SR 162 Sumner to Orting Corridor Study

Stakeholder Committee Meeting #3

Thursday, August 25, 2016
9:00 a.m. to 12 noon
Sumner City Hall, 1104 Maple Street, Sumner

Attendees

Jason Sullivan, City of Bonney Lake
Bill Drake, City of Orting
Eric Mendenhall, City of Sumner
Rory Grindley, Pierce County
Jesse Hamashima, Pierce County
Jason Kennedy, Pierce Transit
Eric Chipps, Sound Transit
Scott Jones, Tehaleh/Newland Communities
Joe Pestinger, City of Orting
Josh Penner, City of Orting
Shawn Bunney Observer

WSDOT
Dennis Engel, Olympic Region Planning
Nazmul Alam, Olympic Region Planning
T.J. Nedrow, Olympic Region Planning
Yvette Liufau, Olympic Region Planning
Ray Crumbley, Olympic Region Traffic
Janarthanan Natarajan, Headquarters TDGO
Ming-Bang Shyu, Headquarters TDGO

Welcome/Introductions

T.J. Nedrow, WSDOT's study lead welcomed everyone and led the introductions around the table. The meeting agenda was reviewed and committee reminded of the decision making process of thumbs up, sideways and thumbs down.

Study Progress

T.J. reviewed with the committee members the study challenge to recommend suitable strategies to move forward that meet current and future travel needs along the SR 162 corridor. He mentioned the study team performed an initial screening which will be covered later in the meeting. Secondary stakeholder outreach efforts were conducted by T.J. with WSDOT Maintenance, school district transportation staff, law enforcement, local fire and rescue staff. The following significant points were raised in those conversations:

- Narrow shoulders
- Left turns are an impedance to throughput
- Congestion makes travel predictability difficult
- Crashes close the highway
- Congestion is getting worse
- Extreme weather events create terrible travel conditions

He also noted a study briefing with elected officials has been scheduled for September 15th.

Preliminary Online Survey Results

Dennis Engel, WSDOT Olympic Region's Planning Manager reported on the preliminary online survey results to the group. He explained a total of 2,214 surveys were completed and 2 were filled out in Spanish. The online survey window closed on Friday, August 19th. He summerized some interesting results that were picked up from the following six survey questions:

Q5. Has your average travel time changed between Sumner and Orting over the last 5 years?
80% of the surveys answered yes

Q6. Please choose one of the following that best describes how your average travel time has changed over the last 5 years on SR 162 between Sumner and Orting?
Approximately 46% said it increased over 15 minutes, 34% said it increased 11-15 minutes, and 18% said it increased 1-10 minutes

Q14. How do you normally commute to work?
Approximately 75% drive alone, 18% are retired, 10% carpool, 8% telework, and 1% walk, bicycle or vanpool

Q15. If you rideshare to work, do you use the Sumner or Puyallup Sounder Park & Ride lot?
Approximately 95% don't rideshare, 5% rideshare and use the Sumner lot, and less than 1% rideshare and use the Puyallup lot

Q20. If transit or some other form of public transportation was available from Sumner to Orting, would you use it?
Approximately 6% said no while 40% said yes

Q22. To give us an idea of your normal workday commute, please indicate your home zip code.
Approximately 72% from 98360 (Orting), 12% from 98390 (Sumner), 9% from 98338 (Graham) and 8% from 98372 (Puyallup)

Dennis provided some additional comments that were noted in the surveys:

- You should have been asking this question 15 years ago.
- The lights coming out of Sumner are a pain.
- Add extra lanes. Add an alternate route. Only allow Fords, no Chevys.
- Have another highway above the current one just specifically for those traveling from one end to the other.
- Bus lines, maybe a light rail.
- This year add 3 more lanes.
- Fewer or removing all street lights.
- More lights to allow residents to access road.
- Any unnecessary death due to poor traffic planning will be on your hands.
- Turn lanes, turn lanes, turn lanes, turn lanes, turn lanes, turn lanes…did I make my Point?!
- Drive thru pot shops needed, please.

