

SR 202 Sahalee Way to Duthie Hill Road Corridor Study

SR 202 CORRIDOR WORKING GROUP KICK-OFF MEETING SUMMARY

Thursday, July 19, 2007
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Urban Planning Office, Conference Room 350
401 Second Avenue So., Seattle 98104

Attendees

WSDOT

Jean Mabry
Binh Nguyen
Chris Picard
Rick Roberts
Kurt Sielbach
Randy Simonsen
Richard Warren

King County

Aaron Grimes

City of Sammamish

Jeff Brauns

PSRC

Robin Mayhew

Perteet

Michael Booth
Rory Cameron
Justin Lacson
Jeff Lundstrom
Brian Woodburn

Welcome and Introductions

Jean Mabry, WSDOT

Jean Mabry, WSDOT, welcomed the group and thanked them for coming. She asked the attendees to introduce themselves and the agency or organization they represent.

Jean reviewed the meeting objectives:

- Review the SR 202 Route Development Plan (RDP) schedule and key milestones
- Adopt Corridor Working Group (CWG) guiding principles
- Endorse corridor vision and project goals
- Review existing and 2030 no-build traffic analysis and identified deficiencies
- Select 8 intersections for developing improvement options

Project Overview

Jean Mabry, WSDOT

Jean Mabry, WSDOT, went over the SR 202 Corridor Study schedule and milestones. Jean explained that the study is on a fast-paced schedule with the goal to have prioritized recommendations by mid-December. She also explained that the CWG partners will be included in the analysis, provided with the results, and that there will be ongoing communication between WSDOT, CWG partners, and consultants. She noted that the schedule is based on delivery of work for the four CWG meetings.

The project team has completed model validation, year 2006 and 2030 no-build traffic forecasts, deficiencies analysis, and the public involvement plan (PIP). The draft goals and objectives were based on input from agencies during the initial agency interviews.

Some of the public outreach to date includes setting up the project website, sending out a news release, and submitting an article to the Cascade Bicycle Club newsletter. WSDOT staff will attend local fairs and festivals throughout the summer. Staff will also do presentations to local community organizations such as the Sammamish Chamber of Commerce. Data collection for the environmental overview is focusing on “red-flag” issues and constraints.

Throughout July and August 2007 improvement options and strategies will be developed that address deficiencies. On August 21, 2007 CWG partners will have a workshop to brainstorm and assist in the development of strategies to address areas of concern. Jean explained that screening criteria will be developed to determine what criteria are most important when selecting improvement options. A public open house will be held in September 2007 to present proposed option improvements.

The third CWG meeting on October 16th will focus on reviewing the screening analysis, developing short- and long-term recommendations, and developing criteria for prioritizing the recommendations. The fourth CWG meeting on December 11th will prioritize the recommendations. The CWG will review the corridor study report by email. A meeting is not scheduled for review of the report but will be held if needed. The project team will do agency presentations as requested to councils, executive staff, and committees.

Discussion

- Rick Roberts and Randy Simonsen, WSDOT, asked if public outreach would be at the level of contacting individuals at home. Jean explained that outreach would not be at that level since the study is not doing design or an Environmental Impact Statement. Outreach will include the open house, booths at local events such as Sammamish’s Summer Concerts, mailers, presentations to local groups, traveling display at local institutions such as libraries, webpage, and news releases. The group agreed this is an appropriate level of outreach.
- Jeff Brauns, City of Sammamish, asked if signs at the beginning and end of the study area could be posted as another way to inform the public about the study. Jean will have the project team follow-up to see if this can be done.

Summary of Initial CWG Interviews

Jean Mabry, WSDOT

Jean provided an overview of the initial partner interviews conducted in November and December 2006. Individual agency interviews were held between WSDOT staff and technical staff from nine partner agencies who would potentially participate in the CWG for the SR 202 Corridor Study. The main purpose of the interviews was to ask local agencies to provide a representative for the CWG, introduce the SR 202 Corridor Study project to local agencies along the SR 9 corridor, review the RDP planning process, and seek local agency input their issues and concerns. Three agencies agreed to participate in the CWG.

Jean explained that the summary includes input from all nine agencies interviewed and asked the partners to confirm that WSDOT fully captured their input. She noted that the Draft Vision and Goals was based on input provided at the interviews.

Jean reviewed common themes identified for key areas of concern and improvements the agencies would like to see made in the corridor, including:

- Safety
- Mobility
- Multimodal including transit, pedestrians and bikes
- Preservation / Environmental
- Growth
- Outreach

Discussion

- The CWG agreed that the notes had fully captured their input.

Corridor Working Group Operating Guidelines

Jean Mabry, WSDOT

Jean led the discussion on the Corridor Working Group Operating Guidelines document. She stated that the operating rules and guidelines would provide a foundation for how the CWG partners would interact and the roles and responsibilities that each would play. She noted that a similar document has been used for other studies such as SR 9 and US 2.

Jean explained that the CWG partners would act as an advisory group to WSDOT. She reviewed the ground rules, roles and responsibilities, communication protocol for the CWG, decision making process, and conflict resolution process. She explained that it is necessary that at least one representative from each agency be present at every meeting.

Discussion

- The group jointly agreed to the contents of the CWG Operating Guidelines and changed the document status from draft to adopted.

SR 202 Corridor Vision & Goals

Jean Mabry, WSDOT

Jean presented the draft SR 202 vision. After listing the project goals, she reviewed the project outcomes.

