



Bremerton Economic Development Study

STAKEHOLDER MEETING #1 MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting date: June 25, 2008
Location: Port of Allyn – 18560 SR 3, Allyn, WA 98524

- Attendees:**
- Stakeholders in attendance:
- Allyn Community Association, Jeanette Morne for Jeff Carey
 - Bremerton Chamber, Annalee Todd
 - City of Bremerton, Michael Mecham
 - Kitsap County, Greg Cioc
 - Kitsap EDA, Kathy Cocus
 - Mason County Transit, Dave O'Connell
 - North Mason Chamber, Frank Kenny
 - Port of Allyn, Bonnie Knight
 - Port of Bremerton, Fred Salisbury
 - Port of Bremerton, Ken Attebery
 - Port of Shelton, Patti Miller-Crowley
 - WSDOT, Richard Warren
- Stakeholders not in attendance:
- City of Port Orchard, Mark Dorsey
 - City of Shelton, Jay Ebbeson
 - Kitsap Transit, Dick Hayes
 - Kitsap Transit, Doug Johnson
 - Mason County EDC, Matt Matayoshi
 - Mason County, Charlie Butros
- Agency interview participants not in attendance:
- Bremerton Chamber, Gary Gartin
 - Harrison Medical Center, Leon Smith
 - Kitsap County, Jim Rogers
 - North Mason Chamber, Tim Wing
 - Port of Bremerton, Tim Thomson
- Others in attendance:*
- EnviroIssues, Ray Outlaw
 - HW Lochner, Steve Lewis, Bob Munchinski and Yong Zhu
 - Parametrix, Samantha Alden
 - Peninsula RPTO, Patrick Babineau
 - WSDOT, T. J. Nedrow and Nazmul Alam

Welcome and Introductions

Richard Warren, WSDOT, welcomed the group to the meeting and thanked them for coming. He extended a special thank you to Bonnie Knight and the Port of Allyn for providing the facility and refreshments. He asked the attendees to sign in using the form circulating around the room. Attendees introduced themselves and the agency they were representing.

Richard reviewed the agenda with the group noting the purpose of the meeting was to review the Bremerton Economic Development Study (BEDS) scope, schedule, key milestones, goals and objectives, and current activities.

Project Overview (Timeline, Milestones, and Scope)

Richard briefly discussed the scope of work, noting that this topic was covered extensively during the stakeholder interview process. Although not provided at the meeting, the stakeholder interview summary has been provided to each stakeholder.

The group reviewed the schedule and milestones in detail, referring to the handout in the packet of materials distributed to the partners labeled "Major Milestones."

Richard noted that the second stakeholder meeting will be for the adoption of recommendations and that the project team will be looking for the group's endorsement of the recommendations to take forward to elected officials.

Even though the next meeting is not until October, communications will continue with the stakeholders. The timeline does not include elected official briefings, but the project team would like the stakeholder group's assistance in coordinating with local elected officials.

Question: It is an election year, is it an issue that some officials will no longer be in office? *No, it is something we face and address regularly.*

Question: Could we invite the candidates? *The meetings will be public, but the project team will look to the stakeholders to coordinate those meetings and attendees.*

Question: What is the timeframe for the briefings? *The briefings will be in late August and September, before the second stakeholder meeting. Stakeholders can begin looking for dates and forward them to the project team.*

The project team is also looking to the stakeholders to feed this information to their elected officials at regular intervals.

Steve noted that some elected boards may not meet in August, so the project team needs help coordinating dates and times of meetings with the appropriate members of each organization.

Richard noted that the project team is already working to schedule a briefing at the September Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO) meeting.

Goals and Objectives (Stakeholder Representation)

Richard noted that some stakeholders have requested bringing additional staff to the meetings. This is fine, but the stakeholders need to clearly identify their organizations' representative member so that adoption of the recommendations is fair and consistent. The project team is considering the existing stakeholder list 'official' unless the stakeholders note otherwise.

Richard reviewed the goals and objectives.

Question: Will this be posted on the Web site? *Yes, everything from our meetings will be posted on the Web.*

Richard noted that the project team plans to come up with recommendations and projects, and will look to the group to prioritize and adopt those projects with the understanding that funding is limited. However, any lack of funding should not deter the group from making appropriate decisions. The project team is looking at both short and long-term projects.

Initial Stakeholder Interviews

Richard briefly discussed the summary of stakeholder interviews previously distributed, information from which has already fed into the analysis. Top issues included:

- 1) Gorst area
- 2) Traffic movement through Shelton
- 3) Growth throughout the area
- 4) Increasing transit use
- 5) Safety, particularly lack of pedestrian and non-motorized facilities

Existing Conditions Analysis

The group reviewed the status of the study to date beginning with a discussion of the study area. Richard referred to the following boards and handouts:

Study area: Richard described the segmentation of the corridors, noting that segments are easier to analyze and allow the project team to look at discrete pieces individually. This will allow recommendations to better fit the character of segments rather than developing solutions for the corridor as a whole. Richard noted the similarities between the US 2 project and how segmenting the corridor helps develop recommendations that fit the problem.

