SR 302 Advisory Committee Meeting
September 10, 2008
Rosedale Fire Station
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Terry Bouck, Peninsula School District
Senator Derek Kilmer
Representative Larry Seaquist
Pat Leach, Tacoma Power
Thair Jorgenson, North Pacific Design
Mike Baum, Key Peninsula Community Council
Jay Spady, South Kitsap Improvement
Bill Pebley, Pierce County Sheriff
Mike Galizio, Pierce County
Randy Boss
Jim Rogers, Kitsap County
Laura Armstrong, Key Peninsula Parks
Murray Payne, Burley Lagoon Coalition
Bill Evers, Emerald Shores Association
Ron Talley, Emerald Shores Association
Brian Ward, Pierce County Sheriff
Dennis Marshall, Lake Holiday Association
Rob Karlinsey, City of Gig Harbor
Jean Archer, Pierce Transit
Chuck Cuzzetto, Peninsula School District

John Donahue, WSDOT SR 302 Project Manager
Dave Skinner, HDR
Yvette Liufau, WSDOT

Introductions

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

Study and Projects Update

Burley-Olalla Interchange Project
Brenden Clarke, project engineer for the Burley-Olalla Interchange Project provided a status report on the project. The Burley-Olalla interchange is the last at grade intersection on SR 16. Construction is underway and the completion date is fall of 2010. The project will build SR 16 up and over Burley-Olalla Road. Monday through Friday a lane reduction is in place which will help to shorten the duration of the contract.

Following questions were asked:

1. Will the new interchange provide adequate service to accommodate the amount of traffic in the area? Answer was yes it will.
2. Was the SR 302 alternate route alternative taken into account with the Burley Olalla project? Answer was yes it was.
3. What's the cost of the project? Answer was $20 million for construction.

SR 302 Corridor Study Background

John Donahue presented background information about the SR 302 study taken from a presentation given as part of the environmental process at the SAGES meeting. In 2007, extensive public involvement work began to help the study team understand the issues about SR 302. This effort began with a 1993 study that provided a number of alternatives to consider along the entire SR 302 route from SR 16 to SR 3. In February 2008 following a meeting between WSDOT and the Federal Highway Administration, a decision was made to reduce the project area to SR 302 from SR 16 to Key Peninsula Highway due to the decrease in traffic volume from Key Peninsula Highway to SR 3, the study. All of the alternatives from the 1993 study, except those outside the current study area (R1, R2, and R4) are still being considered. Also still being considered are the alternatives suggested during stakeholder interviews and public meetings in 2007.

A draft Purpose and Need document was developed and shown at the December 2007 public meetings. The traffic patterns show a split at Purdy where 70% of traffic travel southbound to Tacoma/Seattle and 30% travel northbound to Port Orchard. The number of collisions on SR 302 is higher than the average number on similar highways. Level of Service (LOS) measures the seconds of delay to travelers and it's measured like letter grades in school from A to F. The LOS standard set by Puget Sound Regional Council for SR 302 is C. In the design forecast year of 2035, the LOS is expected to be mostly at LOS F on SR 302.

The broad range of alternatives were broken into 4 categories and they are existing, other existing, new bridges and new route. As part of this environmental process, there will be coordination with other state and federal agencies. The Federal Highway Administration is the lead agency. A group of cooperating and participating agencies will be invited to participate in this study. The next steps are outlined on the schedule. The group reviewed the advisory committee principles, goals and objectives and responsibilities list. John asked the group to let him know if there's any comment or additions to the list either tonight or before the next advisory committee meeting.

Following questions were asked:

1. Is the Purpose and Need that was sent to the group the official SEPA/NEPA purpose and need? Answer was that it's still a draft document.

2. What's the Level of Service on SR 16 at the SR 302 exit to Purdy? Study should take into consideration how SR 302 impacts SR 16 when analyzing alternatives. SR 16 is a highway of statewide significance (HSS). The answer to this question is LOS "D" or congestion index 10 – LOS standards on HSS facilities is set by WSDOT. The standard for SR 302 (a non-HSS route) is LOS C as set by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). Note: John will look into possibility of showing LOS on SR 16 and ensure the question is addressed.
3. Is the SR 16 off ramp at SR 302 Spur part of the study? Answer was yes both on/off ramps from SR 16 at SR 302 are included in the study area.
   Note: study team will fix alternatives map to show on and off ramps as part of the study area

Advisory Committee Member 2 Minute Forum

Members were asked to come prepared to share who they are, who they represent and what their organization's concerns about SR 302 are:

Mike Galizio (Pierce County Public Works) – Was involved in the development of the Key Peninsula Community Plan effort, has experience with community outreach and transportation issues. Pierce County has identified SR 302 as a high priority in their focus. He will share information from these meetings with county planning and land use departments. Mentioned that in the Community Plan on page 156 it states county will support the effort of WSDOT….utilize existing roadway and utility corridors. Mike will forward the link to the Key Peninsula Community Plan to advisory committee members.

