

SR 302 Advisory Committee Meeting
October 20, 2008
Horseshoe Lake Golf Course
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Terry Bouck, Peninsula School District
Representative Larry Seaquist
Pat Leach, Tacoma Power
Mike Baum, Key Peninsula Community Council
Laurie Ellis, Key Peninsula Business Association
Jay Spady, South Kitsap Improvement
Skip Ferrucci, Pierce County Parks
Mike Galizio, Pierce County
Scott Gallacher, Key Peninsula Metropolitan Parks
Randy Boss
Jim Rogers, Kitsap County
Murray Payne, Burley Lagoon Coalition
Bill Evers, Emerald Shores Association
George King, Burley Club
Doug Underwood, Burley Club
Ron Talley, Emerald Shores Association
Brian Ward, Pierce County Sheriff
Dennis Marshall, Lake Holiday Association
Marcos McGraw, City of Gig Harbor
Jean Archer, Pierce Transit
Chuck Cuzzetto, Peninsula School District
Chuck West, Key Peninsula Fire Department

Study Team:

Troy Cowan, WSDOT Project Development
John Donahue, WSDOT SR 302 Project Manager
Harjit Bhalla, WSDOT OR Environmental
Yvette Liufau, WSDOT
Dave Skinner, HDR
Kristen Maines, HDR

Visitors:

Rick Sorrels
Tina Lee, Pierce Transit

Introductions

John Donahue opened the meeting and began brief introductions around the room.

Level 1 Alternatives Screening Process

Troy Cowan, WSDOT Project Development

On September 26, 2008, WSDOT internal staff conducted a level 1 screening of SR 302 alternatives. Managers and technical experts from traffic, environmental, planning, bridge, and program management applied their knowledge and experience in evaluating each alternative in the screening process.

John Donahue, WSDOT Project Manager

This group brings knowledge of the community and different aspects within the community. The purpose of the meeting is for the advisory committee to review the decision criteria and to go through a comparative weighting exercise. John also mentioned he's putting together a WSDOT blog and will post articles that can be viewed by the committee and public as another tool for communicating the progress of the study. John introduced Kristin Maines to lead the group through an individual criteria weighting exercise.

Criteria Weighting Exercise - Individual

Kristen Maines, HDR Inc.

Kristen explained the criteria weighting exercise to the group. There are seven criteria. Each person was given a blue, red and green chip. The blue chip represented the most important criteria, the red chip was 2nd most important and the green chip was the 3rd most important. There were seven cups and each cup was marked with a criteria. The group put their chips in the cups they felt were important to them.

Following questions were asked:

1. Improve travel time only for emergency vehicles? The criterion was defined as all vehicles and not just emergency vehicles.
2. The attribute that is missing is one that covers long-term vision (50 years in future) of the highway. The long-range issues are addressed by metropolitan planning organizations and regional transportation planning organizations. The project as currently defined by the study improving the highway between Key Peninsula Highway and SR 16 is consistent with those plans.
3. Does improve mainline mean it's just the highway corridor? Yes.
4. The comment was made that all of the attributes need to be addressed in the chosen alternative. The exercise here is only to determine the weight of each attribute in an effort to determine what's important to the group.

5. How is this exercise different than the level 2 attribute assignment? The Level 2 screening involves much more detailed analysis. The attributes for level 2 screening are more specific.
6. The votes won't get rid of some of the attributes? The seven attributes are not going away, but the alternatives will be reduced.

Following is the Level 1 criteria in order of priority based on the results of the chip exercise:

- Improve local operations and safety
- Improve SR 302 mainline operations and safety
- Reduce environmental impacts
- Improve travel times
- Project schedule
- Improve maintainability
- Reduce construction impacts

Criteria Weighting Exercise - Group

Dave Skinner, HDR Inc.

Dave reviewed each attribute definition with the group. Five of the attributes listed came directly from Federal Highway Administration, and they are used on large scale transportation projects.

Attribute Definition Discussion:

- Improve travel time – Dave clarified this attribute will compare alternative against alternative. Travel time is related to the length of the route.
- Group asked why “bicycle and pedestrian operations and access” is under Improve Local Operations only and not under Improve Mainline. WSDOT addresses bicycle and pedestrian improvements by ensuring that design standards are followed. The group asked to add “bicycle and pedestrian operations and access” to Improve Mainline attribute also.

Dave asked the group for a thumb vote as he led a group discussion of each attribute comparing its importance with every other attribute in the table. Thumbs up means the group agrees it's more important, less important or same as the next attribute. Thumb sideways means you can live with it, and thumb down means you disagree and therefore need to explain your reason. Consensus decision was the goal of each comparison, and a vote was held as a last resort.

Attribute Weighting Results:

Which attribute will provide the greater improvement to the project relative to Purpose and Need?							
Improve SR 302 Mainline Operations and Safety	A	A	A	A	A	A/F	A/G
Improve Local Operations and Safety	B	B	B	B	B	B/F	B/G
Reduce Environmental Impacts	C	C	C	C	C/F	G	
Improve Maintainability	D	D	D	D	F	G	
Reduce Construction Impacts	E	E	E	E	F	G	
Project Schedule	F	F	F	F	F	F/G	
Improve Travel Times	G	G	G	G	G	G	

 Not consensus - simple vote

Dave compared the results of this criteria weighting exercise with advisory committee members to the results of the same exercises conducted with internal WSDOT managers. The weighting assigns a value number and was applied to each of the nine alternatives resulting in a performance score. The results of the committees exercise was comparable to the exercise conducted with the Level 1 screening team, and the Alternatives identified from the process using the Level 1 teams alternative scoring was that alternatives 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 scored higher and will carried forward into the Level 2 screening. Alternatives 1, 2, 8, and 9 scored low and will not be recommended for further study.

Dave reminded the group that individual scores generated as a result of the exercise will not be carried forward into any further analysis, as the Level 2 process will bring a new and better level of detail to the decision making.

Wrap Up

Coming up next is the October 27 and 29 public open houses. The next advisory committee meeting is scheduled for December 9th from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Horseshoe Lake Golf Course.

John thanked everyone for attending and the meeting was adjourned.