



US 2 Upper Wenatchee Valley
TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Project Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Wednesday, April 17, 2019

12:00 PM – 2:00 PM

AGENDA ITEM #1: WELCOME

In-Person Participants

- Nancy Smith, Leavenworth Chamber of Commerce
- Duane Goehner, Citizen, Friends of Leavenworth
- Joel Walinski, City of Leavenworth
- Craig Christiansen, Independent Warehouse Inc.
- Chief Kelly O'Brien, Chelan County Fire District #3
- Richard DeRock, Link Transit
- Jeff Wilkens, Chelan-Douglas Transportation Council
- Scott Bradshaw, Leavenworth Planning Commission
- Sergeant Jason Reinfeld, Chelan County Sheriff
- Nick Manzano, WSDOT
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
- Kendra Breiland, Fehr & Peers
- Kara Hall, Fehr & Peers
- Bianca Popescu, Fehr & Peers

In-Person observing

- Lisa Popoff, WSDOT
- Kathy Murray, WSDOT
- Jim Mahugh, WSDOT

Purpose of the meeting

- Presentation of Vision & Guiding Principles developed based on input from PAC members; present summary of data collection and documentation to date; and gather input from PAC members on Draft Project Evaluation Criteria.

AGENDA ITEM #2 – RECAP & FINDINGS

Kara Hall, Fehr & Peers, provided a review of the corridor Vision and Guiding Principles that were revamped based on feedback from the Project Advisory Group (PAC) at their first meeting. Bianca Popescu, Fehr & Peers, provided an overview of the data that has been gathered about the corridor and the four segments therein.

- Corridor Vision and Principles
 - Vision and Goals have a functional purpose
- Guiding Principles
 - Reliable – helping maintain a reliable travel time between key destinations
 - Safe & Complete – appropriate multimodal infrastructure to enhance safety
 - Vibrant – supporting tourism and growing seasonal usage
 - Realistic – come up with projects and recommendations that can be practically implemented
 - Supported – engage stakeholders and the community
- Planning Context Presentation
 - Segment 1 –
 - Land use is constrained, no bicyclist or pedestrian facilities, no transit options.
 - Traffic volumes are highest on Saturday during the summer.
 - Joel noted that the seasonal shuttle from Leavenworth to Stevens Ski Area should be included in documentation.
 - Segment 2 –
 - Land use is urban/developed with limited projected growth along the corridor.
 - Bicycle lanes and sidewalks are generally provided along US 2 through Leavenworth.
 - One flashing beacon exists today, with more pedestrian crossing upgrades planned.
 - Transit is operated by Link Transit and served by Route 22.
 - StreetLight Data indicates that on a typical weekday most trips in Leavenworth begin and end in the City with areas to the east making up the majority of trips.
 - Segment 3 –
 - Rural land uses including agriculture and agricultural tourism
 - No bicycle facilities provided on US 2, North Road is considered an alternative route.
 - Route 22 serves 5 stops along this segment.
 - Traffic volumes are highest on weekends and in December; however less peaks in traffic occur due to use as a regional commuter route.
 - Collisions are focused mostly around areas with local access to US 2.
 - Segment 4 –
 - No major changes to land use are expected along this portion of the corridor.
 - No bicycle and pedestrian facilities are provided on US 2.
 - Route 22 serves both directions and detours onto local streets in Cashmere.
 - Richard DeRock noted this is due to restrictions on stopping along the highway with speed limits greater than 45 mph.

- Speed was noted as the largest contributor to collisions in this segment.
 - Jim noted that we should clarify if collisions were caused by exceeding the speed limit or driving too fast for the conditions.

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, provided an introduction to the project website, us2upperwenatchee.participate.online, that is now live. She provided results of early analytics about usage of the site and the survey.

- Public Engagement Recap
 - Website is live – 58 users with 65 sessions
 - People are looking at 3.4 pages per session, 3 minutes and 30 seconds on average on the site – as of this morning
 - Source of visitor URLs are 34% Wenatchee, 12% Leavenworth, 10% Seattle, and 39% other places – as of this morning
 - Half of the visitors are viewing on mobile or tablet, the other half on desktop
 - Getting to the site: Almost half the visitors are coming directly to the site via the URL, almost half are coming from Facebook, and 8% are coming via WSDOT
 - 38 people have taken the survey so far

Website discussion:

- Duane noted that only high-level data is shown so far, and that more data might be expected
- Other requested updates to the website include limiting drone footage to 30 seconds per video to highlight what we want users to see
- Nancy Smith (Leavenworth Chamber of Commerce) noted she sent it to the Chamber Board and not the full membership (600 people) – Penny asked Nancy to put a link on the Chamber’s website
- The Project Team noted that the community should start weighing in on guiding principles as soon as possible.

AGENDA ITEM #3 – PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA EXERCISE & REPORT BACK

Kendra Breiland, Fehr & Peers, introduced the topic and noted the project team will talk about capital recommendations at the next meeting. Kendra discussed the draft criteria and how they were drawn from the guiding principles. Once the criteria were determined, evaluation metrics were developed for each criterion. She asked the PAC members for their feedback on the draft criteria and evaluation metrics.

