

**SR 302 Advisory Committee Meeting
December 9, 2008
Burley Community Club
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.**

Attendees:

Terry Bouck, Peninsula School District
Senator Derek Kilmer
Pat Leach, Tacoma Power
Mike Baum, Key Peninsula Community Council
Laurie Ellis, Key Peninsula Business Association
Jay Spady, South Kitsap Improvement
Mike Galizio, Pierce County
Scott Gallacher, Key Peninsula Metropolitan Parks
Randy Boss
Jim Rogers, Kitsap County
Murray Payne, Burley Lagoon Coalition
George King, Burley Club
Brian Ward, Pierce County Sheriff
Dennis Marshall, Lake Holiday Association
Jean Archer, Pierce Transit
Chuck West, Key Peninsula Fire Department
Fred Marinkovich, Fishing Interests
Amy Rigalla, 82nd Street Neighborhood
Dave Morris, Purdy Businesses
Bobbi Woodward, 145th and 88th Road Association

Study Team:

John Donahue, WSDOT SR 302 Project Manager
Yvette Liufau, WSDOT
Kristen Maines, HDR Inc.
Mark Burch, HDR Inc.

Introductions

John Donahue opened the meeting welcoming those in attendance. Four new members were introduced. Fred Marinkovich who represents fishing interests, Amy Ragala representing the 82nd Street neighborhood, Dave Morris representing Purdy business community and Bobbi Woodward representing the 145th and 88th road association.

Study Progress to Date / Alternative #10 added

John Donahue talked about the new Alternative 10 that's being studied. During the Level 1 screening process, the idea of considering the shortest crossing of Burley Lagoon (near 154th St) was brought to the study team's attention. The study team decided to bring the alternative into the screening process. This decision was based on the probability that a

shorter bridge across Burley Lagoon would eventually come up during this environmental process now or later and needed to be looked at. John Donahue and Dave Skinner of HDR Inc. conducted the level 1 screening of Alternative 10, found it to score reasonably, and it will be added to the alternatives to be screened in the level 2 screening process.

John also mentioned there will be a public scoping meeting on January 12, 2009, at the Key Peninsula Civic Center. This meeting is the official kick-off to this environmental process and WSDOT will present its proposal for alternatives to be studied in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and it will be a more defined range of alternatives.

Questions asked by the committee:

- Will the advisory committee be at the public meeting so people have the chance to ask them questions? *Comments or questions can be sent anytime and during this process and if advisory committee members are at the meeting, they would probably welcome your questions. As comments are received, WSDOT will respond to each comment during the scoping period.*
- How did Alternative 2, Existing Alignment, score in level 1 screening and how can it be added back to the range of alternatives being studied? *The level 1 screening report is currently in draft form and will be published on the website once it's finalized. An alternative can be re-introduced into the project by submitting comments in this process, and WSDOT is always accepting comments about this study.*
- Is Department of Natural Resources (DNR) involved in this process? *In the interest of time, John will address the question at the end of the meeting.*

Criteria Weighting Exercise

John introduced the group to the criteria weighting exercise the committee will vote on, which will be used in the level 2 screening process. The committee was asked to look at each criteria and answer which is more important or are both equally important. John informed the group the decision on each criterion will be based on consensus as a committee and not by individual vote. Mark Burch from HDR Inc. and a member of the SR 302 study team helped facilitate the criteria weighting exercise.

Committee Exercise Discussion:

Improve SR 302 Mainline vs. Improve Local Operations –

- Speeds are higher on mainline and therefore more dangerous
- If mainline is improved, local operations will be improved too. Some felt this is not necessarily a true statement.

Result = A/B, did not reach consensus

Improve SR 302 Mainline vs. Archeological/Cultural/4(f)/Agri/LU –

- The committee reached near consensus with 1 vote stating archeological/cultural/4(f)/agricult/LU was more important.

Result = A, reached near consensus with one dissenter

Improve SR 302 Mainline vs. Reloc/Social/EJ –

- It's important to keep a rural lifestyle
- Human safety is important

Result = AD, equally important

Improve SR 302 Mainline vs. Wetlands/Wildlife & Terrestrial Habitat –

- Safety is most important speaking from the perspective of schools and children
- Good groundwater is good for people
- Putting anything in the lagoon is bad news because it will kill everything

Result = AE, no consensus so split as equally important

Improve SR 302 Mainline vs. Fish/Surface Water/Aquatics Habitat –

- No comments

Result = AF, equally important

Improve SR 302 Mainline vs. Project Schedule/Phasing –

- Does this criteria include expandability of the roadway or in the phasing? The criteria for expandable is listed under "Improve SR 302 Mainline"

Result = AG, equally important

Improve SR 302 Mainline vs. Improve Travel Time

- Travel time is important because it relates to pollution and the integrity of the corridor
- Longer time on an improved route could mean less pollution because vehicles are going the posted speed limit

Result = A, most voted improve mainline was more important (2 voted for travel time)

Improve Local Operations vs. Archeological/Cultural/4(f)/Agri/LU –

- No comments

Result = BC, equally important

Improve Local Operations vs. Reloc/Social/EJ –

- The State is not going to build an unsafe road

- Transit service is important and must be able to move people to destinations (work, healthcare, shopping, etc.). It's important to improve mainline in order to get buses into areas.