The project team has conducted traffic counts at 26 locations (orange dots on the Study Area map).

Question: Are there no counts between North Bay and Gorst? *We have a lot of existing data for this section. This map shows new counts, but we will also use existing data in our analysis.*

Transit routes: Richard described the board displaying transit routes and designated park & ride lots.

Question: Route 4 in Belfair is in-correct, half of the route is missing? *Steve will follow-up to correct.*

Question: It would be useful to note that Pickering Rd. is an 'uncontrolled' intersection. Are there others accessing park & rides? *The project team will look into what information is available.*

Question: What do the numbers represent? *The numbers are the actual route numbers. The final report will include the routes, destinations and agencies.*

Question: Should we note 'worker-driver' busses operated by Kitsap and Mason counties (shipyards ask shipyard workers to drive)? *The report will include the data, but the routes are complicated to map.*

Comment: Park & rides 'come and go' depending on vandalism and other factors.

Question: There are also a number of 'gorilla' park & ride lots, should they be included? *We should at least note the existence, but not document the locations. Right now there is no program to officially recognize these spaces. The project team will work directly with Dave to identify.*

Safety Analysis: Richard described the results of the safety analysis to date, noting that the majority of collisions in segment one are rear-end collisions, suggesting congestion is an issue in the Shelton area. Collision data in other segments suggest collisions are less congestion related. Overall the data indicates there are traffic and mobility problems in the Shelton and Gorst areas.

Richard noted that 'other' is a broad category that includes animal, driveway and smaller incidences. The highest percent of any of these is around 10 percent. No category within 'other' warrants its own category.

Some traffic count locations are the same as collision and fatality locations. US 2 found that many collisions were driver error. Impairment related collisions on this corridor appear to be lower, but the project team will study further.

Question: It seems like segment 1 needs to be broken out into two? *The project team discussed this, as well as separating Bremerton / Port Orchard. We decided to pull out the collisions separately for the three highways. The analysis will include independent solutions for each of the problem areas along the corridor.*

Question: Are all the fatalities single-person? Yes.

Traffic Volumes: Richard described the posted speed limits (colored segments) and traffic volumes (black boxes) throughout the corridor. The project team will be looking at what these volumes are projected to be in 2030.

Question: What is it in Allyn? *6,700 vehicles per day*

Comment: The projected increase into Gorst is approximately 3.5 percent per year, which is much higher than other areas. *73,000 vehicles per day is a very large and surprising count. Recommendations will need to address these traffic numbers.*

Comment: Mason is the fastest growing county in the state.

Existing Traffic Analysis: The project team looked at volumes and what that means in terms of traffic flow. The scale used for intersections is A-F. There are level of service (LOS) problems in Gorst (F), in other areas the LOS is at C or D. WSDOT's goal is to get to LOS D. Gorst, Johns Prairie Road and Matlock Road are the problem areas.

Question: Is this evening peak? *It is evening peak hour between 4 and 6.*

Richard noted that several sections of the corridor are approaching the 70% failure threshold. He also noted that these are existing conditions, the forecast will project at least some of these above the failure mark.

Question: Is there any difference between morning and evening peak, the shipyard may have a major impact between 6:45 and 7:15? *We do not have a.m. counts.*

Question: In segment 1, Matlock Road doesn't look correct. *We'll check the data.*

Segments: Richard reviewed each slide, focusing on "what we've heard so far".

Segment 1

No comments

Segment 2

Comment: If the road is closed there are no alternative travel options, which can be a serious problem during an emergency.

Comment: You should re-phrase the average travel speed section.

Segment 3

Comment: Do not list pedestrians and non-motorized because it is a theme throughout the corridor, not just in one or two segments.

Comment: Tourism increases the demand for non-motorized safety improvements.

T. J. Nedrow noted that there will be an updated WSDOT non-motorized plan, with new policy direction, released near the end of 2008.

The project team will be looking for community plans for non-motorized options.

Segment 4

Comment: The comment referring to lack of access to the Bremerton airport should reference 'east' rather than 'west'.

Comment: The sewer statement also applies to Belfair

Comment: An official petition for the development for South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA) has been submitted.

Prioritization Criteria

Steve Lewis discussed the handout titled 'Prioritization Criteria'. Steve noted that a very important piece of the study is a clearly delineated list of projects, but most important is agreement on what projects are first, second, third, etc. The legislature will expect this type of prioritized list. US 2 produced a prioritized list in addition to the top 'big' and 'small' projects. This study will also need to develop a similar prioritized and agreed upon list.