Representative Larry Seaquist – Would like to see this study get finished and have the funding to build the road. The cost of building is going up while at the same time gas tax dollars are going down. Need to get community to help the Legislature get this project to the top of the list for funding.

Senator Derek Kilmer - Want to see the outcome of this effort focus on improving safety and reducing congestion. Need to fight to get this project to the top of the funding list because it's got to be fixed. This is important.

Terry Bouck (Peninsula School District) – Their buses run 6000 miles per day. They are concerned with both safety and congestion. Peak period for schools is 2pm when the high school is out. Congestion is contributing to longer route times such athat they can't get buses where they need to be for the various school releases. The problem areas are focused at 144th and Purdy Drive.

Pat Leach (Tacoma Power) – Concerned about any route that would share or affects power line rights-of-way. However, they are interested in the possibilities presented by shared right-of-way. Puget Sound Energy supplies power to the Peninsula Light Company in the area.

Jean Archer (Pierce Transit) – Is primarily interested in helping communities. Concerned with safety and congestion on SR 302 and how increased congestion is affecting schedules. Currently there are four transit routes that use the Purdy park and ride lot, and they move about 1200 persons per day in the area.

Rob Karlinsey (City of Gig Harbor) – Two concerns in particular are the need for facilities that accommodate growth and the weaving problem between the Burnham interchange and the SR 302 Purdy exit. Purdy is in the Gig Harbor UGA so they are concerned with how transportation issues will be resolved there. Note that solving congestion at SR 302 in Purdy would solve the weave problem too. A recent traffic study by the City verified that some motorists get off at Burnham and take Canterwood Blvd. to get to Purdy. Rob also noted that PM peak hour drivers use the Burnham exit as storage for Purdy. Finally, make sure that improvements on SR 302 takes into consideration interaction with Burnham Drive and also emergency access to/from the new hospital on Canterwood. He is also interested in promoting the extension of the Cushman Trail to Mason County as part of this study.

Dennis Marshall (Lake Holiday) – Their neighborhood is interested in the outcome of this study and meets on the 3rd Sunday of every month. He has read and agrees with the purpose and need statement. The community uses SR 302 and SR 16 routes and is concerned about safety and congestion.

Brian Ward (Pierce County Sheriff) – It's important to be able to access the Key Peninsula in an emergency and to improve travel time for this purpose. He is especially concerned about children and foot traffic in general along the highway. Improving illumination would help. Population is growing and traffic is increasing from periodic to much more constant.

Bill Evers (Emerald Shores) – What's important is safety, safety, safety. Most of the residents go to Gig Harbor and its difficult and unsafe making left turns onto the highway in the AM and PM. Emergency vehicle access is extremely critical, so that access to the neighborhood and services is available when a situation occurs. He noted that widening for capacity is not enough that protected or controlled left turns are also important.

Ron Talley (Emerald Shores) – Concerned about the increase in traffic and having good emergency vehicle access. Would like to see the study completed and start construction.

Murray Payne (Burley Lagoon Coalition) – The organization is concerned with difficult and unsafe left turns made at Goodrich Dr. Also, they are concerned about the environmental impact as it would undo some good work performed recently to recover the lagoon environment. Work that's been done includes fixing dump sites and improvements made to septic systems.

Laura Armstrong (Key Pen Metro Parks) – Interested in ensuring that non-motorized, pedestrian, and bicycle uses are supported in the process and that these activities can be done safely. Also, would like to see the Cushman Trail extension to Mason County.

Jim Rogers (Kitsap County Public Works) – Concerned about delays and congestion. He noted that some of the SR 302 alternatives that enter Kitsap County would present an improvement to road capacity there. Even with the study ending at Key Peninsula Highway, it's important to still consider an alternative that would eventually reach SR 3 and Mason County.

Randy Boss (not affiliated) – Concerned with the Cushman Trail, does not want to see SR 302 extended too far north into Kitsap County. He also expressed concern about environmental issues.