There were 24 categories of responses to the question of what highway changes would you like to see and they are:

Add Lanes	Speed
Alternate Routes	Turn Lanes
Signals	Street Lighting
Transit/Rail	Roundabouts
Restrict Development	New Freeway
Address SR 167/SR 410	Restrict Trucks
Sight Distance	Sidewalks
No 4 lane	Enforcement
SR 410 Interchange	Center Guardrail
Toll Road	School Bus
Better Maintenance	No Shoulder Parking
Complete Solution	Limited Access

Some of the main comments in the online survey that were received are 60% suggested widening the roadway. Of that 60%, 33% said widen to 4 lanes, 15% said add a turn lane down the middle and 13% said they want 4 lanes with a turn lane in the middle. Dennis mentioned a few suggestions were to widen the shoulders and construct a reversible lane. Alternative routes were made up of 5% of the total number of comments. Of that number, 54% preferred an alternative route from Orting to Sumner, with 17% suggesting an alternative route up to Puyallup/SR 161. There were 10% who wanted a Bonney Lake route and even received a few who wanted Cross Base to relieve SR 162. There were 9% of the comments that were about signals. Of those, 52% suggested changes in signal timing or synchronizing, 15% said less signals are needed, 18% said more signals are needed, and 15% asked for specific intersections which the most requests seemed to be for the High Cedars/146th Avenue vicinity. There were 4% of the survey comments which were related to speed. Of them, 9% commented about deceleration and acceleration turn lanes to side streets. Two percent of the public surveyed wanted to restrict development. Transit/rail received 3% of the survey comments and 44% of them asked for rail, 39% asked for transit while 13% were interested in mass transit. Some of the group commented that the percentage of the public interested in widening SR 162 is the same as the percentage who wouldn't use transit. WSDOT will provide Pierce Transit with any transit information from the online survey.

Backup Data for Detailed Screening

Ming-Bang Shyu, WSDOT Transportation Data, GIS & Modeling Office provided a brief review of the existing and future no action conditions. For the households and job growth between 2015 and 2035 land use maps, street names have been added to make it easier to find and discuss locations of concern. Ming explained that following the last stakeholder meeting, the study team reviewed the volume to capacity calculation, particularly the assumptions of the roadway capacity. Based on the three full days of traffic counts conducted in April 2016at six locations along the study corridor, the team found that the maximum throughputs are about 1200 vehicles per hour at a 50 mph speed limit and 1100 vehicles per hour at a 35 mph speed limit. The study team updated the capacity assumptions based on the observed maximum throughputs to reflect better the actual roadway conditions. The calculation of volume to capacity ratios for both the AM and PM peak periods has been updated. Ming mentioned after the last meeting, the study team also received updates of signal timing settings at several intersections. The signal timing inputs were updated in Synchro and re-calculated the intersection delays and LOS. The travel time and travel time reliability was also updated after re-running the SimTraffic simulation.

Safety, Environmental, Feasibility/Constructability

T.J. Nedrow presented the safety, environmental and feasibility/constructability data to the committee. The Five-Year motor vehicle crash data shared. The information was gathered from January 2011 to December 2015 period. The Study team broke the analysis up into logical segments and major intersections. The intersections along SR 162 of focus were:

SR 410 westbound and eastbound ramps

- Rivergrove Drive
- Pioneer Way
- 96th Street E
- Military Road
- 128th Street E
- 136th Street E
- Williams Boulevard

The segments where crashes were analyzed:

- SR 410 to Rivergrove Drive
- Rivergrove Drive to Pioneer Way
- Pioneer Way to 96th Street E
- 96th Street E to Military Road
- Military Road to 128th Street E
- 128th Street E to 136th Street E
- 136th Street E to Williams Boulevard

The WSDOT's highway safety focus is on Serious Injury and Fatal motor vehicle crashes as a goal emphasis of the Washington Traffic Safety Commissions 2013 "Target Zero" Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Crash history records between 2011 and 2015 noted that there were 0% fatal crashes on the corridor, however serious crashes were recorded at the SR 410 eastbound ramp, Rivergrove Drive, Williams Boulevard intersections, and the highway segment from 96th Street E to Military Road. T.J. referred to the powerpoint slide noting the common types of crashes included rear ends, single vehicle/object, entering at angle and opposite direction. The main contributing circumstances in these types of crashes were following too closely, not granting right of way, alcohol and inattention.

