SR 3 RDP STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE MEETING #4
Meeting Summary
August 19, 2004

ATTENDEES

Name	Representing
Greg Cioc	Kitsap County
Ed Johanson	Kitsap Memorial State Park
Katherine Brown	County Commissioner Chris Endresen
Jeff Cowan	Poulsbo Fire Department
Mark Philiposian	Citizen
Heather Philiposian	Citizen
Beverly Woods	Washington State House of Representatives
Mary Bowen	Representative Phil Rockefeller
Tom Washington	WSDOT Urban Planning Office, Puget Sound Regional Council
Joyce Komac	WSDOT Olympic Region Maintenance
Karol Jones	City of Poulsbo
Hilary Renfer	Foxbridge Bed and Breakfast
Lyn Damschen	Edgewater Beach Community
Ray Serebrin	Sawdust Hill Community
Steve Hill	Hill Moving Services

STUDY TEAM

Lynn Hakes	Project Manager, WSDOT
Vicki Steigner	WSDOT
John Donahue	WSDOT
Yvette Liufau	WSDOT

INTRODUCTION

The fourth SR 3 Route Development Plan stakeholder meeting was held August 19, 2004, 6:00 PM at the Poulsbo Fire Station. Lynn Hakes began the meeting with a review of what has happened since the last stakeholder meeting. Lynn talked about the events that occurred at the June 24th Public Meeting. There was a presentation about speed limits and how they are set, as well as information booths about current and future traffic conditions, accidents, and environmental issues that might be encountered during the development of a bypass route. At the brainstorm station, those in attendance noted the need for a bridge traffic holding lane, frontage roads, a bypass route and a four-lane route. Most of all, the group expressed the concern that something needs to be done now. They can't wait 20 years.

On July 14th the study team was invited to attend a Sawdust Hill Community meeting. The group was interested in the study as a result of a bypass route idea that was suggested at the first public meeting. Lynn explained to the stakeholders that at that meeting they had learned that the bypass corridor would impact watersheds, on-going salmon projects, and Washington Conservation Commission projects. Kitsap County's Comprehensive Plan states existing road networks should be improved first before considering new corridors. Kitsap County Commissioner Chris Endresen and Jon Rose of the Olympic Property Group had written to express opposition to the bypass concept.

Lynn reviewed the Route Development Plan Decision Making Process explaining the next step for the group was to make a recommendation of an alternative. The committee was reminded of the Vision Statement and Goals they developed, along with the Evaluation Criteria.

Handouts:

June 24 Public Meeting
Sawdust Hill Meeting
RDP Decision Making Process
Vision Statement and Goals
Evaluation Criteria

ALTERNATIVES

Based on characteristics of the route from SR 305 to Big Valley Road, and from Big Valley Road to SR 104, the study team split the route into two segments (name Seg 1 and 2 so reader has reference for paragraphs below). Alternatives were developed using information and suggestions gathered at the public and stakeholder meetings. Because SR 3 is a highway of statewide significance, a part of the national highway system and a major freight route, it is mandatory that plans for the year 2030 allow the highway to function at a level of service of C. All alternatives required four lanes for traffic.

Mobility Emphasized –	Four lanes, controlled access and frontage roads, with full-width medians in segment 1 and reduced median widths in segment 2. There would be interchanges at Pioneer Hill Road, Big Valley Road and SR 104, and a right-in right-out opportunity in the vicinity of Scenic Drive and Faulkner Road.
Balance Mobility / Access –	Four lanes with reduced median widths in segments 1 and 2. Controlled access in segment 1 with frontage roads and an interchange at Pioneer Hill Road. A stoplight is recommended at Big Valley Road, north of which would be four lanes with right-in right-out only turns allowed. The northbound right lane north of Big Valley Road would serve as a bridge holding lane with a "jughandle" treatment at the signal at SR 104.

Access Emphasized –	Four lanes, reduced median width, and no frontage roads with right-in right-out turns allowed on both segments. Segment 1 has a signal at Pioneer Hill Road, Pioneer Way, and Big Valley Road, , and a truck-climbing lane is recommended. In segment 2, the northbound right lane north of Big Valley Road would serve as a bridge traffic holding lane with a "jughandle" treatment at the signal at SR 104.

Alternatives Handout

MEDIAN TREATMENT AND TRAFFIC SIGNALS

Vicki Steigner talked about Access Management. As stated in RCW 47.50, the State of Washington is required to put in some type of median barrier on multilane highways depending on the access class of the roadway and traffic volumes. State Route 3 from SR 305 to SR 104 is a Class 2 route. Accesses to the highway need to be 660 feet apart. A property owner may also gain access to the highway using an intersecting county road. In special circumstances, nonrestrictive median or two-way left turn lanes may be used. However, forecast traffic volumes on SR 3 are beyond the volumes where a two-way left-turn lane could be used. The study team will be gathering information at the next public meeting on September 29th as well as talking with emergency services staff about where the median breaks should be.