The committee needs to come out with a consensus. This is a message the stakeholders need to deliver to their elected officials. Jurisdictions need to advocate for the prioritized list and not for specific projects benefiting specific communities. Not everyone can be the first to get a project.

Steve noted that these recommendations do not include weighting for each factor. This

can be added if the group thinks it is necessary.

The project team will build a matrix with every project and the criteria. Then we will provide data for each project as it relates to each criteria.

Question: How do you compare intersections that have low LOS, but are failing for different reasons? *We will provide you the statistical information needed to make decisions. The trade-offs and benefits will become clearer as we present the data to you.*

Question: Where are the projects coming from? *We are developing the list from all the existing studies, but not the Belfair bypass because the recommendations are set. We will evaluate the previous proposed solutions and provide updated recommendations.*

Comment: It should be recognized that Community support can change with time.

Question: Should we include the sociological impacts (e.g. Belfair bypass) of projects? How would we incorporate that? *This would be very difficult to measure, but we can evaluate if the projects are in line with your existing plans and the communities are supportive of a particular project.*

Comment: Add a phrase or two to the community support section that adds "consistency with community plans".

Is there a planned review of the findings down the road (e.g. 5 years)? Are there reality checks? *We are looking at your comprehensive plans to help capture the growth accurately. We have not typically included a review point in other areas. Recommendations in this plan should support your growth plans. We need to remember this is a blueprint for corridor development, understanding we may need to go back and evaluate assumptions from time to time. We will keep all the supporting documentation and have it available for future use. These are living documents and staff does review them when questions come up.*

Question: Could the economic impact reference be a part of the criteria to help meet the demands of UGAs? Yes.

Recommended changes: Broaden the definition of community support and economic impact.

Public Involvement

Richard reviewed the public involvement strategies the project will use and provided copies of the fact sheets. Ray Outlaw made copies available after the meeting for stakeholders to share with their respective agencies.

Richard noted that the project does not plan to hold open houses because they are not very well attended and are very expensive. We do plan to attend four public events, which have proven very effective in other areas.

Bonnie Knight requested we attend the Allyn Days Festival. The group agreed that we could drop the Bremerton Farmers' Market in place of the Allyn Days festival. Bremerton also volunteered to staff the farmers' market for us. Bonnie agreed to provide a booth if the project team can arrange the date(s).

Richard also noted the need for translated materials and ongoing efforts to place materials at locations such as libraries. We also plan to use a traveling display and will

discuss free advertising with newspapers and possibly utility companies.

Bonnie noted that the Allyn Community Association puts out a monthly newsletter. The stakeholders suggested the project team provide something to everyone to include in their newsletters.

Question: Have we received any feedback about this being the “101 study relived”?
We have run into this before. One of the messages we try to emphasize is that we are aware of past studies, but we are trying to update that information and this is the corridor’s vision. This will likely come up at fairs and festivals.

Richard noted that the project Web site includes a comment form and the project team is recording comments that come in through the Web.

The group had a brief discussion about the ‘ridge’ solution and if it should be included. T. J. Nedrow noted that the key is for recommended improvements along the existing corridor. The ‘ridge’ solution does not address the problems along the corridor. The intent is not to look at an alternative corridor.

Comment: We shouldn’t ignore data that suggest a solution such as the ‘ridge’.
Richard noted that the project team can make a reference to it.

Next Steps

Richard concluded the meeting noting that the project team will provide the report for review to the stakeholders and that the draft project list will be provided to stakeholders at least one week prior to the next meeting.

Richard thanked the stakeholders for attending and responded to final questions.

Question: Who is responsible for county roads that cross state highways? Richard will follow-up at a later date.

Action Items:

- Stakeholders will assist the project team in identifying and scheduling briefings with their respective elected officials
- The project team will schedule a briefing for the September Peninsula RPTO meeting
- Stakeholders will notify Richard of any changes to the existing stakeholder group
- The project team will look into what information is available regarding uncontrolled intersections accessing park & rides
- The project team will work with Dave to identify ‘gorilla’ park & ride lots
- The project team will check Matlock Road in segment one
- The project team will re-phrase the average travel speed sections for consistency
- The project team will update the board referring to lack of access to the Bremerton airport to ‘east’ rather than ‘west’.
- The project team will update the prioritization criteria by broadening the definition of community support and economic impact
- Richard will work with Bonnie to coordinate a booth at the Allyn Days festival and with Bremerton regarding volunteers to staff the farmers’ market
- The project team will provide some information to the stakeholders for inclusion in their newsletters
- The project team will update the boards to address comments made during the meeting before posting to the Web (e.g. sewer systems in Belfair and Bremerton, corrected transit route, lack of alternative routes)

Handouts

- Stakeholder Meeting #1 Agenda
- Study Area Map
- Safety Analysis Map
- Traffic Volume and Posted Speed Map
- Segment 1
- Segment 2
- Segment 3
- Segment 4
- Project Scoring Criteria
- Fact Sheets