- PAC discussion:
 - Criterion 1.1
 - Change to “seeks to maintain” travel times – we don’t want to design for peak corridor season. This could be addressed through the rankings.
 - Criterion 1.2
 - Maybe it should go into the safety category?
 - Criterion 2:

- Use WSDOT target zero language so the evaluation aligns with WSDOT practices. Would help when seeking funding.
- Replace enhancing safety with reduce crash potential instead. Then the study can use crash analysis to compare locations
- Criterion 2.1
 - Determining how to measure depends on whether looking at long-term or short-term
 - Will need to make sure we meet criteria for Federal Funding
- Criterion 2.2
 - Replace the word “quality” with the word “comfort”
 - Safe should be referencing infrastructure/construction in the guiding principles

Activity

The PAC was broken into small groups and given four sample projects on which to test the criteria. After the testing, the group shared their observations about the criteria and the evaluation process.

Group Report Back

- Some PAC members found the criteria/evaluation process cumbersome.
- A criterion may not address an issue on a segment, so it shouldn't be scored
- For criterion 2.1, it should be framed for a proactive approach instead of a reactive approach
- It was difficult to apply some metrics when the project wasn't dealing with traffic
- Felt like the project's impact on the criteria is minimal
 - It was noted that not all projects will get a score from all criteria.
- Need to be sure all terms are clarified such that terms like “regional” are not interpreted differently for different users
- May want to consider a halfway point for criteria for improving emergency response times
- Criteria 3.2 needs a halfway point
- Project definitions were so broad they couldn't be scored effectively – i.e. pedestrian crossings – if the location isn't known and details aren't provided, sometimes the criteria wouldn't work
- Should we weight the principals equally? The Sheriff thinks the EMS times should be highest, Chamber will want vibrancy to be highest.
- We should keep all Guiding Principles ranked the same to ensure no double counting at multiple levels
- Reliable doesn't always mean improved – do we want better travel times? It is important to define what you mean. Maybe need to include reliable and improved.
- 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 all say 'improves', which contradicts the word 'reliable'.

Penny asked the group, overall, how did the criteria / evaluation matrix work?

- When the tweaks we've suggested are made, it can work well
- The team did a nice job of not double counting between criteria categories.
- There is double counting between 1.1 and 1.2, but that's okay because they are inside the same group.

AGENDA ITEM #4 – NEXT STEPS & PROJECT OVERVIEW

Penny and Kara reviewed next steps in the project.

Kara noted the team will begin to develop a project list to get to apply these criteria. Project evaluation will begin in June with the next PAC meeting

PAC discussion

- Who is generating the list of projects?
 - The project team will workshop a list and then engage with the community to narrow down the list
 - The process is modifiable if projects come up during the process
- Make sure the process is open to benefit from the public. They may have good ideas to suggest.
- It's important how it is presented – don't just share a "list of ideas" – ensure people think outside the box and share their ideas

Penny reviewed community involvement milestones and planned activities. She asked the PAC for input on target audiences for briefings and timing for local and visitor outreach.

- The online website, with survey, is open and the survey asking about guiding principles will be live for a few more weeks.
- A flier is under development for sharing with the public. It announces the project and is intended to draw people to the online site.
- Either the first or second weekend of June, tabling at the Leavenworth Farmers Market will reach locals. They will be able to take the survey, with whatever questions are being asked at the time, at the table.
- In June or July a full brochure will be developed with Vision, Guiding Principles, criteria, and projects being considered. It will include an invite for other project ideas.
- In June and July two targeted briefings will occur. Penny suggested the target audiences could be underserved corridor users and/or typically unengaged people. Penny noted a stakeholder interview subject offered to organize a briefing for local agricultural workers, especially Hispanic workers.
 - A suggestion was to do a briefing to hospital workers, as the hospital is the largest employer group in Leavenworth, and that group has the highest potential transit ridership. They have difficult shifts to work with.
- In September a community meeting will seek comments on the draft plan.

PAC Discussion

- Regarding transit, the situation is changing while the study is ongoing. The Park and Ride is opening June 28, with the shuttle starting to operate. Link Transit is adding 8% operating increase to Route 22 and six days a week of eight hours of shuttle service. The Board is going to the ballot to ask voters to double transit service all day on Saturdays and Sundays. The election is August 6.
 - These changes to the corridor should be considered as the project proceeds.
- Other changes are that DOT changed the flashing yellow left turns and are adding crosswalks.
- We need to ensure that these changes are reflected. We can't assume the transit improvements will happen, so they need to be listed as projects because they are part of what's on the table, but they may not go through
- Perhaps we should add a question to the online survey now, asking people what transportation improvements come to mind.
 - Yes, we want to ensure that open brainstorming happens for the community.
 - Open question to be added to the survey – action item for Penny.
- Penny asked the group how to target visitors. She suggested tabling on September 28th at the Autumn Leaf Festival.
 - That's more of a local festival.
 - The following weekend is the first weekend of Oktoberfest and the marathon.
 - We (Chamber) could do an electronic e-blast and website and Facebook and Instagram that reaches visitors.
 - A Saturday in August or early September will have more visitors in town than the Autumn Leaf Festival.
- WSDOT – We can use Twitter and Facebook to share the survey.

Penny reviewed action items including update criteria based on input, add open question to survey about transportation projects, and sending out flier and website analytics to PAC.

The meeting was adjourned.