Thair Jorgenson (observer) – has worked with property owners in the Purdy area to organize for improvements. He is interested in looking for opportunities for public and private partnerships coming out of the study.

Mike Baum (Key Peninsula Community Council) – What happens on SR 302 will affect the entire peninsula - and it needs to be fixed.

Jay Spady (South Kitsap Improvement Council) – Spoke in favor of "out of the box" ideas for consider. For example, he's interested in finding out the advantages of better signal timing and equipment.Is especially concerned about the PM peak hour problem at the Purdy offramp.

Representative Seaquist mentioned a list of groups who are either not in attendance or not currently represented on the committee and they are:

Fire District 16
Key Peninsula Business Association
Purdy Business
Shellfish people
Mustard Seed Project
Friends of Puget Sound

Questions came up about accessing businesses along Purdy Drive. John will invite Steve Bennett, WSDOT Traffic Operations, to the next advisory committee meeting to talk about what's being done to improve access to Purdy businesses.

Alternatives Criteria Workshop

Dave Skinner of HDR Engineering is working with WSDOT on the SR 302 Corridor Study. He discussed the Value Based Screening Process, which is an objective and qualitative procedure for evaluating alternatives that's been successfully used in WSDOT and elsewhere. This process focuses on the values associated with desired criteria and indicates the most favorable alternative or alternatives based on the results which best meets the purpose and need of the project.

The broad range of alternatives represents the results of the 1993 study, as well as additional detail provided by a number of recent public and stakeholder involvement activities. A large scale map of the study area and alternatives was shown at the meeting. A two level preliminary screening process is proposed for this study, where Level 1 is scheduled for September 26, and Level 2 is scheduled for early January. Managers at WSDOT responsible for different program areas for the department will participate in the Level 1 session, with facilitation by HDR. Participants will be briefed on public and stakeholder input received to date, and will be guided through the process by a set of standardized transportation criteria or "attributes" established by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines for Value Engineering. Additional attributes that are deemed useful in this high level look can be added at the discretion of the participants. Dave explained that the Level 1 screening session would establish the participant values with respect to project attributes first, then assign scores to each attribute for each project alternative based on available, high level information, in order to arrive at a final Level 1 performance score. The performance score of each alternative is then divided by the alternatives estimated cost to receive a final overall value index. The alternatives receiving the highest value will then be carried forward to the Level 2 screening process, where more detailed criteria/attributes and supporting analysis will be available to the group to follow the same procedures as the Level 1 Screening. The Level 1 team will also be tasked with confirming the participants in the Level 2 process. Ultimately the resulting alternatives from the Level 2 Screening process will be recommended for inclusion as viable alternatives for consideration and review in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for this project.

The attributes that Dave suggested (which are supported by the AASHTO guidelines for Value Engineering) include:

- Mainline operations
- Local operations
- Maintainability
- Construction impacts
- Environmental impacts
- Land use compatibility
- Cultural impacts
- Ecological impacts
- Hydrological impacts

Dave mentioned the following selection criteria that he got out of the evenings discussions that he would like to have considered as part of the alternatives screening process.

- Safety
- Congestion
- Variations in peak periods for schools.
- Emergency Access to hospital and Key Peninsula

- Lighting for pedestrian safety
- Accommodations and safety for non-motorized facilities.
- Safe public access to park property.

Group Assignment
An assignment was given to the group to discuss with those interested or responsible members of their agencies/organizations what project attributes are important to them. In other words, to describe the characteristics of a successful final project in their view. This exercise should be accomplished before the December 9 meeting.

Following questions were asked:

1. Does project phasing come into play with this process? Yes, phasing is a level 2 attribute.
2. Do you have a document the group can use to help develop attributes? Yes, Dave Skinner will send an example to the group. Also, you can develop an attribute by asking the question, how do you measure success.
3. Are the alternatives on the map all of the routes being considered? Yes
4. Where did the diagonal alternative come from? It came out of the 20 year WSDOT Highway Systems Plan

Purpose and Need Workshop

Due to time constraints, no discussion of purpose and need took place. However, comments about the purpose and need draft will be solicited at the public meetings in October.

Wrap Up

Next meeting was scheduled for December 9th from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. and the location is to be determined. It was announced there will be a public meeting on October 27th from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the Key Peninsula Middle School. The open house will focus on the results of the level 1 screening process. A second open house is under consideration and would be announced shortly.

The group gave John approval to display advisory committee member names and contact information on the WSDOT SR 302 project website.

John thanked everyone for attending and the meeting was adjourned.