not intended for new non-motorized projects, they can be used to maintain, rehabilitate or upgrade existing trails.

Relevant Uses
• Cycling
• Hiking
• Equestrian
• Mountain biking
• Water trails

Typical Projects
• Clearing overgrown brush and fallen trees from trails
• Repairing trail damage from floods and fires
• Replacing bridges and drainage structures

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
The Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) provides funding for a broad range of land protection and outdoor recreation, including the acquisition, development, or renovation of non-motorized trails.

Relevant Categories for Island County
• Local parks
• Natural areas
• Trails
• Water access

Typical Projects
• Protecting wildlife habitat and recreation opportunities
• Renovating community parks
• Developing regional trails
• Building waterfront parks