T.J. presented the environmental features map which showed fish passage barriers, wetlands, groundwater well, and leaky underground storage tank locations. The committee was provided with a detailed listing of utility providers known to be located within the SR 162 highway corridor. This information is intended to aid in screening the feasibility/constructability category. He mentioned that generally with any roadway improvement, some form of utilities will be impacted. If, for example, PS&E transmission lines need to be relocated due to a highway project, WSDOT would have a heavy cost to relocate the utilities. The existing utilities along the SR 162 corridor study area include:

- Comcast Telecommunications
- AT&T Telecommunications
- CenturyLink Telecommunications
- City of Sumner Communications
- City of Tacoma Water lines
- PS&E Power lines
- PS&E Natural Gas lines
- Valley Water District Water lines
- Wave Broadband Telecommunications
- Zayo Group Telecommunications

Another piece of information T.J. shared with committee members was the existing right of way information. With the Meeker Southern rail line and Pierce County Foothills trail corridor on the west side of SR 162, PS&E power lines to the east, and residential or business properties mixed throughout, the SR 162 corridor is narrow (generally at 60') and therefore large scale widening of the highway could be problematic and overly expensive.

Initial Screening Results

T.J. Nedrow presented the listing of 46 ideas created with stakeholder committee input, online survey suggestions and input from WSDOT staff and 1997 162 route development plan. The WSDOT study team conducted an initial screening based on the following actions:

1. Does not meet the study purpose and need
2. Will not compete regionally (in the sense of larger projects of regional significance)
3. Does not meet corridor vision or study goals
4. Not viable given existing technology or practices
5. Not practical/not applicable
6. Advanced to detailed screening
7. Pursued by others (others would have lead in promoting, establishing or financing idea)

The ideas that matched with Actions 1 through 5 were removed from the list and no longer considered. The ideas that matched action 7 were determined to be outside the influence of the study and also removed from the list for stakeholder screening purposes.

The following ideas that were screened out based on Actions 1-5 and 7 were:

E Linking the Foothills Trail to the Sumner train station
F Add a park and ride lot at 128th and SR 162
G Add park and pool lots
H Opportunities to utilize park and ride lots for event parking
I Look at existing TDM along the SR 162 corridor
K Bus rapid transit service is needed on SR 162 during peak period times
L Public transit service needed on SR 162
Q Train or commuter rail service is needed on SR 162
R Intersection transit queue jumps along SR 162
S Expand existing vanpool availability
T Put tolls on SR 162
AC Reduce Tehaleh growth based on employment growth
AD Constrain development
AE Improve pedestrian and bicycle access into Sumner
AF Increase bicycle storage at Sumner train station
AH Assure that roadway facilities are provided along with development proposals
AI Potential state policy changes to make it easier for cities to join Pierce Transit's benefit area
AJ Consider formation of transportation benefit transit district
AK Utilize District School Bus associated with commuter fixed commuter travel
AO Improve School Bus Routing
AP Speed enforcement
AQ Limit parking on shoulders (access management)
AU Driver education/user outreach

The ideas that matched Action 6 are:

A Improving Riverside Road and McCutcheon Road to use as an alternate route to SR 162
B Channelization on at SR 162
C Consider roundabouts at key locations
D Restricting left turns at unsignalized intersections to right in/right out
E Linking the Foothills Trail to the Sumner train station
F Add a park and ride lot at 128th and SR 162
G Add park and pool lots
I Look at existing TDM along the SR 162 corridor
J HOV lanes are needed on SR 162 during peak periods

The ideas that matched Action 6 are: (*continued)*

K Bus rapid transit service is needed on SR 162 during peak period times
L Public transit service needed on SR 162
M 3 lane configuration on SR 162 (TWLTL)
O Increase incident response along the SR 162 corridor
P ITS devices needed along the SR 162 corridor
Q Train or commuter rail service needed and to include a stop at 128th/SR 162
R Intersection transit queue jumps along SR 162
S Expand existing vanpool availability
V Add reversible 3rd lane in key locations or throughout the SR 162 corridor
W Use historic bridge as a 3rd lane at river crossing
X Separated bus way
Y Dedicated incident turnout areas along the SR 162 corridor
Z Increase law enforcement presence along the SR 162 corridor
AA SR 162/SR 410 interchange overpass to increase capacity
AB Adequate shoulders for bicyclists, vehicle breakdowns and transit
AC 3 lanes with transit in middle lane
AE Improve pedestrian and bicycle access into Sumner
AF Increase bicycle storage at Sumner train station
AG Implementing 1997 Route Development Plan improvements
AL Improve Signal Timing
AM Signal Interconnections
AN Improve sight distance at intersections
AO Improve School Bus Routing
AR Two step left turn from side streets at appropriate locations?
AS Implement narrow roads, wide nodes concept through appropriately designed modern roundabouts?
AT Provide school bus turnouts at appropriate locations?