Result = BD, no consensus

Improve Local Operations vs. Wetlands/Wildlife & Terrestrial Habitat –

- No comments

Result = BE, equally important

Improve Local Operations vs. Fish/Surface Water/Aquatic Habitat –

- Saving human lives is more important than saving fish
- Saving fish so it's safe to eat saves lives too

Result = BF, equally important

Improve Local Operations vs. Project Schedule/Phasing –

- No comments

Result = BG, equally important

Improve Local Operations vs. Improve Travel Times –

- No comments

Result = BH, equally important

Archeological/Cultural/4(f)/Agri/LU vs. Reloc/Social/EJ –

- A park enhances the quality of life, but there has to be life to have quality of life
- Agriculture is important in order to have food to sustain life

Result = CD, equally important

Archeological/Cultural/4(f)/Agri/LU vs. Wetlands/Wildlife & Terrestrial Habitat –

- Maintaining a park by using chemicals to keep grass green is harmful to the environment
- Wetlands are more important than preserving a park

Result = CE, no consensus so split as equally important

Archeological/Cultural/4(f)/Agri/LU vs. Fish/Surface Water/Aquatics Habitat –

- Maintaining a park by using chemicals to keep grass green (for example) is harmful to the environment

Result = CF, equally important

Archeological/Cultural/4(f)/Agri/LU vs. Project Schedule/Phasing –

- People say what's most important to them is to just get it done
- People say get it done, but what they want isn't necessarily the quickest or easiest to do

Result = CG, equally important

Archeological/Cultural/4(f)/Agri/LU vs. Improve Travel Times –

- Travel time includes emergency vehicles

Result = CH, equally important

Reloc/Social/EJ vs. Wetlands/Wildlife & Terrestrial Habitat –

- Sometimes local businesses don't want to stick around if the environment is destroyed
- NEPA will scrutinize what this advisory committee decides which is why it's ok to be bias toward human nature because the environment will be covered.
- It's not just the environment that will be studied.

Result = DE, most voted in favor of relocation and four vote they were equally important

Reloc/Social/EJ vs. Fish/Surface Water/Aquatics Habitat –

- No comments

Result = DF, most voted for relocation (6 voted they were equally important and 1 voted for fish)

Reloc/Social/EJ vs. Project Schedule/Phasing –

- A fast project is more important

Result = DG, most voted for relocation, but final outcome was split so decision was equally important

Reloc/Social/EJ vs. Improve Travel Times –

- No comments

Result = DH, 6 members voted for equally important and the most voted for relocation

Wetlands/Wildlife & Terrestrial Habitat vs. Fish/Surface Water/Aquatics Habitat –

- No comments

Results = EF, equally important

Wetlands/Wildlife & Terrestrial Habitat vs. Project Schedule/Phasing –

- No comments

Results = EG, no where near consensus

Wetlands/Wildlife & Terrestrial Habitat vs. Improve Travel Times –

- No comments

Results = EH, 5 voted for equally important

Fish/Surface Water/Aquatics Habitat vs. Project Schedule/Phasing –

- No comments

Results = FG, no consensus on this

Fish/Surface Water/Aquatics Habitat vs. Improve Travel Times –

- No comments

Results = FH, no consensus

Project Schedule/Phasing vs. Improve Travel Times –

- No comments

Results = GH, most voted for project schedule

Which attribute will provide the greater improvement to the project relative to Purpose and Need?

Improve SR 302 Mainline Operations and Sa	A	AB	A	AD	AE	AF	AG	A
Improve Local Operations and Safety	B	BC	BD	BE	BF	BG	BH	
Arch / Cultural / 4(f) / Ag / Land Use	C	CD	CE	CF	CG	CH		
Relocations / Social / EJ / Noise / Visual	D	DE	DF	DG	DH			
Wetlands / Wildlife and Terrestrial Habitat	E	EF	EG	EH				
Fish / Surface Water / Aquatic Habitat	F	FG	FH					
Project Schedule / Phasing	G	GH						
Improve Travel Times	H							

Wrap Up

John mentioned the study team for the next phase of work will be developing the purpose and role of the advisory committee when the project starts up again in July 2009. He

asked if there was any interest in holding another advisory committee meeting prior to this and there was no interest at this time from the committee.

There was some final discussion about the Existing SR 302 Alternative that was screened out during the level 1 screening. A committee member suggested WSDOT take another look at this alternative. When asked why it was screened out, John pointed out the issues with expanding the roadway on the spit, the park on the spit being a Section 4f issue, and fixing the curves in Wauna. Another committee member suggested the idea of building a viaduct on the existing SR 302 route and asked for a straw vote from the committee. Some discussion followed that the viaduct option was not the same as the Existing SR 302 Alternative that was studied and screened out. There was a feeling from some of the group that they would like to find a way to improve the existing route.

Additional Comments:

- If we want to get funding for a project, we need to keep the study moving ahead
- There was a suggestion from the public to build an express lane to solve the congestion problem

John thanked everyone for attending and the meeting was adjourned.