

1.0 Introduction

Through its State Route (SR) 302 Corridor Study, WSDOT proposes to (1) provide an efficient and functional transportation route through the SR 302 corridor that will improve roadway capacity, mobility, and safety, and (2) address regional connection issues along the route. A number of alternatives have been identified for improving the corridor. These alternatives were developed in conjunction with a Corridor Study conducted by WSDOT in 1993. The alternatives described in this report also incorporate recommendations and feedback that WSDOT obtained from the public and interested stakeholders during public meetings/open houses held on September 25, 2007 and on December 4 and 6, 2007.

Level 1 Screening Process

A two-stage alternative screening process was designed to evaluate the broad range of alternatives that were identified during the 2007 public process. The purpose of the screening process is to determine the reasonable range of alternatives needed for study in a NEPA EIS. WSDOT and the consultant team developed a value-based screening process for this project to evaluate the alternatives for improving the corridor. Level 1 screening was conducted on September 26, 2008 to evaluate the value, performance, and benefit each alternative presents for improving the SR 302 corridor. The screening process is an objective and qualitative procedure that has been successfully used by WSDOT and other public agencies for evaluating multiple alternatives/scenarios under consideration for improving transportation infrastructure. The process focuses on the value and benefit each alternative offers for meeting the purpose and need of the project.

On August 5, 2008, WSDOT presented the broad range of alternatives to the statewide agency group for environmental stewardship (SAGES). The briefing paper for that presentation, called the Project Data Summary Sheet, as well as the SR 302 Corridor Study Technical Memorandum #1 - Design Criteria Assumptions, each provided a useful starting point for alternative screening. The intent of the evaluation is to quickly and efficiently screen a broad set of alternatives to identify possible “fatal flaws” of each alternative and qualitatively rank them to identify which alternatives should be carried forward for further consideration and evaluation in the more detailed Level 2 screening process. The evaluation criteria for the Level 1 screening included meeting the purpose and need for the project, environmental considerations (both built and natural), constructability, and other project attributes identified by the project screening committee.

The screening process involved four steps:

1. Gathering background data.
2. Evaluating alternatives.
3. Selecting alternatives to advance to Level 2 screening process.
4. Documenting the Level 1 screening process.

This alternatives screening analysis documents the Level 1 screening process and recommends four alternatives for evaluation in the Level 2 screening process.