Access Management Handout

Vicki talked about safety as being a major concern along the route. Signalization on a four-lane route will prevent accidents as well as accommodate traffic volumes. The group mentioned right-in right-out access at Thompson Road would impact a school bus route.

SCORING ALTERNATIVES

Lynn talked about the results of scoring the alternatives. Using the vision, goals, and evaluation criteria developed by the stakeholder committee, the team came up with seven things by which to score the alternatives. The Level of Service (LOS) C was already a state requirement for this type of roadway. The rest of the criteria are Scenic, Wetlands, Displacements, Right-of-way, Construction Cost, and Travel Time. The results of the scoring determined the most cost effective solution was the Access Emphasized Alternative. The construction cost was lower, and the alternative minimally impacted the scenic quality, wetlands, displacements, and right-of-way. Travel time was not a significant increase compared to the other two alternatives. One of the stakeholder committee members suggested a lower LOS be considered due to the speed of freight traveling the route.

Alternatives Scoring Results Handout

BYPASS CONCEPT

Vicki talked about the bypass concept, pointing out the area on the map. A bypass of this size would require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS would have to look at the highway system from a regional perspective, possibly benefiting SR 104 and SR 307 as well as SR 3. Other bypass route ideas in the region were mentioned. The funding would need to come from the Legislature. The bypass concept was considered using the same alternatives evaluation criteria. Without an EIS, the specific footprint of the bypass concept could not be known. It was determined that the impacts of a bypass route would be at least as great as the Mobility Emphasized alternative and the number of displacements would be unknown until an EIS was completed.

Representative Phil Rockefeller requested to go on record that he opposes the bypass.

Bypass Map Handout
Bypass Scoring Results Handout

BRIDGE HOLDING LANE

John Donahue talked about the idea of a bridge holding lane. This bridge holding lane would store traffic northbound on SR 3 to the Hood Canal Bridge. The original thought was this lane should be the center lane, but concerns of people getting out of their cars while they wait for the bridge to close creates safety issues. An analysis was done using expected travel demand. In the year 2010, a single lane jug handle is working. In the year 2015, the need for a second lane jug handle would help the flow of traffic. In the year 2020, the jughandle is still working for northbound traffic, however, the gaps between cars traveling southbound becomes very small. In the year 2030, SR 3 begins to operate at a LOS F because traffic backs up onto a two-lane Hood Canal Bridge and the volume of cars at the intersection is high.

Bridge Holding Timeline Handout

2030 AND BEYOND

John showed an Implementation Timeline from the year 2010 to 2030, of what kind of work needs to occur and in what year. In 2010 a bridge holding lane and jughandle are needed. In 2020 the jughandle needs an additional lane. In 2030 making the bridge four lanes is necessary. What we need to be thinking about for the future are signalized intersections, reducing access to SR 3, and identifying locations for and creating frontage roads.

Implementation Timeline Handout

RECOMMENDATION AND ENDORSEMENT

Based on the group's criteria, WSDOT's analysis, and the scoring of alternatives, the Access Emphasized alternative is the most logical choice. Vicki repeated the study process

and ground rules for voting, then led the group in a discussion of the Access Emphasized alternative.

Stakeholder Committee Member Comments:

- Work with the County to construct future frontage/backage roads
- Do an Environmental Impact Report
- Include special design options at the climbing lane and take into consideration large vehicle requirements
- Designate median barrier openings using input from emergency services and the public
- Interim solution to look at improving sight distance at designated locations that don't meet standards
- Full movement access at Falkner (southside) and Scenic
- Full access at Thompson

Stakeholder Committee Members List Handout
Ground Rules Handout
Access Emphasized Alternative

Following comments from the committee, Vicki asked for the group to vote on endorsement of the Access Emphasized alternative. Of the thirteen voting members, twelve gave their support and one member chose not to support the alternative.
The stakeholder committee voting resulted in endorsement of the Access Emphasized alternative. There was one objection. The objecting party has the right to file a written "minority report" stating their objections. The objecting member had two reasons; 1) A national wildlife refuge is less that 500 feet from the highway. Four lanes would impact the refuge. 2) Frontage roads will create noise, which will affect business.

NEXT STEPS

The next public meeting will be Wednesday, September 29th, 6:00 to 8:00 PM, at the Breidablik Hall.

The next stakeholder meeting will be Tuesday, October 26th, 6:00 to 8:00 PM at the Poulsbo Fire Station.