The ideas which were advanced forward to the Stakeholder Committee screening process were:

B Channelization on SR 162, AR – two-step left turn from side street at appropriate locations
C Consider roundabouts at key locations. Implement narrow roads, wide nodes concept through appropriately designed modern roundabouts?
D Restricting left turns at unsignalized intersections to right in/right out
I Looking at existing TDM along the SR 162 corridor, AF – increase bicycle storage at Sumner train station
K K - Bus rapid transit service is needed on SR 162 during peak period times
L – Public transit service is needed on SR 162
U – Intersection transit queue jumps along SR 162
X – Separated bus way
AI – Potential state policy changes to make it easier for cities to join Pierce Transit's benefit area
AJ – Consider formation of transportation benefit or transit district
M 3 lane configuration on SR 162 (TWLTL)
AC – 3 lanes with transit in middle lane
AA SR 162/SR 410 interchange overpass to increase capacity
AB Adequate shoulders for bicyclists, vehicle breakdowns and transit
AG Implementing 1997 Route Development Plan improvements
W – Use historic bridge as a 3rd lane at river crossing
AL Improve signal timing
AM – signal interconnections

The process then compiled the ideas into seven categories that the committee endorsed:

- Channelization
- Intersection improvements
- Access management
- TDM
- Public Transportation
- Capacity improvements
- Signals

T.J. concluded that of the 46 original ideas, through the process so far, seven categories emerged and moved forward into the next phase of the exercise, the stakeholder committee screening process led by Nazmul Alam. The question was asked if the ideas that have been initially screened out will be mentioned in the final study report. T.J. responded that they will be mentioned in the report. The committee gave thumbs up in agreement of how the initial screening process and results were accomplished.

Detailed Screening Process

WSDOT Olympic Region's Nazmul Alam reviewed the list of ideas which came out of the initial screening with the group. He proceeded to walk the group through the four criteria categories and the scoring ranges for each category. The criteria were Mobility/Congestion, Safety, Environmental and Feasibility/Constructability. He mentioned the option of including additional criteria, suggesting the idea of public acceptability if the committee felt the need to. The Stakeholder committee didn't see need for additional criteria. Below are the ranges for each of the categories.

Mobility/Congestion

Intersection LOS	*Segment v/c ratio*
LOS A-C = 0	<0.5 = 0
LOS D = 3	0.5-0.8 = 3
LOS E = 4	0.8-1.0 = 4
LOS F = 5	>1.0 = 5

Safety

% Fatal or Serious Injury Crashes

0% = 0
1-2% = 1
3-4% = 3
5%->5% = 5

Environmental

Number of environmental features

0 Feature = 5
1 Feature = 4
2 Feature = 3
3 Feature = 2
4 Feature = 1

Feasibility/Constructability

Relative Cost

Very low (<$250K) = 5
Low (<$1m) = 4
Medium ($1-5m) = 3
High ($5-10m) = 2
Very high (>$10m) = 1

The committee members discussed the criteria and specifically the need to determine weighting some criteria different than others. A suggestion was made to consider weighing cost heavier than the rest of the categories. Some members felt environmental should be weighted less and safety should be given a heavier weight. Nazmul showed the group some preliminary scoring which the study team processed based on WSDOT's data to help expedite the stakeholder committee's screening of ideas. He noted every score is open to discussion and the preliminary scores can change if the committee sees the need.

The members questioned whether they had enough information to be able to score ideas or is the level of detail appropriate for this screening process? Members asked if fixing intersections should be the priority and directed the Study team to determine which intersections are more critical to make improvements to. A suggestion was made to add a column under mobility to include current 2015 LOS information and not just base screening off of future 2035 LOS, which mostly equals the same number of points for every idea. A decision was made by the stakeholder committee to let them further review the list and currently agreed upon preset scores. Stakeholders were instructed to communicate to the study team which scores if any, they're concerned about. It was suggested that the Study team craft a map depicting the locations corresponding to the alpha (idea) designator to make it easier for the committee to review each idea. This was to be considered given staff resources.

Recap / Actions

T.J. offered to email the list of ideas along with the study team's preliminary scores to the stakeholder committee for review and to provide comments on. The next stakeholder committee meeting (#4) is scheduled for Tuesday, September 27th in the City of Orting's Public Safety building. Stakeholder committee meeting #5 will be held on Wednesday, October 26th where the committee will approve the ranked strategies. Study public information sharing sessions are tentatively planned for November 15 & 16.