Discussion

- Chris Picard, WSDOT, suggested that the word “operational” be deleted in the second sentence under goals. He also suggested that when the CWG is considering improvement options that the options should match regional policies such as PSRC’s policy to avoid widening on rural routes. He noted that there is a three tier approach under mobility in the State Highway Plan. The first tier is for operational improvements, second is bottlenecks and chokepoints, and third is corridor widening. This corridor will focus on tiers one and two.
- Robin Mayhew, PSRC, asked if language for land use and livability should be added.
- Jeff Brauns, City of Sammamish, asked if other terms such as sustainability should be considered.
- The group discussed the three suggestions and agreed that word “operational” should be deleted. It was felt that “acceptable to communities along the corridor” addressed livability

and sustainability and that those terms did not need to be added to the goals but should be kept in mind when considering improvement options.

- The group jointly agreed to endorse the SR 202 Vision & Goals with the word “operational” deleted and changed the document status from draft to endorsed.

Intersection Selection

Jean Mabry, WSDOT

Jean explained that before they reviewed the traffic analysis and identified deficiencies that she wanted to provide the background on how the project team selected which intersections to analyze and to develop options. She noted that the team used a two step screening process. All eighteen street intersections in the study area were screened in the first step based on connectivity, traffic volumes and intersection geometry. Ten intersections were selected for a second level of screening. Jean explained that the other eight intersections had low volumes, were dead-end streets, or served a few houses.

The second level screening included 2006 and 2030 no-build traffic analysis of the ten selected intersections, collision data for the entire corridor, and identified roadway design deficiencies for the entire corridor. Based on this screening process, the project team recommended eight intersections for improvement option development. Jean explained that of the two intersections eliminated from the list of the ten first-tier intersections, the worst approach for one would have very low volume (5 vehicles) in 2030 and that the other intersection had good Level-of-Service (LOS) in 2006 and 2030.

Jean stated that Brian Woodburn, Michael Booth and Rory Cameron of Perteet would provide information on the traffic and deficiency analysis before the CWG was asked whether they agreed to the eight recommended intersections. She then provided collision information on the two High Accident Locations (HAL) and High Accident Corridor (HAC) before Perteet presented the analysis information.

Discussion

- After reviewing the analysis information, the group jointly agreed to the project team’s eight recommended intersections for improvement option development.

Traffic Analysis

Brian Woodburn, Perteet

Brian Woodburn, Perteet, explained that the traffic analysis for both 2006 and 2030 no-build traffic conditions focused on the PM peak hour. He explained that AM peak hour and weekend traffic data had been reviewed and that PM peak hour had the highest numbers. He provided an overview of the map legend and graphics and presented information on intersection LOS, intersection delay and queues level for the eight recommended intersections. It was noted that one intersection in 2006 and four intersections in 2030 had LOS E or F. Brian noted that mainline LOS was not deficient in 2006 or 2030.

Discussion

- Chris asked if the project to connect the two segments of 244th Avenue was included in the model. Brian, and Aaron Grimes of King County, confirmed that it was included.
- Rick asked if during option development whether passing lanes might be considered due to slow moving vehicles causing back-ups.

- Jeff suggested through lanes at intersections could address the back-ups.
- The group discussed the two suggestions and agreed that back-ups due to slow moving vehicles would be considered during option development.

Corridor Deficiencies and Constraints

Rory Cameron, Perteet

Rory Cameron, Perteet, explained that existing roadway design elements were compared to WSDOT design manual standards to identify design deficiencies. He reviewed the list of deficiencies which includes non-standard roadway shoulders, intersections with angles greater than desirable, need for guardrail and side slope review, and intersections at or near capacity. He also noted that constraints (to option development) include wetlands, watersheds, steep slopes, unstable soils and water in the subgrade.

Discussion

- Robin asked if the deficiencies would be prioritized so the CWG would know which deficiencies to address. Rory responded that all deficiencies would be addressed in option development and that the recommendations would be prioritized.
- Jeff asked that other environmental information, such as location of fish barrier culverts, be provided at the option development workshop. Jean responded that information would be provided and that maps from the environmental overview would be available at the workshop in August.
- Kurt Sielbach, WSDOT, asked if the unstable slope program has any projects in the study area. Justin Lacson, Perteet, responded that the environmental overview has identified landslide areas. Jean noted that information will be provided at the next meeting and she will have the project team follow-up to confirm if any projects are in the unstable slope program.
- The group agreed that options to address the non-standard shoulders as related to bike use would be considered at the August workshop.

Next Steps

Jean Mabry, WSDOT

Jean reviewed the three decisions made at the meeting: adopted CWG guidelines, endorsed vision and goals, and eight intersections selected for option development. She noted that the next CWG meeting will be an all-day workshop to develop options on August 21st. She asked that the CWG reserve the day for the workshop but anticipated that the workshop would be shorter in length.

Action Items

- Project team will write and send the CWG partners the kick-off meeting summary.
- Project team will update CWG guidelines and Corridor Visions & Goals to reflect edits and post all meeting handouts on the project Web site. Meeting handouts include CWG Kick-off meeting agenda, Major project milestones, Summary of agency interviews, CWG operating guidelines, SR 202 Corridor vision & goals, Intersection selection summary, 2006 & 2030 LOS maps, and Corridor deficiencies and constraints.
- Project team will follow-up on whether signs can be posted on the corridor announcing the study.
- Project team will follow-up to confirm if there are projects in the unstable slope program.